

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>The subject property encroaches onto the existing City-owned rail trail and natural buffers.</p>	<p>Based on the survey provided by the applicant, the proposed development does not encroach onto the existing City-owned rail trail. The proposed development is located on the western side of the lands, away from the rail trail.</p>
<p>Proposed townhouse dwellings will impact surrounding areas and is not suitable for the surrounding area.</p>	<p>The proposed maisonette dwellings are similar to those already existing on the subject lands and would constitute an intensification of the existing use, which has compatibly existing for many years. Staff do not anticipate any undue adverse impacts being generated by the proposed development.</p>
<p>The proposal will generate a parking demand in the surrounding areas. The existing parking areas are fully utilized by residents of the pre-existing townhouse development.</p>	<p>The proponent submitted a parking management letter, which outlines how parking will be managed on-site with existing and future residents. The Applicant has reported that the current parking utilization rate is approximately 0.7 spaces per unit. The proposed parking rate of 1 space per unit plus an additional 0.17 visitor parking spaces per unit is consistent with the requirements under the City’s new comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200 for such a use. The proposal does not remove any of the existing parking spaces through the redevelopment of the lands and no new parking spaces are proposed, as the existing parking is considered sufficient to service both the existing and proposed dwelling units. Staff are satisfied an appropriate amount of parking is being provided.</p> <p>The subject lands are also well serviced by public transit and active transportation networks, reducing the reliance of future residents on the personal automobile, and thus a parking space.</p>
<p>Public seeking to be notified of Statutory Public Meeting.</p>	<p>The public notification was sent to landowners within 120 metres of the subject lands, and members of the public requesting to be notified of the Public Meeting date.</p>

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>The southerly lands are subject of a Superior Court decision in favour of the owners of the lands fronting onto Trenholme Crescent that back onto the subject lands. The southerly lands are to be dedicated to the owners of Trenholme Crescent.</p>	<p>Staff note the southerly portion of the subject lands are under ownership of Valery Construction Ltd. but are intended to be conveyed to the property owners at Trenholme Crescent, in accordance with the Superior Court Decision. In response, staff have amended the application to exclude the southerly lands subject to the court decision from the Zoning By-law Amendment application. The Applicant was agreeable to this approach.</p> <p>The rear portions of the Trenholm Crescent single detached lots may be rezoned to an appropriate residential zone through a staff-initiated Zoning By-law Amendment in the future through the City's Residential Zoning Project in Zoning By-law No. 05-200.</p>

COPY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED



BY EMAIL TO aminu.bello@hamilton.ca

CITY OF HAMILTON
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton ON. L8P 4Y5

Attention: Aminu Bello

Dear Mr. Bello,

RE: **VALERI CONSTRUCTION LTD. | C/O AMBER LINDSAY**
1400 LIMERIDGE ROAD EAST, HAMILTON ON. (WARD 06)
File No. ZAC-22-065

Thank you for your letter dated November 17, 2022. Please note that I have resided at my property (51 Trenholme Crescent, Hamilton) since 1986. I am a real estate agent, builder and developer. Thus, I am naturally very pro-development. However, respectfully, this proposal made by Valeri Construction ("the proposal") should be re-worked as it does not appear to conform to the principle of "smart development."

The proposal backs on to my property. Accordingly, I will be immediately impacted by the proposal, should it proceed. There is currently a natural buffer in place, and enough parking for the existing tenants, and therefore, to disturb the status quo would be significant. Thus, a new proposal needs to think these issues through carefully.

These are the main issues that I see:

1. The proposal as it stands unreasonably encroaches upon the pre-existing natural buffers and the rail trail. There have been pre-existing setbacks in place for decades for a simple underlying reason – they are required. The proposal seeks to encroach upon this.
2. The number of units proposed will be significantly backing unto my lands and property, and will drastically disturb the surrounding area as a result.
3. I believe that the density is not suitable to the location, given that there is a conservation area and a rail trail, to which the proposal would not only abut, but encroach upon.

