

From: bob p2

Sent: February 1, 2024 5:25 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Comments for Feb 6, 2024 Non-Statutory Public Meeting

Dear Clerk and Planning Committee,

As I am unable to present in person at the Feb 6, 2024 Non-Statutory Public Meeting at city Hall, I would like the following comments to be read into the meeting minutes as a matter of record.

Please find below my comments as submitted in advance of the Feb 6, 2024 Non-statutory meeting at City Hall that is in regard to the rezoning application at 1065 Paramount Drive. The following comments support rejection of the rezoning application at the OLT level.

1. Traffic & Parking

While the rezoning application seeks a RM3-XX zoning for Multiple Residential the increase in cars in the area will not be conducive to our Heritage Green neighbourhood. The proposed Traffic Study implies it is sustainable in the long term however the practical concerns due to increased traffic on a dual lane road is not acceptable.

With reference to item 3.2 and page 20 of the Arcadis Planning Justification Addendum Report dated September 12, 2023 Prepared for Mikmada Homes it mentions "The rate in which parking is calculated is at 1.05 spaces per apartment unit". However the report does not account for cars that are in excess of this number. For example, dwellings with 2 or more cars that cannot park in the allotted parking spots. Paramount drive has no parking along the full length so extra cars will attempt to park on side streets within the local neighborhood.

- Parking outside of the proposed RM3-XX zone is a high-risk problem for child safety and city street cleaning/pickup operations throughout the year.

- Safety for students in the nearby schools from increased car parking is a practical concern.

With reference to the Transportation Impact Study dated September 2023 it proposes "Traffic Remedial Measures: No changes to the existing lane configuration or traffic control are required at the study area intersections to accommodate the forecast traffic volumes." In contrast to this report the practical side of driving into and out of the survey as a local resident makes this recommendation unacceptable.

- The added car congestion will pose a safety risk for entry and exit routes at the Mud St and Paramount intersections due to long lines of cars waiting to turn and back up into the through lanes of traffic. This is almost the case at present during rush hour traffic without the added congestion of the increased car volume.

- The Paramount Drive two lane road with existing concrete medians is not an adequate Collector Road for this proposal.

2. People Density

Reference item 3.1 of the Arcadis Planning Justification Addendum Report dated September 12, 2023 and the total of 304 proposed units.

It is my understanding that the proposed area is considered a “delineated zone” for people density and planning purposes. The Province recommends a combination of 200 people and/or jobs per hectare in growth areas” and “50% more in a delineated area” or 300 people per hectare.

The proposed site at 1065 Paramount occupies 1.625 hectares. Assuming at least a minimum of (2) people will live in one of the proposed 304 dwellings (181 apartment units and 123 town houses) then that translates to (2x304) 608 people total. Therefore, the proposed rezoning of 1065 Paramount Drive translates to a conservative (608/1.625) 375 people per hectare.

The planned density of 375 people per hectare is grossly over (25%) the recommended provincial delineated standard of 300 people per acre and should not be allowed to proceed in the residential Heritage Green neighbourhood.

While the rezoning application seeks a RM3-XX is Multiple Residential zoning, the Mikmada proposal is not conducive to the Heritage Green neighbourhood. The proposed apartment unit must be removed from the proposed application and substituted with a more reasonable amount of multiple use dwellings (i.e. townhouses) to reduce the people density.

Going forward and in reference to the OLT review, if there ever was a time when an application for rezoning should be declined then this is it. The hidden agenda of the consultant and the developer does not align with any sustainable long-term solution for the local community.

Regards Bob Popek