

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: January 25, 2022 7:22 PM

To: Bishop, Kathy <Kathy.Bishop@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>;
Thorne, Jason <Jason.Thorne@hamilton.ca>

Subject: NEW development projects at Wilson/Rousseau and Wilson/Academy

Hello Councillor Ferguson,

I'm not sure if this is the correct way to send my feedback on these 2 development projects, but I have read through all of the documentation online for both proposals and have some thoughts to share:

1 - my main concern is the lack of compatibility with the existing neighbourhood, and with the Wilson ST Secondary Plan.

In both proposals, the developer shows the photos of the surrounding context. It is glaringly obvious that these developments don't fit in the slightest. They look like they'd be better at Yonge and Eglinton. The feel of Ancaster is a very green village. Trees dominate the landscape, and should remain so. The raised elevation at Wilson/Rousseau already makes any development there dramatic. Adding 7-8 stories would be ridiculous.

I'm not saying that I think we should stick strictly to 2.5 stories. With the right design and scale, I could see some portions of both developments landing in the 3.5- 4.5 storey range.

2 - on the plus side: I like the addition of retail space and patios on both projects. Wilson St desperately needs this.

I like the retention of the two homes in the Wilson/Rousseau project, and the retention of the stone building in the Wilson/Academy project. However, surrounding those homes with 7-8 stories of glass again, doesn't fit in the slightest.

3 - the cobblestone/village square concept at Wilson/Academy is very nice

4 - architecture: the podium of Wilson/Rousseau works for me...it is pedestrian scaled and 3-4 stories. I could see that development consisting of 3 or 4 of these buildings instead of one giant long slab running along the back of the property.

I believe that both projects need to use a historic village architectural design, as laid out in the Wilson St Secondary plan.

I'll attach some photos to demonstrate the feel I believe we should be trying to enhance in this village, not destroy.

Some of the pics are from Unionville in Markham, and Kleinburg Village in Vaughan...neither village is adding 6-8 stories of modern glass. Nor is Niagara on the Lake. Historic villages need to be walkable and green. Wilson Streets' worst feature is the car driveways on every single property cutting across the sidewalk.

The following photos will give a better idea of how we should be developing the village, and some courtyard/piazza concepts for the public patio/dining spaces.

Thx for the time, and opportunity to share feedback.

[REDACTED]







alamy

Image ID: WABN7Y
www.alamy.com

From: Gen
Sent: February 4, 2022 12:20 PM
To: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Moving of the Marr house

Hi Mr. Van Rooi,

In regards to the moving of the Marr house in Ancaster. First of all I hear different stories as to the location. Is it to be placed at the top of Lorne Ave. or Acedemy.

I have lived on Lorne Ave. For almost 30 years and I love the fact that it is a Cul-De-Sac.

My worry is that if you move the Marr house to the top of Lorne Ave. you will want to Open up Lorne Ave. to Wilson St. and I am opposed to this.

Lorne Ave. has an opening for pedestrians at the top to access Wilson St..

I am OK with foot and bike traffic only.

We have new families with children who have moved in because our street is quiet , Safe , a Cul-De-Sac.

We have constant high speed traffic issues on Lodor. Some vehicles going at least 50 - 60 Kms on a small side street.

Our street only houses about 10 homes.

Please let me know if you intend on trying to open up the top of Lorne Ave. To Wilson.

Thank you ,
Genevieve

Sent from my iPad

From: David Hardcastle

Sent: February 10, 2022 11:11 AM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Re: Proposed Building Development. Files UHOPA-22-004 / ZAC-22-011

> On Feb 10, 2022, at 11:08 AM, David Hardcastle <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Dear Sirs

> I have the following comments to make with regards to the proposed development on the lands located at 392, 398, 400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorn Avenue, Ancaster Ontario. My first comment is that I object to the high of this proposed building which is being quoted at eight (8) stories high where as the current regulations state a maximum height of 2.5 stories. Also I am concerned regarding how this development will effect the existing services especially the sanitary sewers systems and how and where they propose to discharge the storm water run off from this development without effecting existing adjoining properties. This is even more critical given the increased rainfall we are experiencing due to climate change. Will the developer be paying for the upgrading of the sewer system, incoming water gas and electrical services for this building.

> This developer is proposing to have the main entrance to this development to be off of Academy Street which is a side road and is not built to have an extra 200 plus car using it on a daily basis. This will also cause even more congestion at the junction of Wilson and Academy Streets. How will the developer control the traffic when carrying out works on the sewer and incoming services which will cause major disruption on Wilson, Academy and Rousseaux Streets.

> The developer also wants to move the existing designated Heritage building which is in a poor condition due to the lack of repairs carried out since being purchased by the developer, the possibility of it surviving the move is very low and I would request a full report from the developer on their proposal on how they will carry out this work and what guarantee they will give us on this work being carried out successfully.

> This proposed building is totally out of keeping with the existing architectural features of the Ancaster Village and I would ask how the developer and architect came up with this design as it is obvious that they do not live in the area and I question how much time they have spent in the Ancaster Village. I would ask them to explain to us who reside in this area, how this development will help enhance the Village, when it bears no resemblance to any other building in shape or size in Ancaster Village.

>

> Regards

> David Hardcastle

From: Linda Clements

Sent: February 13, 2022 9:47 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Construction at Academy and Wilson Street

Dear Tim;

I have concerns over the proposed building on the corner of Academy and Wilson Street.

I live on Academy Street and find the ability to turn onto Wilson St. a challenge at the present time due to traffic. The parking in front of Hanley's makes visibility difficult and the Coach and Lantern has food and beer trucks parked on Academy for delivery .

The street is narrow so I can't imagine anymore traffic at any point.

When we had the farmers market on the proposed lot everyone parked against the law on Academy Street. This didn't allow two way traffic let alone an emergency vehicle. I can't imagine where people going to the Coach and Lantern Pub and shops will park once the construction takes place.

During construction it isn't possible for the large trucks to park on Academy. This has been happening a lot when there is construction in the area and is a safety hazard.

I wonder how the increased waste water will be managed as well.

I am concerned about the relocation of the heritage building onsite because of lack of visibility as well as damage during the movement I can't say I like the idea of a building of that height that doesn't fit into the ambiance of the village.

A lot of concerns which I don't feel can be alleviated

Sincerely;

Linda Clements

Sent from my iPad

From: Larry Travis

Sent: February 18, 2022 1:45 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Fwd: Ancaster - Wilson Street Plan Amendment - -file - UHOPA-22-004 / ZAC-22011

Good day - I am writing to express my concern over the proposed plan amendments to Wilson Street East / Lorne Avenue.

It is my understanding that there is a desire to build an eight story structure. It is interesting that the proposed amendment deems this a “Pedestrian Focus (C5a) Zone. While I cannot begin to understand the nuances of the various zoning terms, as I look at the elevation and proposed footprint of the structure, this is not a building that one would call Pedestrian Focused. I believe a vibrant town core should encourage pedestrian traffic in order for retail / commercial space to thrive.

The city of Hamilton has a unique opportunity to create a cohesive town core in Ancaster. The lots in question anchor the core and will dictate the character of the town. Rarely is there an opportunity to create a space that will enhance the heart of a town and invite people to visit (eat / drink / shop). The bones of Ancaster are already in place. The Barracks Hotel, the Needle Emporium and the retail/pub space on the corner of Wilson and Academy. Even Glendale Motors when updating their space made every effort to maintain the integrity of the town core. Just up the street, there is the old town hall and the library which was updated sympathetically. The green space surrounding those buildings softens and invites people to linger. The proposed structure offers no evidence of landscaping to soften the street and provide shade on a hot summer day. It does nothing to enhance the current streetscape and I would suggest it will stand out (to quote Prince Charles) 'like a monstrous carbuncle on the face of a much-loved and elegant friend'. While Ancaster is not London, the sentiment remains valid.

I understand the business case for Hamilton - maximize the tax base. I would suggest that the tax base / income to Hamilton could be increased by looking at this from a different perspective. I was in Paris, ON this past fall (during COVID). It was a Saturday and the streets were shoulder to shoulder with people. There were many restaurants and all were full. Tourists flock to Paris as the town has character. Ancaster could offer this same opportunity for tourism - we do not have the Grand River but we have world class hiking trails on our doorstep. The same folks that come to visit the waterfalls and hike the trails will want to stroll the streets of a town with character. A building that could have been plucked from King Street in Toronto stands out of place and holds no allure.

A further consideration to the equation is the inadequate infrastructure to accommodate this level of increased density. The sewage system currently struggles to cope and we have poor

public transit. Before dramatically increasing density (if this passes then one would assume all future builds will be for 8 stories) the current issues should be addressed.

Developers may argue that they cannot make money without building the proposed structure. I would argue that they were aware of the building codes when purchasing the property. They should have done more diligence rather than assume a project that could only be profitable at the expense of the existing character of the town.

You are about to make a decision that Hamilton cannot reverse. It is an opportunity to make a visionary choice with an eye to sustainability that future generations will look and respect or to choose to rubber stamp a building that will maximize short term profits for developers at the expense of pedestrians and town residents forever.

I appreciate your taking the time to consider the options.

Regards,

Lynn Travis

24 Academy Street, Ancaster.

From: Lucie Poling
Sent: February 22, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

Hi,

I'm writing today in reference to the applications by Wilson St. Ancaster Inc for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for lands located at 392,398,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson St. East and 15 Lorne Avenue.

I originally chose to live in Ancaster on Wilson street because of the appealing historical character of the village, the small town feel afforded by the one or two storey buildings fronting Wilson and the great green canopy the numerous trees in the area provide. I realize that some development is bound to take place but the essence of this precious heritage village should be protected.

If the above referenced applications are approved and an eight storey building is permitted to be built in the centre of the village it would be a travesty. We don't want buildings that exceed the present height restrictions in the village centre.

As depicted in the notice sent by the city, the proposed building looks like a massive prison! In the case of this development, or any other, why would we not ensure that the aesthetics of the building complement the character of the village, that it is pleasing to the eye, that it fits in.

We have an opportunity to control the development in the village now. We have a responsibility to get it right. It's too late for Brandon House. Let's protect the Marr-Phillippo house at 398 Wilson! It should be fronting Wilson! It does not belong on Lorne Ave! The fact that the Wilson street view includes the Marr-Phillippo house adds so much to the special character of the village. It's too precious to hide away.

Lastly, I'd like to point out that your current policy of positioning newly constructed buildings at the very front of the property by the sidewalk does not allow for any strip of green space in front of the building which is a negative- we are losing some of our green canopy. Also as a result of this policy, the recently constructed building at 385 Wilson St. East obstructs the street view of its neighbour, the beautiful stone building at 375 Wilson St. East which is a historical building and which is located more than several feet from the sidewalk. Shouldn't the placement of a new building take into consideration it's neighbour's placement and the resulting street view?

I know what kind of town I enjoy living in.....Please, let's get it right!

Sincerely,
Lucie Poling

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 22, 2022 5:41 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Development at Wilson St. E. and Academy St., Ancaster

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed 8 story "mixed use" development at Academy and Wilson Street East in Ancaster; reference: "Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue (Ancaster Ward 12)".

I am a lifelong resident of Ancaster. I live directly across the street from the site of the proposed development. My community and I would be significantly negatively impacted if it were built.

I have a number of concerns regarding this proposed development.

Traffic along Wilson Street and Rousseaux appears to be already near or at capacity. At peak travel times, I have observed traffic to be backed up and long lines of traffic (up to several kilometers) extend both up and down Wilson Street and down Rousseaux Street. During rush hour it can be almost impossible to make a left hand turn out of my driveway onto Wilson Street East. This congestion is further exacerbated when an accident on the 403 drives additional traffic onto either or both of these roads. The streets in my neighbourhood are, without question, not designed to accommodate the large volume of traffic that would ensue if the proposed development was allowed.

I understand that, according to the Wilson Street Secondary Plan, buildings can be a height of 9 m only and must be consistent with the character of the existing neighbourhood. I have seen pictures of the proposed development. The proposed new 8 storey building clearly exceeds these height restrictions and certainly is not in character with the buildings in my neighbourhood and the Ancaster Village core, which includes a number of heritage and historic buildings. It would be a gross overdevelopment of this site and would change the character of the area substantially.

I have environmental concerns regarding this proposal. I am not aware of evidence of adequate waste water pipe capacity for this area. The addition of large buildings may also negatively impact the natural watershed, including Ancaster creek.

I understand that the Niagara Escarpment Commission does not support this development and that the proposal does not comply with the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP). Apparently the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) requires NEP conformity - therefore, as the NEP does not support the proposal, the UHOP also cannot support it. I have personally witnessed at least three huge, beautiful, environmentally relevant mature trees being cut down at this property,

far in advance of any actual development. Green space around my neighbourhood - a vitally important part of my community, for environmental and a multitude of other reasons - has already been destroyed in the past 5 years with development, and I have sadly observed a number of mature trees destroyed to accommodate new buildings. I oppose further decimation of green space in my community. I would think that removing any more trees at the proposed new development site would also violate the city's Climate Emergency Plan.

For the above reasons, I request that this proposed development be stopped.

I expressly request that the City remove my personal information from my submission.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the author.

From: Marilyn Presutti
Sent: February 23, 2022 2:00 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>; timvrooman@hamilton.ca
Subject: Fwd: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-01

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marilyn Presutti** [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Feb 23, 2022 at 1:43 PM
Subject: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-01
To: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], <timvrooman@hamilton.ca>

This message is in reference to the applications by Wilson St. Ancaster Inc for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for lands located at 392,398,400,402,406 and [412 Wilson St. East](#) and 15 Lorne Avenue.

Further to the email sent by our neighbour [REDACTED] we also reside at 371 Wilson Street East and are in total agreement with the sentiments of her message. We are distressed by the nature and scope of the proposed development.

Wilson Street as a major artery with only two lanes through the village core would become a traffic nightmare for so many multiple units to be squeezed in as residential /commercial space. We totally agree this building has no architectural flair or reverence for the scale or charm of our village. We would like to add our names as objecting to this proposal.

Paolo and Marilyn Presutti
371 Wilson St East Unit 1
Ancaster Ontario L9G2C1

Sent from my iPhone

Mr. E. Tim Vrooman, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Dept.
Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Suburban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Hello Mr. Vrooman:

**Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law
Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and
15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.**

I write in response to the above development application. Thank you for inviting input from the community towards formulating your staff report, it is most welcome.

1) General Comments Regarding Mass, Height, Footprint, and Architectural Style of This Application

In general, this development fails by an extreme to conform to the Cultural Heritage Landscape status of the Ancaster Village, which was instituted in the mid-1970s as a means of protecting Ancaster’s heritage context. The Village was established in 1792/3, one of the earliest European settlements in Ontario, and the area still demonstrates a distinctive sense of history.

The developers and the design team for this project appear to have set aside the bylaws and zoning of the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan, implemented a mere 7 years ago to reflect the requirements of the Cultural Heritage Landscape status - i.e., that all new developments must conform to the neighbourhood heritage context.

If approved, this development would loom, overshadow, and overwhelm both the streetscape of Wilson Street and the small-scale Maywood neighbourhood behind it. The development is three times the height allowed under the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP). It is enormous in height, mass and lot coverage.

It also fails to reflect a heritage architectural style even closely resembling the streetscape and local context of the Village as required by the AWSSP. The architecture is not only massive, but aesthetically unattractive, cookie-cutter, and cheap-looking. A prominent architect based in Hamilton has commented about it:

“The left lobby cladding is distressed barnboard if you Zoom in, at a massive scale representative of old growth forest wood grain, or cheap, fake material. Or just careless drawing work. The splayed posts come from the Queen Richmond Centre West office building in downtown Toronto, perhaps an inappropriate reference for a building on Wilson Street in Ancaster.....”

Ancaster Village deserves better.

Infrastructure will likely be unable to accommodate this development, as discussed later in this report. Further, if approved and built, it will consume so much of the capacity of locally

available infrastructure that it is questionable whether other developments duly conforming to the bylaws and zoning will be buildable with what capacity remains.

The consultants’ reports included in the Application are inadequate. There is no hydrogeological report or Phase 2 ESA report documenting the incidence and levels of hydrocarbons in the soil which led to approval of the relocation of the 1840 Marr-Phillipo House which now stands on the property. Further, both the Traffic Study and the Functional Report are inadequate, as will be shown.

The data presented by the developers is inadequate in so many ways that one must conclude that the developer is presenting this proposal opportunistically.

Ancaster Village Heritage Community does not oppose reasonable intensification which accommodates to the current bylaws, zoning and infrastructure limits. However, this proposal is so far outside the boundaries of “reasonable” that it is inconceivable that it might be built. It will certainly lead to other developments of similar size and scale that will ultimately destroy the Village heritage context.

2) Traffic

There are a number of issues regarding the increased traffic to be generated by this development. To quote the Traffic Report,

“The proposed development is expected to generate 78 total two-way trips (26 inbound and 52 outbound) and 143 total two-way trips (79 inbound and 64 outbound) during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.”

I.e., “during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively”.

The data cited by the consultants’ report is incomplete. It shows only peak hour traffic, i.e., narrowly defined as traffic occurring over one hour during the morning and one hour in the evening at peak times. Use of this inadequate measure also applies to the retail component, which is certainly unrealistic since retail will incur traffic at all hours.

Local residents have pointed out that the intensity of traffic tends to increase well before peak hours, and winds down well after peak hours. It appears that drivers are accommodating to the intense traffic at peak times by arriving at the intersection earlier or later, which reduces the queues but extends the times of peak rush hour traffic considerably, and increases traffic pressures on local neighbours and neighbourhoods as well. This is not accounted for in this study, which minimizes the overall traffic and vehicle trip counts severely.

