

March 31st, 2022

File No: ZAC-22-020

UHOPA-22-010

James Van Rooi, City of Hamilton

Planning and Economic Development Department

Development Planning, Heritage and Design -Suburban Team

71 Main St. W. 5th Floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5

Dear James Van Rooi

As the owners of [REDACTED], we wish to oppose the effect of the Zoning By-law Amendment for the lands at 3250 and 3260 Homestead Drive, Glanbrook (Ward 11). The effect being the amendment to permit a three-story multiple dwelling 40 unit building with 50 surface parking spaces and five bicycle parking spaces.

While the planning committee debates this proposal, they should acknowledge that the term “medium density” is a relative term based upon the environment that it inhabits. Medium density in downtown Hamilton will have a higher number than in an area known as the small, quaint Mount Hope Village. The number of units in this proposal seems to be high in accordance with its environment of detached single-family dwellings. It is proposed that 40 dwelling units with 50 surface parking spaces and 5 bicycle parking spaces be erected. The appeal that Mount Hope holds is its proximity to the highway as public transit is limited in the area. It should be considered that most of those 40 proposed dwellings will be a two-car household. If the two-car assumption is to be taken then the proposal does not allow enough parking. In return, the overflow of resident parking and their visitors will end up being a fixture on our residential streets. Our streets becoming a parking lot becomes a hinderance for the services that Mount Hope owners such as garbage collection, fire trucks and snow removal offer its current residents. The proposal does not mention if there are any designated handicap spots. If they are not included in the plan and are required then the proposed parking spaces will dwindle again adding more possible cars to be parked on the streets.

As our streets add a collection of cars, I am worried about the collection of water draining into the neighbouring properties. My property is directly beside the proposed properties and has a rear yard catch basin in the back corner. We have never had a problem with the drainage before and expect to continue not having any problems. With that being said, we hope that it is acknowledged that the proposed property conforms to the existing properties and not expect to change the elevation or grading of some of the surrounding properties to change to accommodate the new building. The change to my property was a direct comment that has been made to us by the developers which worried us about expectations. A new build should not require that existing properties which currently contain no drainage problems be graded differently to accommodate their plans. The city should require that the new build respects what is already in place. Respecting those boundaries should also be considered regarding property separation. The new build should have required standards such as a fence or tree

line on their own property to provide a bit of separation from low density to medium density. As an owner of a property, we do not want to share a fence with the new build as we already have an existing fence within our property boundary that suits our needs. If the new build was to erect a fence, it would have to be in their property and within the required distance in their property. This may not be a fact that has been considered, in the proposal as it may take away parking spots. Existing structures should not have to change to accommodate new proposals especially if the existing works well.

As my house is an existing structure that is one storey, I am concerned about the height of the building if the proposed plan is directly beside me. A three-storey proposed building directly beside me will put my land and residential unit in darkness. The shadow casting of a building that size could be detrimental to the enjoyment of my property. It would be appreciated that any proposal other than a detached single-family build be located along Homestead Drive instead of lining Longview Dr.

The enjoyment of my property could also be hindered by the building’s garbage location. I do not want to walk into my backyard and view a garbage canister and smell the possible contents. Garbage bins located near our properties may also cause our properties to be run over by unwanted rodents. Rodents are a problem that is rampant within the City of Hamilton. Garbage or F.O.D. (Foreign Object Debris) is also a concern when it comes to the airport. A significant motto at the airport is that “F.O.D. kills”. If the garbage is not contained within the building than the possibility of garbage bin located on site in parking spaces would also again decrease the actual parking spaces. We as residents realize that some of concerns will be addressed further into the process; however, if our concerns are not discussed at the beginning then a project may get the go ahead even though it is riddled with future problems. A 40-unit building may not be the correct number to be put within these properties at question.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: Van Rooi, James
Subject: 3250 & 3260 Homestead, mount hope
Date: Monday, April 4, 2022 7:50:12 AM

this proposal seems incomplete
there are no dwgs
no description of how this might look like when completed
just a statement that it will have 40 units
which by the way , sounds like a lot
you are going from 2 units to 40
- that's a lot of people in a small area
by mount hope standards
the house to the west on Longwood will not see the sun until 11 am ??
hoping you will ask for more info
and pass it forward
when considering this application
[REDACTED]