I have attached numerous pictures hereto that I took at 6:30AM on a weekend, from the back of my property. You will note that the parking lot is completely full of vehicles of the current inhabitants of the development there now. By eradicating the parking lot in favour of the proposal, this will create an immediate demand for parking spots that will no longer exist or be accessible. Moreover, the parking lot will encroach upon pre-existing natural buffers. In conclusion, respectfully, the proposal does not conform to being a smart development. My neighbours concur with me on this, mainly for the reasons outlined herein.

Yours truly,





----- Original message -----

From: "Bello, Aminu" <Aminu.Bello@hamilton.ca>

Date: 2022-12-04 15:49 (GMT-05:00)

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: file no ZAC-22-065 zoning change for 1400 Limeridge Rd E

Hi [REDACTED]

The public meeting date has not been assigned. I can provide you an update once a tentative date is available.

Regards,

Aminu Bello, MCIP RPP
Planner I – Suburban Team
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
Planning Division, City of Hamilton
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 5264



Hamilton The City of Hamilton encourages physical distancing, wearing a mask in an enclosed public space, and increased handwashing. Learn more about the City's response to COVID-19 www.hamilton.ca/coronavirus.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, December 2, 2022 9:38 PM

To: Bello, Aminu <Aminu.Bello@hamilton.ca>

Subject: file no ZAC-22-065 zoning change for 1400 Limeridge Rd E

Hi, would you kindly send me the date and time of the public meeting for this file? thank you

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Bello, Aminu](#)
Subject: RE: 1400 Limeridge Rd E
Date: Thursday, January 12, 2023 5:20:31 AM
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Aminu,

Requesting clarification on this statement: "This internal/external review is now complete". At what stage will you be involving residents of the area in this process?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Bello, Aminu](#)
Subject: File# ZAC-22-065
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 3:03:09 PM

My name is [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED]
On the proposed amendment it shows that T..Valeri construction has the land behind 47,51,55,59 and a small portion behind my property [REDACTED]
I far as I'm aware T.Valeri took the home owners to court claiming the land was there's but the judge ruled in favour of the home owners twice.
How then does it show this land in his admendment.
Thanks
Steve

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Bello, Aminu](#)
Subject: ZAC - 22 -065 T. Valeri Construction Ltd - 1400 Limeridge Road East, Hamilton (the "Subject Property")
Date: Thursday, December 22, 2022 4:04:52 PM
Attachments: [Judgment.PDF](#)
[Annotated Concept Plan_1400 Limeridge.PDF](#)

Good afternoon,

We are counsel for [REDACTED] the owners of [REDACTED] Hamilton, Ontario (the "Fingland Raven Property"). Mr. Fingland and Ms. Raven have received correspondence dated November 17, 2022 regarding the proposed By-Law amendment of the 1400 Limeridge Road East property, which abuts the Fingland/Raven Property. We write to provide written comments on the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application.

We are advised that the City is aware of a decision of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice regarding a portion of the lands at issue in the Application. A copy of the Judgment regarding the Fingland/Raven lands is attached for reference. In essence, the court has determined that Mr. Fingland and Ms. Raven are the owners of a portion of the Subject Lands and are entitled to a conveyance of those lands from the registered owner. The court issued a similar Judgment with respect to portions of the Subject Property that abut the neighbouring lands at 51 Trenholme Crescent and 59 Trenholme Crescent.

The approximate portion of the Subject Lands that is subject to the court decision in favour of the owners of 51, 55 and 59 Trenholme is outlined in red on the attached Annotated Concept Plan, The affected portion of the property continues to the south beyond the image in the attached plan.

On behalf of Mr. Fingland and Ms. Raven we wish to advise that they have no objection to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application for the Subject Property provided that:

1. The change to the By-Law does not impact on the court directed conveyance of the required parcel of land to Mr. Fingland and Ms. Raven;
2. The change is limited to the Subject Property excluding the lands to be conveyed to Mr. Fingland and Ms. Raven; and
3. Mr. Fingland and Ms. Raven entering into an agreement with the owner of the Subject Lands to convey the required portion to them.

We look forward to receiving a copy of the Staff Report when complete. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding this matter. I would appreciate it if you can confirm receipt of this e-mail and look forward to hearing from you.