The developer’s Traffic Study data demonstrates that traffic on Wilson and Rousseaux Streets during peak hours is already at or close to capacity. This is also stated by the Salvini Traffic Study recently completed for the Amica/condo development on the Rousseaux/Wilson

intersection. The Salvini study did include 24-hour traffic, which gave a much clearer picture of the pressure on local streets at all hours of the day.

According to both studies, overloads and long queues at the major Wilson/Rousseaux intersection extend in distance far beyond the queue lanes at peak hours on both streets. Interestingly, the Salvini study also indicated that peak hour traffic trips were not a very large percentage of the total 24-hour trips at this location. The present traffic study fails to account for traffic occurrences and potential increases in traffic from this development during other times of the day.

There are few options available for traffic to travel between Ancaster and Hamilton or Dundas - and well beyond as well. Rousseaux Street, which flows into Wilson Street, accesses major highways including the Linc and the 403.

It is particularly crucial to measure 24-hour traffic due to its impact in the Maywood neighbourhood. Academy Street, where the access point to this development will be located, provides direct access to Lodor, Academy and Church Streets, i.e., Maywood. There should be no access to the Maywood neighbourhood from or to this development on Academy Street except for locals. All access in both directions to the development should be from Wilson Street only not including Academy Street.

The Maywood neighbourhood is already plagued with cut-throughs between Rousseaux and Wilson Streets, especially at peak hours. Drivers want to avoid the long lineups and delays at this major intersection. Maywood has among the narrowest public streets in Hamilton, with sidewalks on one side only. Ancaster Square, Ancaster Green, the Town Library, Town Hall offices, Old Town Hall (which hosts many social and city events), the children's playground and splash pad, tennis courts, and lawn bowling park are all accessed through the Maywood neighbourhood. It is important that this traffic not be increased to maintain the walkability and health and safety of the neighbourhood.

Unlike the Salvini Report previously mentioned, the codes used in the graphs in this report are relatively indecipherable for laypersons, and are not accessible on Google. Included should be an interpretive chart, and a simplification of the data presentation.

3) Parking

Based on the City's By-Law No. 05-200, a total of 332 parking spaces (including barrier-free, retail, resident parking spaces) are required for the proposed development. The proposed development will provide 256 parking spaces for residents, which meets the requirement for residents; and 56 spaces for retail/commercial, which presents a technical shortfall of 43 parking spaces for retail/commercial. This shortfall should be remedied.

4) Wastewater Disposal

The Functional Report includes incomplete data regarding sewage waste disposal. In contrast to the traffic study, which provides only peak hour traffic data, the wastewater report includes only estimates of 24-hour flows of sewage, not peak flows at all. This is difficult to reconcile, since

peak flows, not 24-hour flows, determine the real-time demand on the capacity of the wastewater system. The standard method of estimating peak flows, as we understand it, is to multiply the average 24-hour flow by a factor of 5. This is not done.

There is no evidence that the 200 mm sewage pipe on Wilson Street has the capacity to carry the extra load from this development nor, if it does, whether it will leave adequate capacity behind for other developments more in conformity to the AWSSP to be built in Ancaster Village. Further, there is no information regarding the pumping station on Old Dundas Road in the valley below the escarpment, which sends the sewage back up the escarpment to Rousseaux Street, and whether it is adequate to cope with this extra load.

Further work on the Functional Report is clearly necessary, especially since the route taken by the wastewater pipe has apparently contributed to sewage-flooded basements in the valley below the escarpment.

5) Hydrocarbons in the Soil

It was mentioned above that there is inadequate data about the hydrocarbon content of the soil on the lot. The presence of significant hydrocarbons, though undocumented, necessitated the relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House on the site. This data is not only important for underpinning the relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House, but also for generating plans necessary to deal with the contaminated soil, which is an environmental issue not dealt with in the Application.

Comments below were made by a qualified hydrogeological consultant of 30 years' experience in the field, Wilf Ruland P.Eng, located in Ancaster. He says in response to our queries:

“It’s true that this is a Geotechnical report, and that its purpose is to ensure structures has sound footings etc. Nonetheless, there are some interesting points:

1) A total of 14 boreholes were drilled (and some were completed as wells), with the borehole logs at the back of the report. None of the borehole logs for the boreholes/wells closest to the Marr-Phillipo House made any mention of hydrocarbons - which is passing odd, given that the proponent has said contamination around the house is so bad it has to be moved.

2) Only one borehole log (for BH/MW8) notes hydrocarbon odours - it is in the extreme southwest corner of the property.

3) No one seems to have told the Geotechnical engineer that the proponent considers the site to be contaminated. There is no mention of special provisions for testing or safe disposal of water which may run into excavations, nor is there any provision for testing and safe handling/disposal of soils being excavated for building construction.

The report leaves me with a number of questions. What we need is the Hydrogeology Report, and the Environmental Site Assessment reports.”

And in another communication:

“This report is lengthy but incomplete. Various bits are missing - most critically for me the Figures are missing, as is Appendix I (the Site Conceptual Model).

This was a Phase I ESA - as such, it was a desktop study.

The key documents will be the Phase II ESA and the Hydrogeology Report.

If such soil and/or water samples exist, then they will be in the Phase II ESA and/or the Hydrogeology Report.”

6) Noise Study

The noise study was also incomplete. It addressed noise levels in the neighbourhood and those which would emanate from the relocated Marr-Phillipo historical building. It failed to address noise and disturbance emitted by the building itself, for example the climate control apparatus, and its residents, into the neighbourhood. This is also a failure that should be remedied, since many of the homes in the neighbourhood are located very close to the new building.

7) Conclusions

In conclusion, this development should be denied, and any future application should be required to accommodate to the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria for development and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Maton PhD, President
Ancaster Village Heritage Community
330 Lodor Street
Ancaster, ON L9G 2Z2
[REDACTED]

28 Academy St,
Ancaster,
Ontario,
L9G 2X9
23 February 2022

Planning Committee,
City of Hamilton
71 Main St West,
1st, Floor
Hamilton,
Ontario.
L8P 4Y5

Attn: Mr. Tim Voorman,
Heritage Planner

Dear Mr. Voorman,

RE: Files: UHOPA-22-004 / ZAC-22-011

I wish to register my objections to this proposed development.

The letter sent out on February 4 contains few details. There are no reports included by consultants, staff, or experts from the host of specialist disciplines expected.

Sufficient to say:

- 1) The building, as depicted in the application, does not meet the general intent of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan or the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan. The proposed development is too large, dense and high for the property and surrounding area.
- 2) The building height, density, bulk and scale are out of all proportion to the neighbourhood and are totally incompatible with the heritage and character of our historic village. A huge, continuous building, as proposed, just does not fit into the village street scape.

- 3) The building is inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood and significantly detracts from, not enhances, the Village. This plan not only eradicates the heritage character of the existing neighbourhood, it leads to the further destruction of the historic roots of Ancaster, as exist in the other areas of the Village Core.
- 4) The massing is far too big for the area. It is over three times the maximum height allowed in the Wilson Street Secondary Plan. The Wilson Street Secondary Plan and its associated bylaws, were developed after much consultation with many interested parties. They have been totally ignored. This plan ONLY became effective seven years ago and was supposed to remain in place for some twenty years. That objective has been nowhere near recognized. To suggest it is outdated is nonsense.
- 5) The well - known and documented traffic problems of the Maywood area will be exacerbated and become even more intolerable. The increase in resident and commercial traffic this development will bring can be readily envisaged and is unacceptable.
- 6) Access to the building is from Academy Street. A residential street that is currently overloaded with cut-through traffic trying to avoid the Rousseaux / Wilson St intersection. Academy Street is far too narrow to handle the volumes and sizes of vehicles that will service this building. It will lead to a safety hazard the city cannot condone.
- 7) There are so many things wrong with this development it is difficult to enumerate them all. The main ones; beside the huge overreach in massing, lot coverage, and imposition on the neighbours from noise, shadowing and oversight; are the increased heavy traffic on already overloaded Wilson, Lodor and Academy Streets.

These lands should be developed in accordance with the bylaw “Mixed Use Medium Density - Pedestrian Focus (C5a, 570) Zone”. This permits a building with a height of 9 metres, which must also be consistent with the character of the Village.

Ancaster was founded in 1793 and is the third oldest community in Ontario. Development should venerate, not destroy this heritage. The planning and zoning in Ancaster and the city of Hamilton for the Village Area, was designed to project a humble, simple but not overbuilt street scape. Not this monstrosity.

The application contains many of the failings of the recent Wilson St / Rousseaux application and similarly, must be denied.

Please keep me advised of further steps. I may wish to make a formal presentation at any further meeting that might arise.

Yours faithfully,

R.H.Baker P.Eng.

From: Toby Yull
Sent: February 23, 2022 8:09 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Manchia/Spallacci Development Wilson St Ancaster

Hi Tim

I wanted to register my opposition to this development at Academy and Wilson Streets, and the ridiculous idea that moving the Marr-Phillippo house could be successfully accomplished.

The rendered drawing shows a building that's massively over-scaled, both for the site and for the surrounding streetscape. The fake stone facing just makes it worse -- this is not 'respecting the character' of Ancaster -- more like a developer's rough attempt at mollifying planning values without understanding or caring what a desirable outcome would really look like.

The collection of styles and elements thrown at the east-end corner is a mind-boggling salad-bar. It bears zero relationship to the rest of the building and to the town of Ancaster. Honestly, I'd be embarrassed to submit this building for this site!

Spallacci built an infill condo building in International Village on King Street 20 or so years ago that was a thousand times more respectful -- what has happened here? (Sergio Manchia?? Who can forget what he did at the southwest corner of Aberdeen and Dundurn?)

Anyway, please put me down against this proposal. Spank them and send them away to do much much better.

thanks,

Toby Yull

Dundas

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 24, 2022 7:54 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: With Regard to UHOPA-22-004 - ZAC-22-011

Dear Ohi Izirein,

I am opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendment (File No. ZAC-22-011) and (UHOPA-22-0040 being proposed by Wilson Street Ancaster Inc.

Relocating the Phillipo-Marr House (if it can be relocated) which has stood at its current location since 1834, and is one of only 5 Ontario Heritage Act designated buildings in Ancaster, will detrimentally affect the atmosphere and character of the Ancaster Village community.

Is there any guarantee, or a signed and stamped Engineer's report indicating that it is possible to move the Phillipo-Marr House, located at 398 Wilson St E, Ancaster, ON L9G 2C3, without severely damaging or destroying this historic structure?

Why do we have the Ontario Heritage Act, of which the if Phillipo-Marr House is a designated building, if heritage buildings are not protected?

Is the preservation and protection of designated Heritage Buildings not the responsibility of council?

The proposed new development does not in any way attempt to follow the requirements outlined in the Wilson Street Secondary Plan's Area Urban Design Guidelines.

Please Remove all Personal Information before entering this letter into the public record.

[REDACTED]

From: Jennifer Davis
Sent: February 24, 2022 11:53 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Proposed New Development on Wilson Street East, Ancaster

Mr E. Tim Vrooman, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department Development Planning, Heritage and Design -
Suburban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario

Attention: E. Tim Vrooman

Re UHOPA-22-004/ZAC - 22-001

I am writing in response to your letter of February 4, 2022 seeking comments for staff to assist in preparation of a staff report for the above applications

The 8 storey condominium building proposed for Wilson Street East, in Ancaster, Ontario. I believe the building is totally inappropriate for this location in our and violates all aspects of The Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP).

The AWSSP was developed over an 18 month period of time, beginning in 2012 by a committee of residents and city councillors in consultation with residents of Ancaster, business people, City of Hamilton staff, and area boards of education. The plan has been in place since 2015 and is scheduled for a review in 2035. The AWSSP supersedes the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP).

The AWSSP delineates 5 distinct character areas along Wilson Street. The in which this development at Wilson Street East would be located is in the centre of what is referred to as "The Village Core", extending from Rousseaux Street to Daley Drive (4 Blocks). This proposal violates The AWSSP in terms of its mass, materials, setbacks design, height and size. In addition, it over develops "The Village Core" and does not demonstrate how it intends to meet the intent if The AWSSP guidelines. Finally, it does not reflect any of the cultural heritage of the surrounding area.

Another issue related to this proposal is the fact that The Planning Department of the City of Hamilton has approved the developer's request to move a Heritage Building, The Marr-Phillipo House, built in 1870, which currently stands at the corner of Wilson Street East and Academy Avenue. It is proposed that this building be moved away for The Wilson street scape to Lorne Avenue because of suspected soil contamination caused by a gasoline station previously located on the site. The developers, however, have not provided and independent, objective hydro geological reports that support their contention that soil contamination is present on the site and requires the relocation of The Marr-Phillipo Home in order to remediate the soil.

A third issue related to potential vehicle traffic problems that could be caused by this development. Although the developers have not yet requested a 24 hour traffic study, it is clear that traffic will increase especially along Academy Street, which is a narrow heritage Street with sidewalks on only one

side of the street. The roads in this surrounding Maywood neighbourhood have been awaiting traffic-calming measures for a number of years but have had no resolutions of the existing traffic issues. The neighbourhood will require widening and rebuilding of its roads to make them safe.

Waste Water management is currently a problem in "The Village Core" area of Wilson Street, particularly during heavy rainfall. The developers have not provided specific, independent data regarding the impact of the proposed building on 24 hour flows in this area. Depending on the results of the study, the City of Hamilton need to upgrade sanitary and storm sewers in the area.

The issue of decreased water pressure to homes in Ancaster is another topic which our City Councillor, Lloyd Ferguson, has discussed at community meetings and the likelihood that our town may need to rebuild water towers which were removed a number of years ago. The proposed development, as well as others, in the area may hasten the need for this additional infrastructure.

Finally, Ancaster is a Heritage Village, established by European settlers in 1793 and became a Police Village in 1852. The federal, provincial, and my governments are encouraging the preserve of heritage sites like Ancaster, which, in turn, will further support tourism in Hamilton. The one-time grant from The Government of Canada, The Province of Ontario and the. It's of Hamilton to support the restoration of the Hermitage is a good example. The AWSSP is in place to promote the restoration and redevelopment of "The Village Core" and provides a very clear and comprehensive set of guidelines for doing so. Therefore, I respectfully request that the developers of this condominium and follow these guidelines and help us to make "The Village Core" all it can be.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Davis
87 St Margarets Road
Ancaster, Ontario
L9G 2L1

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 24, 2022 12:49 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Proposed Manchi/ Spallachi Development-Wilson and Academy

I am writing this to register my request to stop the proposed development at the corner of Wilson and Academy in Ancaster.

It in no way is in keeping with the heritage architectural style of Ancaster.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Rhonda Scott
Sent: February 24, 2022 1:47 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Proposed Building at Wilson and Academy in Ancaster

I am writing to express my strong opposition to this proposal.
For a number of reasons including traffic congestion, noise, parking, wastewater issues, the fact that it contravenes the current height restrictions, and overall modern aesthetics juxtaposed to that of the charming character of our historic village, this development should be denied, and any future application should be required to accommodate to the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria for development and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Stay positive, but test negative!
Take care,
Rhonda Scott
Sent from my iPhone

From: Ashley Allan

Sent: February 24, 2022 2:36 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.


Hello Mr. Vrooman

I have been a resident of Ancaster for 39 years. I loved growing up in this town. I love Ancaster History and the charm the village brings to it and proud that I am now privileged to be able to raise my own family here.

Ancaster is just as old as Niagara- on -the -lake. Ancaster does play a huge role in Ontario's history. Our village is one of the few that still have buildings to remind us of that history. This development will tower over our village and take away that charm. The development lacks imagination and style. It looks like a institutions. Bylaws are in place for a reason in Ancaster so we can keep developments like this out of the historical village core.

I would like to see a much smaller building with stone, old architecture mixed with modern or adding on to the existing historical Marr house. Do it right!

I have posted below all the point made by Bob Matson the head of Ancaster Historical Society. I agree with all his point fully that a building like this does not belong in our village core.

Ashley Venturelli
Ancaster Resident


1) General Comments Regarding Mass, Height, Footprint, and Architectural Style of This Application

In general, this development fails by an extreme to conform to the Cultural Heritage Landscape status of the Ancaster Village, which was instituted in the mid-1970s as a means of protecting Ancaster's heritage context. The Village was established in 1792/3, one of the earliest European settlements in Ontario, and the area still demonstrates a distinctive sense of history.

The developers and the design team for this project appear to have set aside the bylaws and zoning of the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan, implemented a mere 7 years ago to reflect the requirements of the Cultural Heritage Landscape status - i.e., that all new developments must conform to the neighbourhood heritage context.

If approved, this development would loom, overshadow, and overwhelm both the streetscape of Wilson Street and the small-scale Maywood neighbourhood behind it. The development is three times the height allowed under the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP). It is enormous in height, mass and lot coverage.

It also fails to reflect a heritage architectural style even closely resembling the streetscape and local context of the Village as required by the AWSSP. The architecture is not only massive, but aesthetically

unattractive, cookie-cutter, and cheap-looking. A prominent architect based in Hamilton has commented about it:

“The left lobby cladding is distressed barnboard if you Zoom in, at a massive scale representative of old growth forest wood grain, or cheap, fake material. Or just careless drawing work. The splayed posts come from the Queen Richmond Centre West office building in downtown Toronto, perhaps an inappropriate reference for a building on Wilson Street in Ancaster.....”

Ancaster Village deserves better.

Infrastructure will likely be unable to accommodate this development, as discussed later in this report. Further, if approved and built, it will consume so much of the capacity of locally available infrastructure that it is questionable whether other developments duly conforming to the bylaws and zoning will be buildable with what capacity remains.

The consultants’ reports included in the Application are inadequate. There is no hydrogeological report or Phase 2 ESA report documenting the incidence and levels of hydrocarbons in the soil which led to approval of the relocation of the 1840 Marr-Phillipo House which now stands on the property. Further, both the Traffic Study and the Functional Report are inadequate, as will be shown.

The data presented by the developers is inadequate in so many ways that one must conclude that the developer is presenting this proposal opportunistically.

Ancaster Village Heritage Community does not oppose reasonable intensification which accommodates to the current bylaws, zoning and infrastructure limits. However, this proposal is so far outside the boundaries of “reasonable” that it is inconceivable that it might be built. It will certainly lead to other developments of similar size and scale that will ultimately destroy the Village heritage context.

2) Traffic

There are a number of issues regarding the increased traffic to be generated by this development. To quote the Traffic Report,

“The proposed development is expected to generate 78 total two-way trips (26 inbound and 52 outbound) and 143 total two-way trips (79 inbound and 64 outbound) during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.”

I.e., “during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively”.

The data cited by the consultants’ report is incomplete. It shows only peak hour traffic, i.e., narrowly defined as traffic occurring over one hour during the morning and one hour in the evening at peak times. Use of this inadequate measure also applies to the retail component, which is certainly unrealistic since retail will incur traffic at all hours.

Local residents have pointed out that the intensity of traffic tends to increase well before peak hours, and winds down well after peak hours. It appears that drivers are accommodating to the intense traffic at peak times by arriving at the intersection earlier or later, which reduces the queues but extends the times of peak rush hour traffic considerably, and increases traffic pressures on local neighbours and neighbourhoods as well. This is not accounted for in this study, which minimizes the overall traffic and vehicle trip counts severely.

The developer’s Traffic Study data demonstrates that traffic on Wilson and Rousseaux Streets during peak hours is already at or close to capacity. This is also stated by the Salvini Traffic Study recently completed for the Amica/condo development on the Rousseaux/Wilson intersection. The Salvini study did include 24-hour traffic, which gave a much clearer picture of the pressure on local streets at all hours of the day.

According to both studies, overloads and long queues at the major Wilson/Rousseaux intersection extend in distance far beyond the queue lanes at peak hours on both streets. Interestingly, the Salvini study also indicated that peak hour traffic trips were not a very large percentage of the total 24-hour

trips at this location. The present traffic study fails to account for traffic occurrences and potential increases in traffic from this development during other times of the day.

There are few options available for traffic to travel between Ancaster and Hamilton or Dundas - and well beyond as well. Rousseaux Street, which flows into Wilson Street, accesses major highways including the Linc and the 403.

It is particularly crucial to measure 24-hour traffic due to its impact in the Maywood neighbourhood.

Academy Street, where the access point to this development will be located, provides direct access to Lodor, Academy and Church Streets, i.e., Maywood. There should be no access to the Maywood neighbourhood from or to this development on Academy Street except for locals. All access in both directions to the development should be from Wilson Street only not including Academy Street.

The Maywood neighbourhood is already plagued with cut-throughs between Rousseaux and Wilson Streets, especially at peak hours. Drivers want to avoid the long lineups and delays at this major intersection. Maywood has among the narrowest public streets in Hamilton, with sidewalks on one side only. Ancaster Square, Ancaster Green, the Town Library, Town Hall offices, Old Town Hall (which hosts many social and city events), the children’s playground and splash pad, tennis courts, and lawn bowling park are all accessed through the Maywood neighbourhood. It is important that this traffic not be increased to maintain the walkability and health and safety of the neighbourhood.

Unlike the Salvini Report previously mentioned, the codes used in the graphs in this report are relatively indecipherable for laypersons, and are not accessible on Google. Included should be an interpretive chart, and a simplification of the data presentation.

3) Parking

Based on the City’s By-Law No. 05-200, a total of 332 parking spaces (including barrier-free, retail, resident parking spaces) are required for the proposed development. The proposed development will provide 256 parking spaces for residents, which meets the requirement for residents; and 56 spaces for retail/commercial, which presents a technical shortfall of 43 parking spaces for retail/commercial. This shortfall should be remedied.

4) Wastewater Disposal

The Functional Report includes incomplete data regarding sewage waste disposal. In contrast to the traffic study, which provides only peak hour traffic data, the wastewater report includes only estimates of 24-hour flows of sewage, not peak flows at all. This is difficult to reconcile, since peak flows, not 24-hour flows, determine the real-time demand on the capacity of the wastewater system. The standard method of estimating peak flows, as we understand it, is to multiply the average 24-hour flow by a factor of 5. This is not done.

There is no evidence that the 200 mm sewage pipe on Wilson Street has the capacity to carry the extra load from this development nor, if it does, whether it will leave adequate capacity behind for other developments more in conformity to the AWSSP to be built in Ancaster Village. Further, there is no information regarding the pumping station on Old Dundas Road in the valley below the escarpment, which sends the sewage back up the escarpment to Rousseaux Street, and whether it is adequate to cope with this extra load.

Further work on the Functional Report is clearly necessary, especially since the route taken by the wastewater pipe has apparently contributed to sewage-flooded basements in the valley below the escarpment.

5) Hydrocarbons in the Soil

It was mentioned above that there is inadequate data about the hydrocarbon content of the soil on the lot. The presence of significant hydrocarbons, though undocumented, necessitated the relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House on the site. This data is not only important for underpinning the relocation of the

Marr-Phillipo House, but also for generating plans necessary to deal with the contaminated soil, which is an environmental issue not dealt with in the Application.

Comments below were made by a qualified hydrogeological consultant of 30 years' experience in the field, Wilf Ruland P.Eng, located in Ancaster. He says in response to our queries:

“It's true that this is a Geotechnical report, and that its purpose is to ensure structures has sound footings etc. Nonetheless, there are some interesting points:

1) A total of 14 boreholes were drilled (and some were completed as wells), with the borehole logs at the back of the report. None of the borehole logs for the boreholes/wells closest to the Marr-Philippo House made any mention of hydrocarbons - which is passing odd, given that the proponent has said contamination around the house is so bad it has to be moved.

2) Only one borehole log (for BH/MW8) notes hydrocarbon odours - it is in the extreme southwest corner of the property.

3) No one seems to have told the Geotechnical engineer that the proponent considers the site to be contaminated. There is no mention of special provisions for testing or safe disposal of water which may run into excavations, nor is there any provision for testing and safe handling/disposal of soils being excavated for building construction.

The report leaves me with a number of questions. What we need is the Hydrogeology Report, and the Environmental Site Assessment reports.”

And in another communication:

“This report is lengthy but incomplete. Various bits are missing - most critically for me the Figures are missing, as is Appendix I (the Site Conceptual Model).

This was a Phase I ESA - as such, it was a desktop study.

The key documents will be the Phase II ESA and the Hydrogeology Report.

If such soil and/or water samples exist, then they will be in the Phase II ESA and/or the Hydrogeology Report.”

6) Noise Study

The noise study was also incomplete. It addressed noise levels in the neighbourhood and those which would emanate from the relocated Marr-Phillipo historical building. It failed to address noise and disturbance emitted by the building itself, for example the climate control apparatus, and its residents, into the neighbourhood. This is also a failure that should be remedied, since many of the homes in the neighbourhood are located very close to the new building.

7) Conclusions

In conclusion, this development should be denied, and any future application should be required to accommodate to the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria for development and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

Bob Maton PhD, President
Ancaster Village Heritage Community

From: johnallan

Sent: February 24, 2022 2:59 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Fwd: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Sent from my Galaxy

Subject: Fwd: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne

Date: Thu., Feb. 24, 2022, 2:35 p.m.

Subject: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

To: Tim Vortman

We are against this plan. My Wife, daughter and I attended the protest in town that was covered by CHCH TV.

We are not against progress and building in Ancaster. We are against not maintaining the Heritage Stone facade that's keeps within the spirit of our History. This is an abomination and who ever develops this property can easily incorporate Marr House into a less obtrusive project within existing Hight by laws for what they paid and current market prices.

See below for further concerns.

John and Janice Allan
301 Woodland Dr
Ancaster
L9G4A1

1) General Comments Regarding Mass, Height, Footprint, and Architectural Style of This Application

In general, this development fails by an extreme to conform to the Cultural Heritage Landscape status of the Ancaster Village, which was instituted in the mid-1970s as a means of protecting Ancaster's heritage context. The Village was established in 1792/3, one of the earliest European settlements in Ontario, and the area still demonstrates a distinctive sense of history.

The developers and the design team for this project appear to have set aside the bylaws and zoning of the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan, implemented a mere 7 years ago to reflect the requirements of the Cultural Heritage Landscape status - i.e., that all new developments must conform to the neighbourhood heritage context.

If approved, this development would loom, overshadow, and overwhelm both the streetscape of Wilson Street and the small-scale Maywood neighbourhood behind it. The development is three times the

height allowed under the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP). It is enormous in height, mass and lot coverage.

It also fails to reflect a heritage architectural style even closely resembling the streetscape and local context of the Village as required by the AWSSP. The architecture is not only massive, but aesthetically unattractive, cookie-cutter, and cheap-looking. A prominent architect based in Hamilton has commented about it:

“The left lobby cladding is distressed barnboard if you Zoom in, at a massive scale representative of old growth forest wood grain, or cheap, fake material. Or just careless drawing work. The splayed posts come from the Queen Richmond Centre West office building in downtown Toronto, perhaps an inappropriate reference for a building on Wilson Street in Ancaster.....”

Ancaster Village deserves better.

Infrastructure will likely be unable to accommodate this development, as discussed later in this report. Further, if approved and built, it will consume so much of the capacity of locally available infrastructure that it is questionable whether other developments duly conforming to the bylaws and zoning will be buildable with what capacity remains.

The consultants’ reports included in the Application are inadequate. There is no hydrogeological report or Phase 2 ESA report documenting the incidence and levels of hydrocarbons in the soil which led to approval of the relocation of the 1840 Marr-Phillipo House which now stands on the property. Further, both the Traffic Study and the Functional Report are inadequate, as will be shown.

The data presented by the developers is inadequate in so many ways that one must conclude that the developer is presenting this proposal opportunistically.

Ancaster Village Heritage Community does not oppose reasonable intensification which accommodates to the current bylaws, zoning and infrastructure limits. However, this proposal is so far outside the boundaries of “reasonable” that it is inconceivable that it might be built. It will certainly lead to other developments of similar size and scale that will ultimately destroy the Village heritage context.

2) Traffic

There are a number of issues regarding the increased traffic to be generated by this development. To quote the Traffic Report,

“The proposed development is expected to generate 78 total two-way trips (26 inbound and 52 outbound) and 143 total two-way trips (79 inbound and 64 outbound) during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.”

I.e., “during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively”.

The data cited by the consultants’ report is incomplete. It shows only peak hour traffic, i.e., narrowly defined as traffic occurring over one hour during the morning and one hour in the evening at peak times. Use of this inadequate measure also applies to the retail component, which is certainly unrealistic since retail will incur traffic at all hours.

Local residents have pointed out that the intensity of traffic tends to increase well before peak hours, and winds down well after peak hours. It appears that drivers are accommodating to the intense traffic at peak times by arriving at the intersection earlier or later, which reduces the queues but extends the times of peak rush hour traffic considerably, and increases traffic pressures on local neighbours and neighbourhoods as well. This is not accounted for in this study, which minimizes the overall traffic and vehicle trip counts severely.

The developer’s Traffic Study data demonstrates that traffic on Wilson and Rousseaux Streets during peak hours is already at or close to capacity. This is also stated by the Salvini Traffic Study recently completed for the Amica/condo development on the Rousseaux/Wilson intersection. The Salvini study did include 24-hour traffic, which gave a much clearer picture of the pressure on local streets at all hours of the day.

According to both studies, overloads and long queues at the major Wilson/Rousseaux intersection extend in distance far beyond the queue lanes at peak hours on both streets. Interestingly, the Salvini study also indicated that peak hour traffic trips were not a very large percentage of the total 24-hour trips at this location. The present traffic study fails to account for traffic occurrences and potential increases in traffic from this development during other times of the day.

There are few options available for traffic to travel between Ancaster and Hamilton or Dundas - and well beyond as well. Rousseaux Street, which flows into Wilson Street, accesses major highways including the Linc and the 403.

It is particularly crucial to measure 24-hour traffic due to its impact in the Maywood neighbourhood.

Academy Street, where the access point to this development will be located, provides direct access to Lodor, Academy and Church Streets, i.e., Maywood. There should be no access to the Maywood neighbourhood from or to this development on Academy Street except for locals. All access in both directions to the development should be from Wilson Street only not including Academy Street.

The Maywood neighbourhood is already plagued with cut-throughs between Rousseaux and Wilson Streets, especially at peak hours. Drivers want to avoid the long lineups and delays at this major intersection. Maywood has among the narrowest public streets in Hamilton, with sidewalks on one side only. Ancaster Square, Ancaster Green, the Town Library, Town Hall offices, Old Town Hall (which hosts many social and city events), the children's playground and splash pad, tennis courts, and lawn bowling park are all accessed through the Maywood neighbourhood. It is important that this traffic not be increased to maintain the walkability and health and safety of the neighbourhood.

Unlike the Salvini Report previously mentioned, the codes used in the graphs in this report are relatively indecipherable for laypersons, and are not accessible on Google. Included should be an interpretive chart, and a simplification of the data presentation.

3) Parking

Based on the City's By-Law No. 05-200, a total of 332 parking spaces (including barrier-free, retail, resident parking spaces) are required for the proposed development. The proposed development will provide 256 parking spaces for residents, which meets the requirement for residents; and 56 spaces for retail/commercial, which presents a technical shortfall of 43 parking spaces for retail/commercial. This shortfall should be remedied.

4) Wastewater Disposal

The Functional Report includes incomplete data regarding sewage waste disposal. In contrast to the traffic study, which provides only peak hour traffic data, the wastewater report includes only estimates of 24-hour flows of sewage, not peak flows at all. This is difficult to reconcile, since peak flows, not 24-hour flows, determine the real-time demand on the capacity of the wastewater system. The standard method of estimating peak flows, as we understand it, is to multiply the average 24-hour flow by a factor of 5. This is not done.

There is no evidence that the 200 mm sewage pipe on Wilson Street has the capacity to carry the extra load from this development nor, if it does, whether it will leave adequate capacity behind for other developments more in conformity to the AWSSP to be built in Ancaster Village. Further, there is no information regarding the pumping station on Old Dundas Road in the valley below the escarpment, which sends the sewage back up the escarpment to Rousseaux Street, and whether it is adequate to cope with this extra load.

Further work on the Functional Report is clearly necessary, especially since the route taken by the wastewater pipe has apparently contributed to sewage-flooded basements in the valley below the escarpment.

5) Hydrocarbons in the Soil

It was mentioned above that there is inadequate data about the hydrocarbon content of the soil on the lot. The presence of significant hydrocarbons, though undocumented, necessitated the relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House on the site. This data is not only important for underpinning the relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House, but also for generating plans necessary to deal with the contaminated soil, which is an environmental issue not dealt with in the Application.

Comments below were made by a qualified hydrogeological consultant of 30 years' experience in the field, Wilf Ruland P.Eng, located in Ancaster. He says in response to our queries:

“It’s true that this is a Geotechnical report, and that its purpose is to ensure structures has sound footings etc. Nonetheless, there are some interesting points:

1) A total of 14 boreholes were drilled (and some were completed as wells), with the borehole logs at the back of the report. None of the borehole logs for the boreholes/wells closest to the Marr-Philippo House made any mention of hydrocarbons - which is passing odd, given that the proponent has said contamination around the house is so bad it has to be moved.

2) Only one borehole log (for BH/MW8) notes hydrocarbon odours - it is in the extreme southwest corner of the property.

3) No one seems to have told the Geotechnical engineer that the proponent considers the site to be contaminated. There is no mention of special provisions for testing or safe disposal of water which may run into excavations, nor is there any provision for testing and safe handling/disposal of soils being excavated for building construction.

The report leaves me with a number of questions. What we need is the Hydrogeology Report, and the Environmental Site Assessment reports.”

And in another communication:

“This report is lengthy but incomplete. Various bits are missing - most critically for me the Figures are missing, as is Appendix I (the Site Conceptual Model).

This was a Phase I ESA - as such, it was a desktop study.

The key documents will be the Phase II ESA and the Hydrogeology Report.

If such soil and/or water samples exist, then they will be in the Phase II ESA and/or the Hydrogeology Report.”

6) Noise Study

The noise study was also incomplete. It addressed noise levels in the neighbourhood and those which would emanate from the relocated Marr-Phillipo historical building. It failed to address noise and disturbance emitted by the building itself, for example the climate control apparatus, and its residents, into the neighbourhood. This is also a failure that should be remedied, since many of the homes in the neighbourhood are located very close to the new building.

7) Conclusions

In conclusion, this development should be denied, and any future application should be required to accommodate to the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria for development and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

Bob Maton PhD, President
Ancaster Village Heritage Community

20 Rousseaux Street
Ancaster, ON L9G 2W5
February 25, 2022

Planning and Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage and Design—Suburban
71 Main St W—5th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

By email: Tim.Vrooman@Hamilton.ca

Attention: E. Tim Vrooman

Re: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

This is in response to your letter of February 4, 2022 seeking comments for staff to assist in preparation of a staff report for the above applications.

1. This application is inextricably linked to Heritage Permit application HP2021-033 which granted conditional approval for the demolition or removal of a heritage-designated building at 398 Wilson Street E.

This approval included 17 conditions and it seems impossible given the complex nature of some of those conditions that they have been completed.

It is surprising to see Planning considers this application to be “complete” when it clearly proposes an 8 storey building where 398 Wilson Street East is located, in use as a bridal shop, and there is no indication that land will be available.

To proceed with this application seems to make a public statement that 398 Wilson Street will be removed with or without satisfaction of the 17 conditions.

This development application should be deferred until the City decision on the 17 conditions and thus the approval of the Heritage Permit. 398 Wilson Street might be exactly where it is today, and the proposal as set out in these applications will be impossible.

A decision that makes development approval conditional on the ultimate approval of the Heritage Permit places incredible pressure on the City staff who have responsibility for considering the various reports and items required in the 17 conditions.

This application is NOT complete as the applicant does not have 398 Wilson Street clear for development. Moving this to site planning does not solve this.

Frankly, I am shocked that the February 4 notice does not even mention this issue despite remarkable public input to the Heritage Permit application.

2. The total disregard for the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan is breathtaking. This land is in the heart of the Village Core. I trust that staff will vigorously apply the provisions of the Plan in the Staff Report. If we cannot protect the heritage character of 4 blocks in one of Ontario’s oldest villages we will have Anytown, Ontario in Ancaster in a few short years. Remarkable intensification can be achieved following the Plan and the C5a (570) zoning permits and will be 100% appropriate for the Core.
3. The chatter I hear that OLT will approve 6 or 8 or 10 or whatever stories is ridiculous. If we are at a point in Ontario where OLT will tear up secondary plans in Ancaster and Stoney Creek and Dundas and Unionville and Niagara On the Lake and force over-sized buildings and destruction of our heritage character in a few blocks in each community we may as well just go home and let the developers have their way.

I have confidence the City can defend the relatively small enclaves and force larger developments to locate outside the Village Cores.

4. You are well acquainted with the Secondary Plan and Zoning so no need to set out the incredible proposals to steamroller it. A couple of highlights:

3.1—a height of 31 meters where 9 is permitted. Wow.
3.2—density of 220 units per hectare where 50 is the Plan guideline
5. There was significant discussion at Planning on another proposal at 462 Wilson Street East with regard to sewer capacity. It was not clear at that application that there is capacity for it, so another 169 proposed dwelling units would seem to indicate city staff needs a clear indication for this application at Planning Committee if there is sewer capacity or not.
6. Ancaster traffic can be a significant problem in busy periods. The City recognizes the Wilson Street/Rousseaux intersection is at capacity at those times. If the development at 462 Wilson Street gets approval in some form pressure will be added. It is imperative that the Staff Report deal with traffic that will be layered on by this proposal.

7. Neighbourhood cut through traffic is a major issue for residents on Lodor St, Academy and Church St. This applicant needs to propose a solution to absolutely prevent traffic for this development cutting through the neighbourhood and entering/exiting on Academy to avoid the Rousseaux/Wilson intersection.
8. With all due respect to the architect it seems they did not get a copy of the Ancaster Wilson Street Design Guidelines. There is zero fit to the streetscape.
9. On the positive side the street level retail space is a big win for the Core. It would appear there is some parking for the customers. However, the applicant should keep in mind it is the scale and heritage character that brings those customers to Ancaster Village Core.

I encourage staff to defend the well thought through Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan and the C5a (270) zoning. They are NOT outdated. The Secondary Plan finally went into effect in 2015 and the Zoning in 2018.

I find it interesting that developers want to take advantage of the character and ambiance of the old Ancaster neighbourhoods as it does have attraction for their ultimate clients, but in the rush to maximize profits they destroy the very thing one building at a time that sets it apart from greenfield projects.

The community is counting on Planning to welcome new development to the older parts of Ancaster but ensure the development fits the character and ambiance rather than trying to change that with over building and inappropriate design so it will be like any suburban street in any town. It is special. Please help keep it that way.

Sincerely



Jim MacLeod

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 24, 2022 4:03 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Opposition to proposed building

Mr. Tim Vrooman,

February 24, 2022

I oppose the proposed 8-story mixed-use development at Academy and Wilson Street East in Ancaster.

Since 1969 I have been a resident of Ancaster (i.e., for 52 years). The traffic on Wilson St. was already very great travelling to work at McMaster University for 35 years, and its volume has increased since my retirement in 2002. The proposed development of an 8-storey building, if allowed, would result in yet a larger increase in traffic congestion. Also, such a building would not be in character with the buildings in the Ancaster Village core, which include a number with heritage and historical significance.

I'm not aware of evidence of adequate waste water pipe capacity for this area. Such a large building could also impact the natural watershed, including Ancaster Creek

The Niagara Escarpment Commission does not support this development and the proposal does not comply with the Niagara Escarpment Plan. It seems that the Urban Hamilton Official Plan requires NEP conformity. Thus, since the NEP does not support the proposal, the UHOP also cannot support it.

Please consider my concerns.

I request that the City of Hamilton remove my personal information from this email.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

From: Charles Walker

Sent: February 24, 2022 6:33 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Hello Mr. Vrooman,

I write in opposition to the development plans for the plot of land at Wilson and Academy in Ancaster. The proposed building is completely out of step with the traffic capacity of the roads in the area and is physically inconsistent with the style and history of the area. It also puts a historically significant building at risk. This project would impose many unreasonable burdens on the neighbourhood.

Please stop this project from proceeding further.

Thank you, Charles Walker - Dundas, Ontario.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 24, 2022 7:13 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Proposed development at Academy and Wilson

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed 8 story “mixed use” development at Academy and Wilson Street East in Ancaster; reference: “Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue (Ancaster Ward 12)”.

I am not a resident of Ancaster but do frequent the area as an avid cyclist on Wilson street and as a patron of several of the Ancaster businesses in the downtown core. The traffic on Wilson and Rousseau is already congested and can not tolerate a further increase in volume. The building complex as proposed will detract from the aesthetics of this part of Ancaster. For these reasons, I propose that the development not proceed.

I request that the City remove my personal information from my submission.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: Wendi Van Exan

Sent: February 24, 2022 7:54 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

RE: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

As residents of Ancaster for almost 50 years and having seen many changes throughout those years both good and bad, we are wishing to submit our total opposition to this proposed development

There are so many reasons behind this opposition , a total disregard for the Wilson st secondary plan being one of the top ones. This proposed development is far to large for the lands where they want to put it.. It does not fit the Heritage village that is Ancaster and which we want to keep.

And as a resident on Rousseaux St suffering now with the increased traffic and the dangerous driving especially with people turning up Academy (across from our driveway) to avoid the Wilson/Rousseaux light we can't even imagine the state of this road when one adds either a retirement complex or apartments.

And of course we all know what happens to Ancaster when there is a problem on the 403. How will that intersection handle those issues?

In general we agree with the staff report saying this is not in keeping with the existing character of the neighbourhood.

We certainly hope that the City of Hamilton listens to the residents of this town. I have met no one in the months since this was announced who can understand how on earth this development can even be considered. We would hope you would deny this application and that any further application

from these (and any other developers) should be required to accommodate the Heritage criteria for development and the Wilson st Secondary plan.

Yours truly

Richard and Wendi Van Exan

From: Chris Kruter
Sent: February 24, 2022 8:23 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

Dear Sir,
Looking at the proposal I never saw such ridiculous monstrosity .

This will be the end of the Village of Ancaster .
The reason is that the rich people will get richer and Ancaster will be destroyed .
Respectfully ,
Chris Kruter
A very upset citizen

From: Noora Grifi

Sent: February 24, 2022 8:29 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am writing to inform you that I strongly disagree with the project. Educated assessments have already been emailed to you from the local community regarding the rationale- including traffic and inconclusive research on waste water disposal and hydrocarbons in the soil.

The design definitely does not meet the Ancaster Heritage Landscape expectations.

The above stated development should be denied, and any future application should be required to accommodate to the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria for development and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

The village and people of Ancaster deserve better.

Regards,

Noora Grifi

From: Gayle Villeneuve
Sent: February 24, 2022 9:23 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Development at Wilson & Academy

Hello Mr Vrooman,

**Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law
Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and
15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.**

I have been a resident of Ancaster for 22 years and I am in favour of development but not this time on this property with this disrespect for a heritage building and disrespect for the people of Ancaster!

- 1.Regarding the Mar Phillipo house, this heritage building should be incorporated into the development, not moved with risk to the back corner where no one will appreciate it.
2. Traffic, traffic, traffic – the building is too big! The development is three times the height allowed under the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP). The Maywood neighbourhood is already plagued with cut-throughs between Rousseaux and Wilson Streets, especially at peak hours. Drivers want to avoid the long lineups and delays at this major intersection. Maywood has among the narrowest public streets in Hamilton, with sidewalks on one side only. This is dangerous for pedestrians and children.
3. Too many stories – it's against the rules of Ancaster's plan
4. Waste water – how will this huge development handle the waste water issue that exists in Ancaster?

In conclusion, this development should be denied, and any future application should be required to accommodate to the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria for development and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

I implore you to consider the implications of this development and deny the application in full.

Yours truly,

Gayle Villeneuve

From: David Wallis
Sent: February 24, 2022 9:25 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Continued disappointment of Ancaster Village Planning

Good Day Tim,

As a long time resident of Ancaster, I continue to be perplexed and disappointed at the lack of Vision for the Development of Ancaster Village.

I continue to be disappointed at the City of Hamilton not standing up to lack lustre development, no push back on height, size and what seems to be Development deciding on what Council, Councillors, Mayor will and can do eventually.

You have an opportunity with vision and support...to complete Ancaster into a boutique village like Unionville, Niagara on the lake etc.

Ancaster has a secondary plan that continues to be flouted and balked at. No respect from Development, little or no enforcement from the city and the cycle continues. It is quite sad.

I will give 1 win at the push back to recent Amica plans, after the disaster of Brandon House being torn down during questionable circumstances.

Within the pocket of our village with rich history and unique old character at risk, the decisions made are ever more important to get right.

The current plan of the Manchia & Spallaci development should be scaled back and enforced to comply with the secondary plan in place.

I hope you and they entire council are up to the challenge or sadly Wilson Street will look like any street from anywhere.

Sincerely,
David Wallis
Ancaster, ON

From: Marc Bader

Sent: February 24, 2022 9:33 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Re: Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Mr. E. Tim Vrooman, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Dept.
Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Suburban Team
71 Main Street West, 5 th Floor, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Mr.Vrooman,

The residents of Ancaster are just about fed up with the city trying to make Ancaster look like Mississauga. A sea of building structures having nothing in common but bricks, steel and cement. We want to keep Ancaster as a small town with a wonderful heritage. That's why a lot of people moved here - to get away from a typical city scape.

According to the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan the plans for this development are totally out of line. Obviously the developers ask you for a mile hoping they will get half a mile. In this case they are asking for 10 miles, hoping they will get 5.

If you touch the Marr-Phillipo house, the developers know it will fall apart and that's exactly what they want.

Traffic in Ancaster because of its growth of 3 storey town houses wherever developers can build them is already horrid. Why make it worse?

How about making a lovely park right in the middle of the village where people could come and enjoy an open space - maybe go skating in the winter, maybe have a picnic in the summer. Developers are taking all this away- what a pity.

Marc Bader
23 Norma Crescent
Village of Ancaster ON L9G 4V8

From: Sandra Starr

Sent: February 24, 2022 9:39 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Hello,

I am opposed to the proposed 8-storey development based on the building height, scale, massing, footprint and compatibility with the village. In addition to traffic, sewer and remediation of the site – all of which details and data are incomplete or "opportunistic" at best.

This proposed development is a close parallel to the recently proposed Amica development at Rousseaux and Wilson where the planning committee recently recommended denial.

The property at the corner of Wilson Street and Academy falls within the historic village core. I feel strongly we need to preserve Ancaster's unique position as the second earliest established village in Upper Canada. This belief is supported by the creation of the **Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan a short 7 years ago** which has been totally ignored recently by developers. The Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan was created with public consultation and was to govern for 20 years. How an application that so blatantly disregards the building height, scale, massing, privacy, overlook, setback and compatibility with the village moves to this stage in the city's planning department is beyond me. We are wasting tax payer resources and the public's time when consultation already took place and there is a governing document. What is the point of creating governing documents with input from all stakeholders if they are simply ignored when developers with deep pockets approach the city?

With respect to the Ontario Planning Act, Section 2, does this proposed development not grossly exceed both height and footprint parameters?

In terms of traffic, the data cited by the consultants' report is incomplete. It shows only traffic at peak hours. The developer's traffic study data demonstrates that traffic on Wilson and Rousseaux streets during peak hours is already at or close to capacity. This was also stated by the Salvini Traffic Study recently completed for the Amica development on the Rousseaux/Wilson intersection. The Salvini Study gave a much clearer picture of the pressure on local streets at all hours of the day. With respect to protection of public safety, this nearby intersection cannot take any more traffic, especially at peak periods – the traffic delays are not just felt at the

pinch point of Rousseaux and Wilson Street, but extend past Golf Links Road and McNiven Roads 2 km away during peak periods. This is a public safety concern for EMS, especially when we are already reading about the number of Code Zeros in our city.

The Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan, developed to protect our historic town's cultural and heritage resources, establishes a goal of 50 people per hectare in portions of Ancaster which includes the Village Core from Rousseaux Street to Dalley Drive (a very short 1.2 km section). This request is in no way in the spirit of the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

The list of bonafide concerns continue. After all the "sewergate" articles in the Spec, and the sewer backups in the homes downhill from this proposed large-scale development, it is doubtful that the sewer infrastructure can take such an enormous development or leave any "bandwidth" for any other development of the street. Council considered mitigating this with an overflow pipe into Ancaster Creek this past summer which was, thankfully, rejected, which means the potential problem remains. In speaking with a staff member at Water & Sewer, if I understood them correctly, they say they do a study after the application is approved. That seems backwards to me and will cost taxpayers in the City of Hamilton (rather than the developer). The Old Dundas Road pumping station is a longstanding issue and it is unlikely it can support the additional effluent from these large-scale developments. Period. Is this proposal feasible with the City's Stormwater Management Master Plan? I understand the staff report related to the proposed Amica development said, "The Functional Servicing Report (FSR), prepared by S. Llewellyn & Associates Limited and dated August 2021, does not provide population projections for sanitary waste water. Growth Management staff have advised that based on the FSR and other information, these applications are not supportable."

And the silent issue here is what happened to the alarm bells about hydrocarbons in the soil?? The data presented is inadequate. The City was adamant that this site needed to be remediated. The Mayor even weighed in with an Opinion piece in the Spectator on November 5th, and wrote, "The piece also ignores the fact that the house sits atop six to eight metres of contaminated soil in some spots that needs to be remediated". So, where's the plan to remediate which is an environmental issue? How is there no mention of this in the proposed development????

Currently, there is not enough parking in the quaint historic core for the local shops, restaurants and services. The City's By-Law No. 05-200 states a total of 332 parking spaces are required for the proposed development. The proposed development will, however, only deliver 256 parking spaces for residents leading to a further shortfall of parking and yet another bylaw violation.

I support thoughtful intensification. I consider this 8-storey proposal a blatant disregard for the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan. These exceedingly high buildings will dwarf everything in the village and promote further traffic issues. In addition, the proposed architectural style in no way blends with the Cultural Heritage Landscape of the historic Ancaster village.

In conclusion, the massive proposed 8-storey development fails to meet numerous criteria from sheer mass, height, footprint and lack of incorporating heritage features and design. Additionally, there are real concerns regarding the additional effluent, hydrocarbon contamination and traffic. Given the sheer magnitude of all of these factors during a time in history when all resources are scarce and staffing shortages prevail, why are we wasting city resources entertaining such brazen proposals that so clearly do not come anywhere close to following any of the established bylaws and plans. I encourage the city to enforce its bylaws and governing documents and DENY these proposals and simply say, "no".

The city needs to be tough on developers ensuring they don't waste any more of anyone's limited time and resources until a REASONABLE proposal is received. JUST SAY NO!

Respectfully,

Sandra Starr
Ancaster Resident

From: Darren Earl
Sent: February 24, 2022 10:00 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Zoning By-Law Amendment for 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am writing you to express my concerns with the application for development in Ancaster at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 on Wilson Street East.

I feel this proposal is too big of a deviation from the Ancaster secondary plan. This development is very out of character for the street scape within a historic district.

In particular the amendments to the following.

1. Height: The 8 storey proposals is excessively over what is outlined within the secondary plan and should be denied.
2. Setback: The setback to both Wilson street and neighboring property is not sufficient for both pedestrian or drainage.
3. Density and usage: The increase in density for the area would be very significant. I know on the surface the area does not appear dense. However given the historic nature of the road infrastructure and its already high traffic use for people trying to get to the Link. Such a high number of units would create a significant burden on the community.
4. Relocation of Marr-Phillipo House: It is an absolute tragedy that we would allow the moving and effective destruction of the Marr-Phillipo House. It should remain in its current context within the Ancaster village
5. Heritage: As outlined in the official “Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan” Ancaster is heritage neighborhood and buildings within it must make every effort to maintain context of the community. Ancaster is a pre confederation community that is quickly being stripped of its heritage. In comparison Niagara on the Lake is a destination known across Ontario for unique historic character, they accomplished that with strong heritage bylaws.

I would very much like to see the Hamilton planning department take a firm line with this and future developments that densification and redevelopment have to be done with the community contexts in mind. The secondary plans were developed for a reason and should be the assumed guidelines not something that should be changed at the whim of every developer.

If developers are continually allowed to chip away at our heritage, we soon have nothing left. This fight is not specific to Ancaster, it applies to all of Hamilton as we struggle to meet provincial densification targets. I implore city council to show that densification and heritage preservation must work together.

Hamilton is emerging as power house within the GTHA and one of our greatest assets is our physical heritage. It draws in new residents, tourists and even film studios. If we let it slip away brick by brick, we will never get it back.

I would very much like to be kept informed about this development and maintain my right to appeal.

I would also like to note that I am a resident of Ancaster but do not live within Ancaster village core.

Regards
Darren Earl

From: Jan King

Sent: February 24, 2022 10:39 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Messrs Manchia and Spallaci/Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Dear Mr Vrooman,

As a concerned citizen of Ancaster, I wish to express my views on the current application to develop an 8-storey building at the corner of Wilson and Academy. We need to honour the zoning and Secondary Plan, set forth for Ancaster in 2013 which allows for a building height of 9 meters. This development proposal would not only dwarf the surrounding buildings but would not be consistent with the surrounding streetscape of the neighbourhood. Unfortunately, we have lost some very significant historical buildings on Wilson Street and the potential move of the Marr Phillippo building is of grave concern.

The proposed structure is unattractive and does not compliment the character of Ancaster village. Ancaster is steep with Canadian history, let's develop buildings that reflect the style and design of this era.

I do not oppose reasonable intensification which meets our current bylaws, zoning and infrastructure limits, however, this proposal is so far outside the required boundaries! Please abide by the 9-meter height restriction and at least try to blend in with the historical appearance of the neighbourhood.

If you want to be part of the community, please listen to the community.

Thank you,

Jan King

From: hello

Sent: February 24, 2022 11:39 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Mr Vrooman

I write in response to the development application at Wilson St and Lorne Ave.

The scale of this structure is overwhelming in this neighbourhood. It does not meet the Wilson Street Secondary Plan specifications.

The design, as indicated, does not meet or reflect the requirements of the Cultural Heritage Landscape status for Ancaster Village.

Regarding waste water disposal, in the past we have had issues with the pumping station on Old Dundas Road, does Wilson Street have the capacity to carry the extra load from this development?

I am very concerned about the proposal put forth by Manchia/Spallaci

George Bennett

From: Dianne Auty
Sent: February 24, 2022 11:56 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am in opposition of any change of existing zoning which would permit such a building as proposed for properties at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, 412 Wilson St. E. and 15 Lorne Ave. , Ancaster.

The massive size of this proposed building is completely out of character with this area and there is nothing attractive about the building itself.

Aside from the size and appearance of the building, there are several other reasons to reject it.

1. Traffic

The traffic on Wilson St. is already quite heavy and it spills over onto neighbouring streets. Traffic even now cuts through the library parking lot and down Lodor St. to avoid traffic lights, which in turn endangers people going to the library and children going to the playground. The large number of units in this proposed building will only compound the problems.

2. The environment

There will be environmental harm resulting from the construction as well as from increased population and vehicles - noise pollution, air pollution, light pollution.

3. The need to move a heritage building to accommodate this building should also be enough concern to reject this proposal.

4. Will taxpayers be paying for all the necessary changes to infrastructure this project will bring about?

5. Is this really the type of housing needed here? People moving here are looking for family homes. Who are these units geared to?

I do not see this being a positive addition to Ancaster. Please consider who is really profiting from such a proposal.

Sincerely,
Dianne Auty
Ancaster, Ont.

Stay calm, be brave, watch for the signs.

From: Cynthia Watson
Sent: February 25, 2022 12:08 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Messrs Manchia and Spallaci

Mr. Vrooman,

I live in the Maywood neighborhood of Ancaster. I am opposed to the development proposed at the corner of Wilson St. and Rousseau. Besides the fact that they snuck in the destruction of a heritage inventoried gem called Brandon House that marked the grand entry into Ancaster, the complex is in no way befitting of the heritage buildings and feel of the third oldest police township in Ontario.

Just a few years ago, maybe 4, Councilman Ferguson stopped Spallaci from building 6 semi homes on the corner of Lodor and Academy, one block away from the now disputed site, because the infrastructure could not handle it. What has changed that this 8 storey complex won't be a drag on the same infrastructure? I live on Lodor St. I know that the Dundas grid cannot handle what is here. Our electricity flips off and on often. It goes down in storms for hours and it is a major nuisance. Where is the sewage going? Can the water mains handle it? Probably not. I am not an engineer but I can't see it.

Lodor St. is approximately 20 foot wide. We already have traffic problems on the street that Councilman Ferguson flat out refuses to address. He even refused after a woman pulling her toddler in a wagon was almost hit by an idiot driving up on the sidewalk because a car was parked across the street and another oncoming car was going around it. He refused after multiple neighbours met with him about it. These incidents multiply when there are problems on the 403. I have watched my neighbour's bushes get run over by cars trying to get by under similar circumstances. My neighbour as well as myself have almost been hit by cars speeding down Church or Lodor streets using it as a cut through. My incident was around midnight as I take walks after my afternoon work shift. I was crossing the street at a corner and a truck was speeding down from the park. Where is the traffic that this development promises going to be going instead of on Wilson? Lodor St. and Academy St I forgot, this will also double traffic getting out to the Linc and 403 on that two lane road.

Do we want this? No. A resounding NO. My husband and I bought here for the small village feel. We are in our sixties and factory workers. We can't afford to relocate. We don't want to look at this and see what it will do to this quaint area with so much charm. We don't want to have to deal with even more traffic on our little street. We oppose this development as well at the one on Church St. by Veloce.

Have you or anyone on council even been to Ancaster, spent the day in the village. Met the residents? Other than Ferguson that is who just wants to call us names. Probably not. Most of us do not want this here. We do not want Marr Philipo house moved and we DO NOT want any further destruction of the rich heritage here.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Watson

Lodor St.
Ancaster ON, L9G 2Z2

From: Patricia Cole-Stever
Sent: February 25, 2022 12:40 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Regarding the Manchia/Spellaci Development in Ancaster, ON

Mr. T. Vrooman
City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Dept.
Development Planning Heritage and Design-Suburban Team
71 Main St., W 5th flr.
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law
Amendment for Lands located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson St., E and 15
Lorne Ave., Ancaster, the proposed Manchia/Spellaci Development.

Mr. Vrooman

I am writing to you with regard to the above-mentioned application for amendments to development. I respectfully request that you strongly consider the proposed development and how it will negatively affect the community. Along with referencing the actual development, I also ask you to consider how amendments and changes to existing zoning and by-laws reflect poorly on City staff and erode the trust of the citizens staff are supposed to be working 'with' or for, not against. I am referring to the current Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan versus the plans and amendments submitted by Spellaci, which clearly avoid any conformity to anything already existing.

I ask you to consider why you *would* allow for an increased density of residents along the addresses above mentioned, of Wilson St., E ~ an already congested area for traffic during rush periods? I ask you to consider pedestrian safety and an increase of noise pollution for residents due to traffic increases. I ask that you consider the overreaching height and density of the proposed development and its non-conformity ~from a visual perspective, to any of the heritage buildings in the area. The extra vehicular traffic and inadequate parking are further issues to consider. Emergency response to a large residential development such as the one proposed will be differed at peak hours due to traffic congestion and a lack of actual road way for emergency vehicles to pass safely through in gridlocked traffic; there will be wastewater disposal issues and leaching of toxins into the soil from large scale construction and development to contend with. Please consider that the plans by the developer are a gross interpretation of architectural 'style' and fails to fit into the cultural and historical vibe of the area; there are already projected restrictions to the **current** infrastructure as it will fail to support the immense scale of the proposed development; the push of increased peak-period traffic on to the side streets in the area; the flared tempers and well-being of the good

citizens of this community when they feel threatened by their own City and community planners about what is to come of their beloved home. The additional costs of emergency services due to a population density increase, increased road maintenance due to greater usage, increased garbage pick-up due to an increase in residents, on-time snow clearing... are these costs reasonable for the City ... hence the tax payers, to carry? I ask you... *what is* good, about this development??

It is this writer's opinion that development not be considered appropriate for the location at which it is proposed to occur. It does not take into consideration any of the Cultural Heritage Landscape criteria which currently exists and indeed allows for excesses of the use of current infrastructure and City services.

I ask that you fairly consider your decision and how it will impact this community. Please base it upon evidence, or the lack of evidence from unfinished or incomplete studies, data or reports submitted by the developer; the clear opposition by area residents and knowledge that the City already has.

In final remark, I will ask that if you have not received a copy of my opposition as addressed to the City of Hamilton Planning Committee which convened on February 15/22, please contact me and I will be happy to provide it to you.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Cole-Stever
15 Millcreek Ct.,
Ancaster, ON
L9G 4Z3



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 25, 2022 1:58 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Response to Spallaci/Manchia Development on Wilson Street, Ancaster

In the case of the proposed development on this site, I oppose the design seeking approval because of its massive scale and height which is incompatible with the existing historic character of Wilson Street and adjacent neighbourhood and the close proximity of such a large complex to the pedestrian sidewalk.

In the case of the relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House, Heritage Planning staff recommended denial of the relocation, as did the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee and the Permit Review Committee. I oppose the change in this recommendation by the Planning Committee for reasons given by both Heritage Committees. Clearly stated in the Ontario Heritage Act, designated buildings are protected from demolition, unsympathetic alteration and risky relocation. Our Hamilton Master Plan states that heritage buildings, particularly pre-Confederation, are important resources to the community and our quality of life and ought to be preserved. Now developers are making policy for the City and our communities and they are being supported by our planning department and Council in their defiance of City Heritage Conservation policies and provincial laws.

Sincerely,
Carol Priamo

Vice Chair, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, Hamilton Region
Heritage Board Member, Beasley Neighbourhood Association
City of Hamilton Heritage Permit Review Sub Committee
City of Hamilton Policy and Design Working Group
Heritage Hamilton Foundation Board of Directors
Friends of Century Manor, Vice Chair

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 25, 2022 7:30 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Development at Wilson St. E. and Academy St., Ancaster

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed 8 story "mixed use" development at Academy and Wilson Street East in Ancaster; reference: "Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue (Ancaster Ward 12)".

I live a short distance from the newly proposed development and often spend time in or pass through the area concerned.

Traffic along Wilson Street and Rousseaux is already quite heavy even during non peak hours. At peak travel times traffic can be heavily backed up on both roads. The problem is further compounded where an accident on the 403 drive additional traffic on to either or both of these roads. During these situations it is not uncommon for it to take more than 20 minutes to travel between Fiddlers Green and Rousseaux. The streets in this neighbourhood are, without question, not designed to accommodate the volume of traffic that would ensue if the proposed development was allowed.

I understand that, according to the Wilson Street Secondary Plan, buildings can be a height of 9 m only and must be consistent with the character of the existing neighbourhood. I have seen pictures of the proposed development. The proposed new building clearly exceeds these height restrictions and certainly is not in character with the buildings in my neighbourhood. It would be a gross overdevelopment of this site and change the character of the area substantially.

I am not aware of evidence of adequate waste water pipe capacity for this area. Addition of large buildings may also negatively impact the natural watershed including Ancaster creek.

I understand that the Niagara Escarpment Commission does not support this development and that the proposal does not comply with the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP). Apparently the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) requires NEP conformity - therefore, as the NEP does not support the proposal, the UHOP also cannot support it. The proposal to remove all trees on the site and replace them with trees on top of the parking garage is ludicrous. Green space in all parts of Ancaster is vitally important and one of the reasons I chose to live in the area. Developments in the past 5 years with development have already removed many mature trees and cause the loss of natural green spaces. I understand that removing the trees at the proposed new development site also violates the city's Climate Emergency Plan.

For the above reasons, I request that this proposed development be stopped.

I expressly request that the City remove my personal information from my submission.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: Sarah Bentham

Sent: February 25, 2022 8:23 AM

To: Bob Maton <[REDACTED]>; Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Development on the Wilson/Academy corner in Ancaster

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed development on the corner of Wilson and Academy Streets. As a fifth generation resident and mother of three small children I cannot imagine an Ancaster in which the mega developments are even under consideration. Moving a fragile Heritage building to make way for this is reprehensible. Every year before Covid, Academy street was the beginning of the yearly Heritage parade; we would eagerly watch the floats and bands prepare to celebrate Ancaster history. Within the last few years the city and developers seem to be intent on stomping out that history at any cost; will parades even make sense going past these developments?

I do hope common sense will prevail and the greed of developers does not overpower the will of those who will have to live with the outcome.

Thank you for your time,

Sarah Bentham
80 Academy St, Ancaster

From: Robert Wilkins

Sent: February 25, 2022 8:48 AM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Manchia and Spallaci development application for 392,398,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson St E and 15 Lorne Avenue

This email is for the purposes of commenting on the above application(s). I will not be commenting on the specific individual OP, zoning or Secondary Plan sections as others will be doing so. I do want to put this application in context. It must be considered not only by its non-compliance with current zoning but also by its flagrant over-development of a significant amount of land in our historic village. Notwithstanding that we need some alternative housing in and around Ancaster this proposal does everything to the max. Ancaster is the 3rd oldest community in Ontario-- 1793. In 1793 land was not at a premium and there were humble buildings with spaces between them -- we had a three dimensional street scape. You could see the side of a building, the front, the side, a side yard etc. This compares to later developments such as Dundas -- 1846 est wherein land was at a premium and the streetscape is essentially a single dimension. The planners of the former town of Ancaster and the current City of Hamilton have recognized this and provided protection for over 60 years. These planning documents have been respected and new developments in the village have complied -- why should this be the exception. The important protections included a height limit, a special provision in the new comprehensive zoning bylaw which requires side yard setbacks between buildings and design and material guidelines in the new Secondary Plan. This development doesn't respect any of these provisions. In fact when you consider how many properties this application entails, it is basically trying to do an "end-run" around the minimum side yard provision by having one massive building covering all these lots. The new buildings in the village to date have respected the planning provisions and still been successful. I was responsible for the new smaller stone buildings at 231 Wilson St E and 253 Wilson St E (the clock tower building). I have had the pleasure of doing other new buildings and renovating others in the village. All done in the context of the existing zoning. I only mention this to let you know that one doesn't have to do "maximum" development to be successful. I can assure you that there was a "line-up" of people that wanted to go in those "historic looking" new buildings. The scale and size of this new development contravenes the design and material guidelines and will destroy the look and feel of one of the oldest humble streetscapes in Ontario. There will be future opportunities for condominiums near the village on lands such as Mount Mary. Kindest regards Bob Wilkins

--

Please note that my email address has changed to [REDACTED]

From: Nancy Hurst
Sent: February 25, 2022 8:48 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Support for intensification in Ancaster

Re: Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law
Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15
Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Dear Tim,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the above application. As an Ancaster resident, I am in favour of missing middle density (2-5 storeys) being allowed here. It is my belief that the Ancaster Secondary Plan is out of date and needs to be revised in light of the absolute necessity of municipalities to meaningfully address the climate emergency. Hamilton has declared a climate emergency and allowing well planned infill projects to be built within all neighbourhoods across the city is one step we can take to do our part. Additionally, Hamilton City Council has voted for no urban expansion so gentle density in the city is now crucial if we are to avoid sprawl onto farm fields.

My thoughts on this project are:

- up to 5 storeys is acceptable along Wilson st.
- keep the Marr Philippo house where it is and incorporate it into the design as the Amica project down the road is proposing to do with those two heritage homes.
- keep to heritage design with the project
- mandate a percentage to affordable housing as we are in a desperate housing shortage and Ancaster must also do it's share to provide affordable homes to residents.
- require green building standards that don't use fossil fuels such as solar and heat pumps.
- mixed use with commercial on the ground level will add to the vibrancy of the area and hopefully encourage more variety than the current glut of denture clinics in Ancaster village.
- underground parking only

As a related ask, I believe we need to drastically increase transit to Ancaster as the bus service here is much too infrequent. More neighbours will mean more traffic unless we provide decent transit options for new residents.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this application.

Kind regards,
Nancy Hurst
Ancaster

From: Lori Kormos
Sent: February 25, 2022 9:12 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Proposed development at Wilson/Academy in Ancaster

Good morning Tim,
I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed development at Wilson/Academy in Ancaster.

It is my understanding that the Secondary Plan for Wilson Street includes a maximum height of 9 metres and the building must be in keeping with the character of the village.
This proposal meets neither of these requirements. In fact, it is my opinion that the building will ruin the character of the street.

I am also saddened to hear that the existing proposal includes a plan to move the heritage home that sits on the property. Even if it survives the move, it will no longer be visible from Wilson Street, further eroding the character of the village.

Finally, traffic congestion that will result from such a large building will cause undo harm to the community, both in terms of the volume of cars moving along Wilson Street and on the surrounding streets. If allowed to go ahead, there is no way to mitigate the harm. It will permanently damage the village.

It is my hope that council will reject this proposal and request that a new proposal (that meets the secondary plan) is submitted in its place.

Thank you,

Lori Kormos
Ancaster.

Sent from my iPad

From: Richard Wallace
Sent: February 25, 2022 9:22 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Wilson & Academy Ancaster development

Attention: City Clerk

Re: Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson St. East and 15 Lorne Ave., Ancaster

I wish to express my concerns in regard to the proposed development at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson St. East and 15 Lorne Ave., Ancaster

This proposal flies in the face of the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan which was the result of an intensive consultation with experts in the field as well as concerned residents wishing for the best development of Ancaster. The community and its well being should not be dismissed lightly at the call of any developer. The current height restrictions may be somewhat restrictive to overly profitable development, but the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan allowing for a height of 9 meters needs to be adhered to in the best interests of the community. To grant the proposed height allowance would not conform with the current neighbouring residences, would restrict neighbourhood view lines, invade neighbouring privacy, and demean the character of the neighbourhood.

The building and extensive paving of the properties would deny the absorption of rainfall by needed greenspace. Ancaster has already shown that it currently cannot effectively deal with waste water run-off from this area. Households on Old Dundas Rd. which are below this proposed development have suffered damage and expenses incurred by what is currently a problem. Along with development plans for the property at Wilson and Rousseau Street, whatever that may turn out to be, as well as the other developments planned along Wilson Street at 393 Wilson St. E., at 327-335 Wilson St. E., at 280-282 Wilson St. E., at 154 Wilson St. E., and at 223 Wilson St. E. the effects on the waste water system would be over-burdened. This is a serious issue.

The planned automobile access for this development is apparently requested for Academy St. This location is very close to Wilson St. The old stone building on the south east corner of Wilson Street fronts right up to the sidewalk on the street. There is a balcony with pillars on the front of the building which partially obstruct vision of traffic coming down Wilson Street from the south, and with parked vehicles at the metered parking spaces in front of the building the sight line is so badly restricted that residents on Academy wishing to turn left from Academy drive east on Academy, up Lorne to Church Street so they can enter Wilson street safely at the stop light there. On top of that there are daily delivery trucks parked parked unloading right where the entrance to the proposed site would be. There is nowhere else for them to locate. This restricts an already narrow street. Traffic making right turns onto Academy have no vision of what is ahead until they have made the turn. This is a real safety issue.

Housing around the proposed building would suffer light restriction from shading by this overly high building affecting gardens and privacy. Current height allowances should be adhered to.

This plan does not regard the history, or the character of the community. It is contrary to the Secondary Plan that was developed with great consideration for the well being of the community while still allowing for considerate development. These properties could be tastefully developed within the current zoning and by-laws.

I would request that the proposed development not be accepted by the Committee

Regards
Richard Wallace
Ancaster ON

From: Hazel Ryan
Sent: February 25, 2022 9:56 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Development on Wilson st Ancaster.

Dear Mr Vrooman,

My family has lived on Academy St in the Maywood area of Ancaster for 40 years and I would like to add a comment to the discussion around the proposal for an 8-storey development on the corner of Wilson and Academy.

It seems to me that the overwhelming scale and density of this proposal is totally out of keeping with this residential area and will seriously affect the quality of life for local residents as well as being a visual blight on Wilson St.

I recall the original proposal in 2015 was for a maximum height of 5 stories which at the time seemed monstrous enough.

It is very disappointing to realize that our local councillor seems to have the interests of developers a priority in his thinking.

I really hope that you and your department will reject this application !

Thank you for reading this.

Yours sincerely,

Hazel Ryan.

Sent from my iPad

From: Anka Cassar

Sent: February 25, 2022 11:51 AM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Dear Tim,

I am an Ancaster resident and I am writing to you to provide some input on the noted development application. I feel that Ancaster residents will have to accept gentle densification in order to accommodate population growth within our urban boundary. This being said, the proposal for a 8 storey structure is too tall but I believe a 4 storey building would fit in nicely with the aesthetics of the town and would maximize the amount of housing it provides. I understand that the Ancaster Secondary Plan has height restrictions but we are facing a climate emergency and cannot sprawl out and instead need to infill and build up. The developer can even keep the Marr Phillippo house and incorporate into the design, it could become a cute Coffee House or Bakery. Having commercial units on the main floor and housing above will help Wilson Street become an attractive, walkable and sustainable downtown. Parking would be better suited to be underground and permeable paving, solar panels, a grey water recycling system and even roof top or terrace plantings would make it an even more environmentally sustainable build. There is a concern for increased traffic, but if a walkable community is created residents will no longer need cars and with the increased density, hopefully public transit will become more frequent and desirable in Ancaster. The potential is there and with some changes I feel this could be a development that would benefit all.

Thank you,

Anka Cassar

From: Rebecca Simpson
Sent: February 25, 2022 12:07 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

Thank you for taking time to review input from Ancaster community members regarding the proposed development at Wilson and Academy.

I am in favour of preserving our farmland by increasing density within urban boundaries and I strongly advocate that this is done in a reasonable, responsible way that enhances our existing community. I think we have a wonderful opportunity to create walkable, safe, and beautiful neighbourhoods that accommodate people of all ages and reflect a commitment to the environment.

The current proposed development at Wilson and Academy does not reflect these goals. It grossly disregards the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan as well as the requirements of the Cultural Heritage Landscape status.

To increase densification, it is imperative that we create walkable neighbourhoods. Basic necessities, such as public transit, grocery stores, pharmacies, and banking must be within walking distance. These necessities are not adequately available at this site. The proposed development would therefore rely heavily on car traffic in a way that can not be supported by the local roads. There are very few inroads to Ancaster and allowing a development that will impede flow at this key juncture will have catastrophic ramifications on the whole city.

One of the main reasons people love living in and visiting Ancaster is because of its green space. The proposed structure is massive and offers little in the way of landscaping. Its height is three times what is allowed under the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan and would cast significant shadows on neighbouring properties, further limiting the landscape of the area. I fear this would set an unfortunate precedent and erode the natural areas that make Ancaster so special.

In Canada, we have little built history compared to other countries. Given that Ancaster is home to some of Canada's oldest buildings, I think it is important to preserve its architectural heritage. Wilson Street is a main component of this history and development here should adhere to the requirements of the Cultural Heritage Landscape status. The architectural style of the proposed development attempts to conform to the neighbourhood heritage context but I find that the modern elements pull focus from the historical references instead of highlighting them. Additionally, it is disappointing that the Marr-Phillipo historical building would be moved and quite likely damaged to accommodate this development.

Given the recent concerns regarding wastewater disposal within Ancaster, I think it is also important that the Functional Report be required to assess peak flow sewage waste disposal data. Any development at this site must have the necessary infrastructure to support it such that existing properties and green spaces are not at risk of damage.

I am deeply concerned that allowing the development to proceed as proposed will cause significant and irreparable damage to the neighbourhood and will only encourage further such developments that will inevitably destroy the charm of Ancaster while causing significant environmental harm. I hope that the current proposal will be denied and that any future application will better reflect the needs and character of the community.

Thank you for your consideration, Mr. Vrooman.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca Simpson

Bachelor of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Toronto

Ancaster Resident

[REDACTED]

From: Doug Amos
Sent: February 25, 2022 12:11 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Academy/Wilson development Ancaster

Please respect Ancaster's history and deny this development

regards & tx
Douglas Amos
Ancaster

From: David Pentland
Sent: February 25, 2022 12:29 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Re: Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Mr. E. Tim Vrooman, City of Hamilton

Planning and Economic Development Dept.

Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Suburban Team

71 Main Street West, 5 th Floor, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Vrooman:

Please substitute this for my previous email from this morning.

I seem to be having some computer problems preventing proper editing.

I wish state my opposition to the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law

Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Development of the subject lands should be in accordance with the existing Official Plan and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan which allows a height of 9 meters only and requires that buildings be consistent with the character of the neighbourhood.

“The Official Plan provides direction and guidance on the management of our communities, land use change and physical *development* over the next **30 years**.”
Urban Hamilton Official Plan, September 2013 Chapter A: Introduction

“Provincial plans and municipal official plans provide a framework for comprehensive, integrated, **place-based and long-term planning** that supports and integrates the principles of

strong communities, a clean and healthy environment and economic growth, **for the long term.**" Provincial Policy Statement 2020

In this regard, approval of the proposed amendments raises two questions.

1. **Is this Bad Planning?** Since the proposal is contradictory to the intent and letter of the Official Plan and Wilson Street Secondary Plan and there has been no radical change in circumstances, either the original Plan is flawed or the proposed amendment is flawed.
2. **What is directing development in Hamilton?** Since the amendment was proposed by other than Hamilton's Planning Department, approval of the proposed application would suggest that development is being directed by considerations other than Hamilton's stated long term plan.

Thank you for ensuring this letter will appear before the Planning Committee of the City of Hamilton.

David Pentland

293 Woodworth Drive

Ancaster ONT.

On Fri, 25 Feb 2022 at 11:14, David Pentland <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Dear Mr. Vrooman,

Please see my attached objection to the subject application.
Thank you.

Dave Pentland

From: shannon kyles
Sent: February 25, 2022 12:44 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Opposed to development on Wilson at Academy

Hello,

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed development in Ancaster at Academy at Wilson.

The ignores the Designation status of the Philippo Marr house, is contrary to the Secondary Plan in Ancaster and will virtually destroy the main street of Ancaster. As one of the oldest towns in Ontario, this proposed development should be rejected on every level.

Yours Very Truly,

Shannon Kyles

From: David Molnar

Sent: February 25, 2022 1:05 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Manchia and Spallaci proposed development at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue (Wilson and Academy Streets), Ancaster

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

Please do not approve this proposed development!

It has become so commonplace for developers to ignore the established guidelines – and there are so many “minor variances, zoning changes, official plan amendments, relief from height restrictions and countless other requests to stray far from the established guidelines for developments in any given area that the guidelines appear to be totally meaningless. Developers and builders seem to expect that the rules will be bent, stretched or ignored completely and frankly, that attitude and practice must stop now!

How can anyone with good intentions submit a proposal for buildings which are so out of context with the established areas in which they are proposed to be built? How can any one submit proposals for buildings which are two, three and even several times the established maximum height limits and expect to be taken seriously? I believe I understand the logic behind the idea of “urban intensification” which has become the current buzzword among developers recently but a historic town like Ancaster which is the third oldest community in the Province of Ontario (behind Niagara on the Lake and Kingston) is not an urban centre and cannot be expected to look like downtown Hamilton or Toronto. Can you imagine the response if a developer attempted to submit a proposal similar to the subject proposal in a community such as Niagara on the Lake? Why do you suppose that nothing even remotely resembling the proposed monstrosity exists in historic communities such as NOTL, Port Hope, etc.? – because planners there would not entertain such nonsense for a moment and would not allow developers and builders to demolish their existing communities!

Surely there must be a limit to the number of variations and exceptions to any proposed development proposal. Surely, the established guidelines mean something and reflect the norms of the community. Please say no to this proposal. Residents feel abandoned by municipal officials, and are helpless, left to watch their community decimated in the name profit for a few.

Thanks in you advance for your consideration,

Donna and David Molnar
15 Hostein Dr.
Ancaster, ON
L9G 2S4

MOBLE: [REDACTED]

From: Simon Hardcastle
Sent: February 25, 2022 1:06 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Subject: UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

Good afternoon Tim and Lloyd

Please see my comments below and attached for the proposed development in Ancaster for UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

Thank you for your time
Simon

UHOPA-22-004/ZAC-22-011

Attn: Tim Vrooman

Well, I must congratulate the developers on this proposal. You have managed to capture absolutely nothing of the Ancaster downtown vibe with this design:

- An 8-story building when no other building in the area is that high
- Probably the most god awful design that does not match any other surrounding buildings
- Being built on one of the busiest roads in the area

And with that being said you have managed to irritate the local community by

- Needing to move a historic building to the back of the property because you do not have the foresight to include it in your plans to probably be used as a bike shed
 - Amazing how the consultant that the developer hired and paid needed the building to be moved for their design
 - Amazing how no one cares about the neighboring homes. Do they have this same contamination problem on their property? Is it under Academy Road leaking into sewage or drinking pipes? I guess it was because the heritage house was in their way of this design so they paid to find the problem!!
- You took down 2 building before the plans were even put in years ago making the parcel of land look like a dump (but I guess that worked in the developers favor)
- No consideration for the houses on Academy:
 - Who will now have the entrance to a customer parking lot at the side of their property
 - Who will now have the underground parking garage entrance/exit at the back of their property. That will be great at night with the lights shining through their windows from vehicles coming up the ramp from the underground parking
- No consideration for the houses on Lorne:
 - With the windows and balconies all looking over their gardens

- Amazing how there is no picture of the back of the North Elevation which would be looking over the houses on Lorne
- Once again we see renderings of a development without the houses/businesses next to them. Maybe do a rendering of what the development will look like for residents at the Lodor/Lorne intersection, so we can all see what they get to look at each morning.
-

Now let's get to the traffic problems:

- Wow, great insight. Let's turn a residential street into the entrance and exit for the residents and retail customers.
- So, tell me what's going to happen when cars (residents and customers/staff of the commercial units) leave this development and want to head to the Lincoln Alexander Pkwy/403. Will they turn onto Academy, then Wilson Street and then Rousseaux Street? Or will they simply turn on Academy roll through the stop sign and enter Rousseaux street that way, you cut out a set of traffic lights, and all the traffic, that seems like the easiest path, and when they return from the Lincoln Alexander Pkwy/403 they will just turn onto Academy that way to save some time with the traffic at the Wilson/Rousseaux intersection
- Then what about the cars (residents and customers/staff of the commercial units) that want to head towards Fiddlers green way. Will they turn on Wilson street from Academy? Probably not because that intersection is very busy with no lights. So, they will head up to Lodor street then to Church to catch the lights there.

Now with all the cut through traffic as well at this intersection, this will make Lodor, Academy and Church even busier

- There is also no turning lane on Wilson to Academy. So, for the small majority of people who do not cut through Lodor or Academy will have issue turning onto Academy .
- Academy is not a wide road. There will be issues with deliveries for the commercial units, delivery trucks, and moving vans on that road especially with other business opposite the development

It's a shame. The developer really could have made this into something nice for the Town of Ancaster, but instead profit trumps everything. I am looking forward to the when residents move in and realize what they have purchased with all the noise from the traffic and local businesses.

In conclusion, I would like to see this land developed. An 8-story building is way too high. Bring it back down to the 3-story building you are allowed in this area. And maybe have someone else design a building that is more attractive than what they have submitted.

Simon Hardcastle
Lodor Street

Mr. E. Tim Vrooman, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Dept.
Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Suburban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Mr. Vrooman,

Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster, ON.

As a member of the Ancaster community, I write in response to the above development application.

Not having the opportunity to read the actual application documents, I cannot comment on specifics but request that City Staff review the application so:

1. That the proposed [bylaw] amendment meet the general intent of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan with respect to building height, scale, massing, privacy, overlook, compatibility, and enhancing the character of the existing neighbourhood and cultural heritage;
2. That the proposed change in zoning meet the general intent of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan with respect to setbacks, building height, and massing;
3. That the proposal be considered good planning and is not considered an over development of the site (urban green infrastructure and engineered infrastructure),.
4. That a record of site condition under the Environmental Protection Act be required given the history of subsurface hydrocarbon contamination west and upgradient of the site.

Thank you for inviting input from the community in consideration for your staff report.

Mary Vrabel
158 Sulphur Springs Rd.
Ancaster, ON

From: David Hamber

Sent: February 25, 2022 1:31 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: My response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands located at 392,398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson St. East and 15 Lorne Street

Dear Mr. Vrooman:

The gargantuan height and the potential disastrous effect of added sewage and traffic problems which would result from this proposed development in our village are reason aplenty for denial of the application, as it was the case for the old Brandon House property.

Any sense we ever had of the cultural and heritage history of Ancaster will be destroyed. When the camel gets into the tent, there is ruin all around.

We urge those who will have the final vote to take the only responsible avenue and defeat this application.

Sincerely,

David & Lynn Hamber
Ancaster

Sent from my iPad

From: nancy dingwall
Sent: February 25, 2022 2:43 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Response to amendments: Ancaster

Response to application for official plan amendment and zoning bylaw amendment for lands located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson st East and 15 Lorne Ave. Ancaster.

Hello,

I write in response to the above development application. This does not in any way conform to the cultural heritage landscape of Ancaster.

Any new development should conform to the neighborhood heritage. This development at the corner of Mohawk Rd and Wilson St. is three times the height allowed under the Ancaster Wilson Street secondary plan.

The traffic which will be generated from this development will greatly increase and will impact an already high traffic area.

The wastewater disposal system is very likely inadequate and unable to carry the extra flow from this development.

With respect to the Filippo Marr house, we need a complete hydrogeology report and an environmental site assessment to fully understand the status of the soil.

Please maintain the heritage of Ancaster and build accordingly after the tragic demolition of the beautiful Brandon House. Also the Filippo Marr house needs to remain where it is so we can all appreciate its architecture.

Thank you,
Nancy Dingwall

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 25, 2022 3:07 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: UHOPA-22-004, ZAC-22-011

Dear Sir

This letter is in regards to Urban Plan Amendment File No. UHOPA-22-004 and Zoning Bi-law amendment File No. ZAC-22-011 here-in referred to as the "plan".

My name is [REDACTED] (Milton). My mother, [REDACTED] is the owner of the property at 20 Lorne Ave. Ancaster, ON. L9G 2X5. I am writing this response in representation of [REDACTED], myself and [REDACTED]'s other 2 children, [REDACTED] (Hamilton) and [REDACTED] (Port Rowan). We expressly request that our names be removed from any publication of this response on the City website.

With regards to the plan and amendment noted above we wish to express several concerns.

1. Our family home is at 20 Lorne Avenue which adjoins the plan. [REDACTED] is the property owner. We welcome the need for intensification especially along a major transit route and so the basic idea of building multi unit housing in this area is understood. We are, however, disturbed and frankly horrified that it be 8 storeys tall. This exceeds the definition of "medium density" and a "walkable neighborhood". It is far more reasonable to expect intensification to occur such that density ramps up from single family dwellings to 3 or 4 storey structures and then 8, 16 etc. Building what some would define as a "high rise" right next to low density housing is not good planning.
2.
 - a. How will this affect the value of the property at 20 Lorne. Ave.? Is the developer prepared to compensate the property owner for any losses?
 - b. How will this affect the quality of life at 20 Lorne Ave.? What steps will the developer take to mitigate the added noise, traffic and garbage created during construction and after construction is complete?
 - c. How will this affect the sunlight falling on 20 Lorne Ave.? We look forward to an engineer's report so that we can enter into negotiations for compensation for the loss of sunlight should this plan move forward.

In order to bring sewage lines and gas lines into Lorne Ave the construction companies had to use blasting. Towards the top of the hill, which is an esker, the rocks and boulders get very large. These rocks are suspended in loose sand. The plan calls for underground parking which requires 2 or more subsurface levels. We believe this will require blasting. We require assurances in contract that the developer will take full

responsibility for damages such as cracks and subsidence to her property. We wish to see any engineering reports pertaining to the geology on the plan.

The plan shows a narrow strip of grass between the property line at 20 Lorne Ave. and an above grade parking lot. The difference in elevation between the parking lot and the property line are not shown but are of concern because there is an existing slope on the 20 Lorne Avenue side. We require assurances in contract that construction on the plan side of the line does not cause further subsidence down the slope towards the plan. We wish to see any engineering reports pertaining to the maintenance of soil slope and stability in this region.

Lorne Ave. is a dead end street. It is very narrow and has no sidewalk. In the 1950s drivers could access the rear of the grocery store parking lot at 412 Wilson via Lorne Ave. A small child was hit by a car and killed on Lorne Ave due to poor site lines, slope, lack of sidewalks and constant traffic. Subsequently access to the rear of the grocery store parking lot at 412 Wilson was closed. We require assurances that this roadway will not be reopened temporarily for construction or permanently for parking access.



From: Honor Hughes

Sent: February 25, 2022 3:33 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment

Dear Sir

We are writing in response to your request for input from Ancaster residents with regards to the above Application. Yet again, we feel frustrated that these developers are missing the mark when they designed this oversized monster of a building, in a location that is in the centre of a heritage village that is trying desperately to preserve its architectural heritage. There is nothing about the design of this building that would fit in with the area's architecture, nor does it conform to the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan, which was developed in consultation with the public to prevent the situation we are currently facing. Applying to the City for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for a building that fails to comply for so many reasons is just wasting tax payers' money, time and effort. Applying for an 8 storey structure in an area zoned for 2.5 storeys shouldn't even be up for discussion. An 8 storey building would tower over existing buildings, making the village core dark and there has been no effort made to create a building that tastefully marries the new with the old.

We are also disheartened to hear that in order to build such a bland modern monstrosity, the Marr-Philippo House that stands proud as one of Ancaster's oldest buildings, has to be taken apart and moved out of sight from where it has rightfully stood all these years. The concern to local historians and stonemasons is that this building would likely not survive a move as it is fragile. There has been commentary that as the location was the site of a former gas station that remediation needs to be taken, understandably because of contaminated soil, yet there has yet to be proof that the Marr-Phillipo house is actually affected by any contamination from the rest of the site. We feel that the developer could have successfully utilised Marr-Philippo house in its plans in its current location and that this location is clearly not suitable for what they wish to build, given that there is such a property of significance already there.

Traffic in Ancaster is becoming a problem and has definitely grown significantly since we moved to Ancaster 11 years ago. Many people cut through the back roads of the Maywood neighbourhood behind the downtown core to try and avoid lengthy traffic along Wilson Street, particularly when there is an accident on the 403/Linc which means that everyone is trying to find alternate routes. Having huge overbuilt properties comprising multiple units on Wilson Street in the village core will only create more traffic to an already overburdened area. Residents aren't opposed to development and understand that empty lots aren't attractive, but adhering to guidelines put in place for a reason, is expected and is entirely reasonable. We feel that the wheel shouldn't be reinvented by taking such an Application into consideration and asking for input when it clearly goes against everything the City of Hamilton and the public agreed for Ancaster when the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan was put in place.

When looking at buildings already in the village core, a newer medical building next to Blackbird restaurant (former Rousseau House) and opposite the Tim Hortons Plaza, built a few years ago in of itself looms large for most residents, imagining a building almost three times higher is

inconceivable. There is another new development proposed for the site of the old Post Office on Wilson Street but its building footprint will at least run behind Wilson Street and will not have the height nor will it be a wide blot on the landscape that this development would be. This proposed development by Messrs Manchia & Spallaci is wide, tall and ugly with no discerning character, just a bland modern featureless box using materials that are out of place in that location. Imagine the likes of Niagara-on-the-Lake, Grimsby, Dundas or old Oakville accepting such a building in the middle of their downtown heritage core. It would not be welcomed. Choosing to build on such a site needs a developer with vision, and an understanding of the responsibility to design a building that would fit into a heritage streetscape. It can be modern, mixing building materials that are tasteful, and not jarring but it has to fit in with its neighbouring buildings. It has to comply with mass, height, footprint as per the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan. Bring us small boutique storefronts with overhead accommodation, built in complimentary brick tones, roof tiles, fretwork or smaller residential units that mock traditional design and you'd have the public eager but designing a featureless 8 storey box won't cut it with locals.

So we feel strongly that this Application should be denied and the message passed to developers not to return unless their Application complies with existing plans in place for Ancaster. Thank you for considering the input of our community when assessing this Application.

Regards

Honor & Brendan Hughes

Ancaster residents

From: Karen Hanna
Sent: February 25, 2022 3:56 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Cc: @i [REDACTED]
Subject: Wilson Street and Lorne Avenue Development in Ancaster

Hello, we are writing about the proposal for the land in Ancaster on Wilson and Lorne. We live on Lodor Street and would like to see this property well developed to make good use of the land.

When we look at the plans submitted and stand in front of property as we do most days on our walks, we can't imagine this building looming over the village and destroying the ambiance of the town. It is the opposite of the thoughtful development that has occurred in the past and a real contrast to the exciting Memorial Arts Centre that honours the past and builds for the future.

Many thanks,
Ian and Karen Hanna



Karen Hanna | [REDACTED]
TKB Hanna & Associates Ltd.
<https://tkbhanna.com/> & <https://talenttroublecollective.com/>
co-author Talent Trouble® - <https://www.talenttrouble.com/>

From: pada venus

Sent: February 25, 2022 4:37 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Application for Official Plan Amendment & Zoning By-Law Amendment for 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, 412 Wilson Street and 15 Lorne Ave., Ancaster.

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

We are writing this as concerned community citizens respecting the Application for Official Plan Amendment & Zoning By-Law Amendment for 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, 412 Wilson Street and 15 Lorne Ave., Ancaster. We appreciate this opportunity to share our perspective and reasoning in opposition to this application.

The proposed application is disturbing to the extent that this development completely ignores existing bylaws and zoning restrictions. It is offensive in that it ignores the Cultural Heritage Landscape Status. In short, the building's looming height over the rest of the town (3 times higher than what is currently permissible under the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan), massive size, appalling nondescript, cheap, design would be a scarring, and sadly permanent eyesore on the townscape.

Furthermore, rather than creating development in tune with the lower rooftops and historic references of the town, this development undermines potential economic gains in promoting Ancaster as a historic "escape from the city", a respite surrounded by Conservation for tourism. Should a development of this kind proceed, it would permanently destroy "historic" development potential and consequent economic gains, as experienced by communities who have maximized their unique strengths such as Niagara-on-the-Lake. It is very sad that there is not a better vision for this land, a vision which would develop its potential responsibly and for the benefit economically of existing and future town businesses. A recent example of such a positive development was the neighbouring Barracks Inn.

Traffic, is, of course another problem, with backups occurring daily during commuter times to work and home, and being a full stop on Wilson St. whenever the Highway 403 or eastbound Lincoln Alexander Parkway experience serious accidents. A development of this size would only aggravate this problem, which at present, has no other solution.

We fully support the refusal of this application, and hope that future applications are more thoughtful and respectful of current development restrictions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Pat Venus

David Venus

376 Brookview Court
Ancaster

From: Paul White
Sent: February 25, 2022 4:39 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Proposed development at Wilson and Academy Streets, Ancaster

Mr. Vrooman:


I wish to express my extreme disappointment with the Manchia & Spallaci proposed development for Ancaster at the corner of Wilson and Academy Streets. The scale of this proposal seems to display a complete disregard for the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan.

I am also against the proposal to move the Marr-Phillipo house. This would be a tragic event, and the loss of yet another piece of heritage architecture for Ancaster.

The Manchia & Spallaci development would have a negative effect on the town's infrastructure in the areas of traffic in the Wilson - Rousseau Street area, and waste water due to the scale of the proposal.

There has been a raised awareness of late of the public's lack of support for development of this type as proposals such as this seem deaf to the wishes of the neighbourhood. I feel this proposal is just that - deaf to what could and should be done.

Sincerely,

Paul White
24 Lynndale Drive
Dundas, ON
L9H 3L6


From: benburke benburke

Sent: February 25, 2022 4:01 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: [SUSPICIOUS MESSAGE] Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wison Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Mr. Vrooman:

I am writing to express my dismay at what can only be described as the brazen disregard of the application captioned above for a rules-based planning process.

The cynical will see this proposal as a trial balloon by the developers who, in the event that the proposal is rejected by the City, will hope that the OLT will permit something that be may smaller than the current proposal but in the interests of "compromise" will permit a development far larger than the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP) would allow.

Scale & Density:

At eight and a half storeys the proposed building is completely at variance with the concept for the Village Core as expressed through the 7-year old Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan which envisaged two and half storeys. It is incongruous to propose an eight-storey building fronting a two lane street. The idea of Pedestrian-Focused Streets as set out in Policy 2.2.8.5 of the AWSSP would be entirely lost. This proposal would if accepted by the City would set a precedent for the creation of a canyon through the Village Core.

The development is a clear breach of design consideration set out in the AWSSP Policy 2.8.12.1.j) ii). Policy 2.8.1 states that "*Development and redevelopment shall be required to demonstrate consistency with the Urban Design Guidelines.*" This development completely flaunts them.

For the sake of our community I ask that you reject this proposed development and furthermore ask that your make it a condition of any future development of the site that it comply with the AWSSP.

Regards,

Ben Burke

Ancaster, ON

From: Doug Stephens
Sent: February 25, 2022 5:47 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Manchia/Spallaci development application

Mr. Vrooman,

Re: Response to Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392, 398, 400, 402, 406, and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster

I'm writing to express my objection to the development plan application referenced above. As you will note from the attached report, this proposed development not only violates current planning by-laws but would also have an extremely detrimental effect on the community, natural environment and infrastructure of Ancaster.

I trust you'll take the sentiment of the taxpayers of Ancaster into consideration and choose to do the right thing by denying this harmful and unnecessary development.

Sincerely,

--

Doug Stephens
Ancaster Resident

{Attachment: Letter from Bob Maton PhD, President, Ancaster Village Heritage Community, pgs. 14-18 of Appendix "C" to Report PED22070.}

From: Aimee Frketich

Sent: February 25, 2022 8:25 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Hello Mr. Vrooman

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

While I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition, I find it appalling that I even have to. This build is so obviously and extremely defiant of the current bylaws, current zoning and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP), it is a disgrace I have to spend my time writing you. However, if I must give you reasons to protect a town that was established over 200 years ago and was one of the first in Ontario then here are some quick thoughts (as I just found out about this deadline today).

- Height - obviously 7 - 8 stories is not within the current 2. 5 stories allowed
- This build does not fit in with the character of the town in any way. The Ancaster Secondary Plan requires that new buildings conform to a heritage architectural style. This has already been done well with several of the 'new' builds along the village core, including the Baracks and the corner of Halson and Wilson St., Bravo to this builder. Using appropriate brick and mortar, windows and doors is important to the keeping of a town and its history and intrigue. The most recent building placed directly in the view of locals enjoying good food and drink at the 'Blackbird', formerly Rousseau House restaurant are now forced to look a building that pretends to fit in but does not and I don't want to see that happen again. It is embarrassing and a delinquent reflection of developers interests and illustration of the apathy among our elected officials and city planners.
- The consultant reports included in the Application are inadequate and biased. When a developer pays for the assessments to be done (which he is often heard boasting about how much they cost him) you have to wonder the accuracy. It is embarrassing that these developers feel so confident that they don't even care if people suspect bribery.
- Traffic is already at a tipping point, please see the more accurate Salvini study. Furthermore I drive down Wilson street every morning and night for the past 10 years and it is more than obvious the road way cannot handle anymore traffic. Furthermore the accuracy of the study is also skewed due to COVID restrictions and people working from home have dramatically decreased traffic along Wilson St and will eventually get back to the busy road it was.

I am aware of other discrepancies in the developers assessments for wastewater, hydrocarbons etc. All of which have been accurately expressed to you by Bob Maton. I will not repeat these to you as I know you have been made aware of them and don't want to waste your time.

I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development in anyway but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors a like. It should have some fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my thoughts
Aimee Frketich

From: Sam Kern
Sent: February 25, 2022 8:42 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Condo Opposition

Hello Mr. Vrooman

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and [412 Wilson Street East](#) and [15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster](#).

While I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition, I find it appalling that I even have to. This build is so obviously and extremely defiant of the current bylaws, current zoning and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP), it is a disgrace I have to spend my time writing you. However, if I must give you reasons to protect a town that was established over 200 years ago and was one of the first in Ontario then here are some quick thoughts (as I just found out about this deadline today).

- Height - obviously 7 - 8 stories is not within the current 2. 5 stories allowed
- This build does not fit in with the character of the town in any way. The Ancaster Secondary Plan requires that new buildings conform to a heritage architectural style. This has already been done well with several of the 'new' builds along the village core, including the Baracks and the corner of Halson and Wilson St., Bravo to this builder. Using appropriate brick and mortar, windows and doors is important to the keeping of a town and its history and intrigue. The most recent building placed directly in the view of locals enjoying good food and drink at the 'Blackbird', formerly Rousseau House restaurant are now forced to look a building that pretends to fit in but does not and I don't want to see that happen again. It is embarrassing and a delinquent reflection of developers interests and illustration of the apathy among our elected officials and city planners.
- The consultant reports included in the Application are inadequate and biased. When a developer pays for the assessments to be done (which he is often heard boasting about how much they cost him) you have to wonder the accuracy. It is embarrassing that these developers feel so confident that they don't even care if people suspect bribery.
- Traffic is already at a tipping point, please see the more accurate Salvini study. Furthermore I drive down Wilson street every morning and night for the past 10 years and it is more than obvious the road way cannot handle anymore traffic. Furthermore the accuracy of the study is also skewed due to COVID restrictions and people working from home have dramatically decreased traffic along Wilson St and will eventually get back to the busy road it was.

I am aware of other discrepancies in the developers assessments for wastewater, hydrocarbons etc. All of which have been accurately expressed to you by Bob Maton. I will not repeat these to you as I know you have been made aware of them and don't want to waste your time.

I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development in anyway but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors a like. It should have some

fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area.

--

Cheers,

Sam Kern

From: Terri-Lynn Kern
Sent: February 25, 2022 8:46 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Condo Opposition Ancaster

Hello Mr. Vrooman,

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

While I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition, I find it appalling that I even have to. This build is so obviously and extremely defiant of the current bylaws, current zoning and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP), it is a disgrace I have to spend my time writing to you. However, if I must give you reasons to protect a town that was established over 200 years ago and was one of the first in Ontario then here are some quick thoughts (as I just found out about this deadline today).

- Height - obviously 7 - 8 stories is not within the current 2. 5 stories allowed
- This build does not fit in with the character of the town in any way. The Ancaster Secondary Plan requires that new buildings conform to a heritage architectural style. This has already been done well with several of the 'new' builds along the village core, including the Baracks and the corner of Halson and Wilson St., Bravo to this builder. Using appropriate brick and mortar, windows and doors is important to the keeping of a town and its history and intrigue. The most recent building placed directly in the view of locals enjoying good food and drink at the 'Blackbird', formerly Rousseau House restaurant, is now forced to look like a building that pretends to fit in but does not and I don't want to see that happen again. It is embarrassing and a delinquent reflection of developers interests and illustration of the apathy among our elected officials and city planners.
- The consultant reports included in the Application are inadequate and biased. When a developer pays for the assessments to be done (which he is often heard boasting about how much they cost him) you have to wonder about the accuracy. It is embarrassing that these developers feel so confident that they don't even care if people suspect bribery.
- Traffic is already at a tipping point, please see the more accurate Salvini study. Furthermore I have driven down Wilson street every morning and night for the past 10 years and it is more than obvious the road way cannot handle anymore traffic. Furthermore the accuracy of the study is also skewed due to COVID restrictions and people working from home have dramatically decreased traffic along Wilson St and will eventually get back to the busy road it was.

I am aware of other discrepancies in the developers assessments for wastewater, hydrocarbons etc. All of which have been accurately expressed to you by Bob Maton. I will not repeat these to you as I know you have been made aware of them and don't want to waste your time.

I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development in any way but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors alike. It should have some fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area.

Regards,
Terri-Lynn Kern

From: Amanda Frketich
Sent: February 25, 2022 8:59 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Oppose

Mr Vrooman,

The below is an email that was sent to you from a neighbour and dear friend who cares very deeply about the integrity of this town, while it seems like none of the city planners or anyone else profiting from the demise of this town do. I thoroughly agree with everything in said email and hope it doesn't fall on deaf ears like all of the other oppositions to the monstrosities that are built here have been.

Regards,

Amanda Taylor

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

While I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition, I find it appalling that I even have to. This build is so obviously and extremely defiant of the current bylaws, current zoning and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP), it is a disgrace I have to spend my time writing you. However, if I must give you reasons to protect a town that was established over 200 years ago and was one of the first in Ontario then here are some quick thoughts (as I just found out about this deadline today).

- Height - obviously 7 - 8 stories is not within the current 2. 5 stories allowed
- This build does not fit in with the character of the town in any way. The Ancaster Secondary Plan requires that new buildings conform to a heritage architectural style. This has already been done well with several of the 'new' builds along the village core, including the Baracks and the corner of Halson and Wilson St., Bravo to this builder. Using appropriate brick and mortar, windows and doors is important to the keeping of a town and its history and intrigue. The most recent building placed directly in the view of locals enjoying good food and drink at the 'Blackbird', formerly Rousseau House restaurant are now forced to look a building that pretends to fit in but does not and I don't want to see that happen again. It is embarrassing and a delinquent reflection of developers interests and illustration of the apathy among our elected officials and city planners.
- The consultant reports included in the Application are inadequate and biased. When a developer pays for the assessments to be done (which he is often heard boasting about how much they cost him) you have to wonder the accuracy. It is embarrassing that these developers feel so confident that they don't even care if people suspect bribery.
- Traffic is already at a tipping point, please see the more accurate Salvini study.
Furthermore I drive down Wilson street every morning and night for the past 10 years

and it is more than obvious the road way cannot handle anymore traffic. Furthermore the accuracy of the study is also skewed due to COVID restrictions and people working from home have dramatically decreased traffic along Wilson St and will eventually get back to the busy road it was.

I am aware of other discrepancies in the developers assessments for wastewater, hydrocarbons etc. All of which have been accurately expressed to you by Bob Maton. I will not repeat these to you as I know you have been made aware of them and don't want to waste your time.

I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development in anyway but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors a like. It should have some fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Nat Frketich
Sent: February 25, 2022 9:20 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Condos

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster. This had better not be passed this town has been destroyed by some pretty corrupt individuals. Sergio is a city planner is this not a conflict of interest? If it isn't it should be. There are a large number of reasons why this is a no go. Congestion of the town is a major one green space is another. I'd be happy to go over all the reasons I oppose this if you'd like to email me back I do not have time to list them all now. There is some kind of corruption going on in this town to allow all this garbage to be built and I for one have recently been making calls to start an investigation as it's obvious there are some pretty greasy pockets on this council.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Miranda Bratina
Sent: February 25, 2022 10:54 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 412 Wilson St. E

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Thank you for your attention in this matter

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Fiona Cooper
Sent: February 25, 2022 11:41 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,398,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster

Hello Mr. Vrooman,

Being residents in very close proximity to the development proposed for the lands detailed above, I wish to place on record our dismay that such a development could ever be considered an appropriate structure in the heart of the historic Village of Ancaster. It would appear that no consideration whatsoever has been given to Ancaster's Cultural Heritage Landscape status. In addition, the architectural style of this structure is not representative of the streetscape in any shape or form and is in no way complementary to the existing structures that have already been built taking into account the character of the neighbourhood.

A development of this size would overwhelm not only the skyline and surrounding buildings, as well as residences in the Village core, but cause further deterioration to existing traffic congestion. "Cut through" traffic is already a cause for concern in the Maywood area. In addition, parking difficulties would also be magnified.

For current residents of the neighbourhood, noise emanating from the building itself, such as climate control apparatus as well as noise created by residents of such an oversized structure, all give cause for concern.

Whilst it is appreciated that density development is required due to the housing shortage, surely protecting this corner of the City, which is in close proximity to so many natural features, should be a priority.

Approving this type of development will only lead to other structures of this type, destroying the Ancaster Village core and the historic atmosphere that it currently enjoys.

Thank you for inviting input from the community towards formulating your staff report. It is with great concern that we watch and wait to hear the outcome, in the hope that this development will in fact, be denied.

Yours truly

Fiona Cooper

From: Nancy Kowalchuk
Sent: February 26, 2022 12:04 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject:

Hello Mr Vrooman

I'm taking the time to let you know that I (and my family) are strongly opposed to the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment for the lands located at 392, 400, 402, 406 and 412 Wilson St E and 15 Lorne Ave, Ancaster.

Nancy Kowalchuk

From: Margarita De Antunano
Sent: February 26, 2022 12:19 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Opposition to 7 floor buildings

Hello Mr. Vrooman I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster. While I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition, I find it appalling that I even have to. This build is so obviously and extremely defiant of the current bylaws, current zoning and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP), it is a disgrace I have to spend my time writing you. However, if I must give you reasons to protect a town that was established over 200 years ago and was one of the first in Ontario then here are some quick thoughts (as I just found out about this deadline today). Height - obviously 7 - 8 stories is not within the current 2. 5 stories allowed This build does not fit in with the character of the town in any way. The Ancaster Secondary Plan requires that new buildings conform to a heritage architectural style. This has already been done well with several of the 'new' builds along the village core, including the Baracks and the corner of Halson and Wilson St., Bravo to this builder. Using appropriate brick and mortar, windows and doors is important to the keeping of a town and its history and intrigue. The most recent building placed directly in the view of locals enjoying good food and drink at the 'Blackbird', formerly Rousseau House restaurant are now forced to look a building that pretends to fit in but does not and I don't want to see that happen again. It is embarrassing and a delinquent reflection of developers interests and illustration of the apathy among our elected officials and city planners. The consultant reports included in the Application are inadequate and biased. When a developer pays for the assessments to be done (which he is often heard boasting about how much they cost him) you have to wonder the accuracy. It is embarrassing that these developers feel so confident that they don't even care if people suspect bribery. Traffic is already at a tipping point, please see the more accurate Salvini study. Furthermore I drive down Wilson street every morning and night for the past 10 years and it is more than obvious the road way cannot handle anymore traffic. Furthermore the accuracy of the study is also skewed due to COVID restrictions and people working from home have dramatically decreased traffic along Wilson St and will eventually get back to the busy road it was. I am aware of other discrepancies in the developers assessments for wastewater, hydrocarbons etc. All of which have been accurately expressed to you by Bob Maton. I will not repeat these to you as I know you have been made aware of them and don't want to waste your time.

I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development in anyway but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors a like. It should have some fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area. Sent from my iPhone

From: John and Anne-Louise Watts
Sent: February 26, 2022 12:55 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Application for Official Plan Amendment

I have read the letter from Mr Frketich regarding a request to amend the Official plan re 392-412 Wilson St East and also object extremely strongly to the proposal. The development is in no respects in the interests of the people of Ancaster and Dundas and should be denied.
John Watts MD FRCPC

From: april gibson
Sent: February 26, 2022 1:26 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject:

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cathy Hiuser
Sent: February 26, 2022 2:20 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Ancaster bylaw amendment

>>> As a long time resident of Ancaster I am writing to state my strong opposition to the application for official plan amendment and zoning bylaw amendment for lands located at 392,400,402,406, and 412 Wilson Street E Ancaster and
>>> 15 Lorne Avenue Ancaster.
>>> Yours truly
>>> Catherine Hiuser.

Sent from my iPhone

From: George McComb
Sent: February 26, 2022 5:10 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Lands

I am writing you as I am opposed to the amendment to lands at 392,400,402,406,422 Wilson st and 15 Lorne ave Ancaster .

This does not at all fit into the official plan and we need height and density restrictions

Thank you
George McComb
95 Moore Crescent
Ancaster
L9g4Z6

Sent from my iPhone

From: Andrea Dewolfe
Sent: February 26, 2022 7:59 PM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject:

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.
Andrea Dewolfe

Sent from my Galaxy

From: Heather McMurray

Sent: February 26, 2022 8:50 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster.

Dear Mr. Vrooman,

I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors. It should have some fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area.

Sincerely,

Heather McMurray,


From: M. Adams

Sent: February 26, 2022 9:21 PM

To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Regarding the Application for Official Plan Amendment

Dear Mr. Vrooman, Ancaster is our home for over 40 years and we love the place. We have always been proud to live here and show our town to friends and family. Our children were raised here and love the town as much as we do. I would never be able to compose a letter like the one I am attaching here so I am sending it as if I had written it because I agree with it.

I want to protect the town. Future buildings should be built to reflect the look and feel of the town as a heritage town and not just be structures built to maximize income at the cost of the feel of the town. There are places on the periphery where this is happening but the town center should be preserved.

PLEASE, PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY ANCASTER. PROTECT IT. IT IS A LOVELY TOWN

Thank you,
Margaret Adams
Parkview Heights

Hello Mr. Vrooman I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster. While I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition, I find it appalling that I even have to. This build is so obviously and extremely defiant of the current bylaws, current zoning and the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (AWSSP), it is a disgrace I have to spend my time writing you. However, if I must give you reasons to protect a town that was established over 200 years ago and was one of the first in Ontario then here are some quick thoughts (as I just found out about this deadline today). Height - obviously 7 - 8 stories is not within the current 2.5 stories allowed. This build does not fit in with the character of the town in any way. The Ancaster Secondary Plan requires that new buildings conform to a heritage architectural style. This has already been done well with several of the 'new' builds along the village core, including the Baracks and the corner of Halson and Wilson St., Bravo to this builder. Using appropriate brick and mortar, windows and doors is important to the keeping of a town and its history and intrigue. The most recent building placed directly in the view of locals enjoying good food and drink at the 'Blackbird', formerly Rousseau House restaurant are now forced to look a building that pretends to fit in but does not and I don't want to see that happen again. It is embarrassing and a delinquent reflection of developers interests and illustration of the apathy among our elected officials and city planners. The consultant reports included in the Application are inadequate and biased. When a developer pays for the assessments to be done (which he is often heard boasting about how much they cost him) you have to wonder the accuracy. It is embarrassing that these developers feel so confident that they don't even care if people suspect bribery. Traffic is already at a tipping point, please see the more accurate Salvini study. Furthermore I drive down Wilson street every morning and night for the past 10 years and it is more than obvious the road way cannot handle anymore traffic. Furthermore the accuracy of the study is also skewed due to COVID restrictions and people working from

home have dramatically decreased traffic along Wilson St and will eventually get back to the busy road it was. I am aware of other discrepancies in the developers assessments for wastewater, hydrocarbons etc. All of which have been accurately expressed to you by Bob Maton. I will not repeat these to you as I know you have been made aware of them and don't want to waste your time. I strongly oppose this development and request that it be denied. Any future application should be required to accommodate the Cultural criteria and the AWSSP. I am not against development in anyway but I am against blatant disregard for the people of this town, its unique heritage and the need for a core that is attractive to its people and visitors a like. It should have some fortitude to the community and at minimum require some contribution. Putting store fronts under condos and charging so much rent that no local artist or entrepreneur could afford it is not ok. I believe the developers can easily establish a build on these lands that is within the current requirements and still earn their buck! These developers need to learn to be creative and not in a misleading, arrogant and conniving way but a way that serves them as well as inspires and creates possibility for a vibrant, cultural and community driven area.

From: Carol Chisholm
Sent: February 27, 2022 12:22 AM
To: Vrooman, Tim <Tim.Vrooman@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Ancaster zoning law amendment

I oppose the Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Law Amendment for Lands Located at 392,400,402,406 and 412 Wilson Street East and 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster

Carol Chishol

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Re: Wilson Street at Academy; 392 - 412 Wilson Street East & 15 Lorne Avenue, Ancaster. Wilson St. Ancaster Inc. (Wilson Street at Academy)

My comments on the above-noted proposal are similar to those for the recently denied "Applications for Amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Zoning By-law 05-200... (hereafter referred to as "Brandon House"). The Wilson Street at Academy development plan:

- ignores all of the existing planning policies and good planning practices
- is a massive over-development of the site
- will have unacceptable impacts on traffic, existing infrastructure and runoff (without significant upgrades and expansion), and the surrounding community.

The 'supporting' technical reports:

- do not recognize existing issues and constraints; therefore, the impacts of additional development cannot begin to be properly assessed
- ignore the effects of climate change in their impact assessment
- do not incorporate any sort of sensitivity analysis in their impact assessments to account for any uncertainties in projections or environmental factors
- recommend mitigation recommendations that are over-simplistic and not supported by any contingency measures
- do not recognize the need for monitoring, adaptive management or agency Permits.

The City needs to identify some means of incorporating the cumulative aspects of several approved or pending applications into its development review process.

Heritage:

The plan to relocate the heritage home to the back of the property and the City's approval of this plan make a mockery of the City's heritage building designation process and policies. Approval for relocation was based on a weak, poorly substantiated analysis, a ridiculous rationale and total disregard of the availability of various technologies that would enable removal of contaminated soil without relocation of the building. The heritage guidelines developed for the town core are ignored. It seems the developers forgot the comments they made at an earlier stage that the design would be sensitive to the heritage nature of the village core: The appearance of these buildings speaks for itself...

Regarding the existing infrastructure limitations, which to date have never been clearly articulated:

To imagine the **traffic** flow from residents and shoppers all dumping out the narrow, sloping back road down and on to the already Academy, which is already busy with cut-around traffic, and then fighting to get onto Rousseaux Street with traffic backed up from the Wilson intersection lights, is beyond laughable.

The traffic report recommends the same remedial option (timing changes at the lights) be implemented to address traffic problems at the Rousseaux/Wilson intersection as the other application – a clear example of cumulative issues. If in fact they have not already considered this option, the City needs to implement the timing changes at the Rousseaux/Wilson lights just to address the current traffic bottleneck.

The City is well aware of the existing traffic issues compounded by the challenges posed by the Wilson/Rousseaux intersection and limited options to improve traffic flow, and the related issue

of cut-around traffic through the Mayfield community. Overarching the local issues is the insurmountable constraint imposed by **Wilson Street. Wilson Street is the single and only through-town road that must also convey emergency services and diverted highway traffic.** The surrounding topography and environmental constraints make even partial new road options in and out of this area impossible. The existing traffic burden needs to be properly quantified and a defensible determination made as to feasible means (if there are any) of accommodating additional traffic.

The City is equally well aware of the existing **sanitary sewer** limitations following the recent sewage back up issues on Old Dundas Road. These issues will only be compounded by climate change – a factor conveniently ignored by the reports and analyses. Who pays for the necessary upgrades and expansions? And when and how are these requirements identified in relation to the development approval process?

Management of **stormwater runoff** from this site, with its excessive 'hard' surfaces, poses the same issues as the “Brandon House” application. Both discharge to the same local section of Ancaster Creek, a sensitive stream already heavily burdened by uncontrolled runoff. Both volume and water quantity management will be very challenging. Technologies are recommended in the Functional Servicing Report, which might work. However nothing is provided in the way of contingency planning or measures (e.g., sensitivity analysis, monitoring and adaptive management, availability of additional mitigation strategies) to provide some degree of assurance that issues can be addressed in the event that any number of potential uncertainties develop.

Preparation for the inevitable OLT challenge:

To present defensible arguments in support of scaling back, or if efforts to negotiate fail, the City needs to prepare for the obvious next step of both developers – referral to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). The developers are well aware that the Province's push for intensification and Ford's recent rejection of existing planning and public process in his efforts to facilitate and expedite development support their plans. However, a thorough review of the Province's *Places to Grow* plan might be useful.

The plan does not state thou shall promote intensification at the expense of everything else. Chapter 3 is devoted to infrastructure requirements. *“The infrastructure framework in this Plan requires that municipalities undertake an integrated approach to land use planning, infrastructure investments, and environmental protection to achieve the outcomes of the Plan”.* There is no point in building large numbers of condominiums if owners cannot access the existing road network or drive anywhere, and shoppers cannot access the commercial entities. Burdening taxpayers to pay for infrastructure expansions or failures following development is beyond unfair. Developers need to pay up-front for what's needed to support their developments. They're the ones who are profiting.

The first step, which continues to elude the review process, is **clearly identifying and substantiating current traffic and infrastructure limitations.**

In preparation for negotiations or an OLT challenge, and even to address current issues, the City needs to undertake a **comprehensive traffic study**. In addition to documenting current traffic conditions locally, traffic burden needs to be assessed in the broader context of the insurmountable constraint posed by the incontrovertible fact that there is and will always be only a single already over-burdened street through the town. **This constraint has to be recognized**

now. Then, these baseline conditions can be used to undertake a critical analysis of the traffic projections and justification report for this plan. The additional traffic flow from approved and pending developments along Wilson Street also requires integration in such analysis.

This assessment could be accommodated if the City, possibly with developer funding, completed its traffic planning obligations under the *Environmental Assessment Act*. The City needs to complete the Level 3-5 assessment, or if nothing else, update the *Ancaster Transportation Master Plan* (2011). This plan is outdated and based on long exceeded population projections, and addresses only the first two levels of the Act's requirements.

Similarly, establishing the **current baseline condition of the sanitary sewer capacity** – which appears to be at or above capacity now – would allow the City to estimate the requirements, costs and timelines to upgrade and expand the existing systems. Imposing conditions to any development approval that require waiting for these works to be designed and constructed and maximize feasible co-contributions of developers to construction of these works would put the onus back on the developers to undertake more realistic impact assessments and pay their fair share. Other municipalities have taken such an approach.

The City needs to require developers include sensitivity analysis that integrates climate change projections in their impact assessments, and integrate monitoring requirements and contingencies as part of their recommended mitigation techniques. Development conditions need to require monitoring and contingency plans with integrated and adaptive response plans for sanitary sewer use, runoff management, construction management etc.

The City faces clear challenges in making decisions about these and other development applications. I, and I assume most of the community and town are not against development, and do recognize that growth and change are inevitable. What we are asking is that development be undertaken in a responsible, defensible, sensitive and integrated manner, not like a bulldozer in a playground. Touting growth as being necessary and desirable and ignoring all its implications is not responsible. And it will backfire on the City and the new residents as well as the rest of us.

A. MacMillan,
Ancaster