

February 2, 2024

To: Brad Clark Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca
James Van Rooi James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca
City Clerk Clerk@Hamilton.ca
Rob Ribaric Rob.Ribaric@hamilton.ca

Objection to File No. UHOPA-23-005 regarding the proposed By-Law to change the land use designation from “Institutional” to “Neighbourhoods” in Schedule “E-1” of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and to change the land use designation from “Institutional” to “High Density Residential 1” in the West Mountain Area (Heritage Green) Secondary Plan.

Objection to File No. ZAC-23-006 regarding the rezoning of the subject lands from the Small Scale Institutional “IS” Zone to a modified Multiple Residential “RM3-XX” Zone

I strongly object to the above proposals for the following reasons:

- 1. List of Concerns submitted February 28, 2023 – attached**
- 2. List of Concerns after our second public Meeting held on June 27, 2023 – attached**
- 3. Tax payer Concern of the OLT itself and the negative impact on our basic democratic rights**
- 4. SITE CONTEXT**

1065 Paramount: 1.63Ha with 301 units = 185 units per Ha in the middle of our suburban, low density, bedroom community

15 Ridgeview (3.5 KM away): 5.00Ha with 105 units = 21 units per Ha (Single family plus 3 storey townhomes) on the periphery of our neighbourhood

Maplewood Park (3.5 KM away: Semis and singles only by Losani Homes in the middle of the neighbourhood

1065 Paramount is in the very middle of a low density suburb where 98% of residents commute to work. People can't live here and walk, cycle or bus to work. It is a bedroom community. Professional Planning standards explicitly state that high-density developments are to be on the periphery of such neighbourhoods and not in the center. High density rationale will not hold true for this site as it is not an 'Urban' community and will only serve to create both an eyesore and ghetto-style development in a very mature, low-density neighbourhood.

The 8 storey apartment is adjacent to two elementary schools. Creating a high-density pocket so close to these schools will obviously attract drug dealers who will be recruiting grade school kids for future high school trafficking, in turn increasing crime in the area primarily for children.

The Lincoln Alexander Parkway and Red Hill Valley Expressway are already stop and go during morning and evening rush hour. Adding another 800 cars to this mix will only create more air pollution; more traffic congestion; more safety concerns for elementary school children; parking headaches as there are not nearly enough parking spots allowed for in the proposal; and waste more fossil fuel as residents are stuck in traffic longer and longer. This proposal not environmentally friendly at all.

The number of residents that the Planner used in their Water Demand study, Traffic Study, Pollution Study, etc are woefully inadequate. They have estimated the bare minimum number of residents at 583 for 301 new residences. With more and more people sharing housing to make it more affordable the number of residents will be more like 900 to 1200. This can be seen as residents are renting out their houses like the one in our court where upwards of 11 students/young people were renting a single family home. Investors will be buying the new units and renting them out to as many people as they can to maximize their return.

5. EVIDENCE

Community surveys demonstrate that 98% of residents in this area commute to work; only 3% use the transit system as it takes over an hour just to get down to King and James in Hamilton

There are no buildings over 3 storeys within a 10km radius, demonstrating that this proposal does not fit the character of the neighbourhood at all. Two storey townhomes would suite the character of the neighbourhood as that is what is along Paramount Drive right now ---- definitely not 4 storey, double-stacked with rooftop patios.

The City Planners deliberated over the proposal for a year and determined that the proposal was not appropriate at all. I'm fairly certain they expected the developer to come back with a second proposal that was more in line with the communities needs. After the first community meeting the developer's planner said he wanted to work with the community and return with a plan that suits everyone's needs. He was told in no uncertain terms that the 8 storey apartment and the High-Density plan was not acceptable. He was in awe at the number of residents in attendance and stated that is the most people he has ever seen at a neighbourhood meeting. He was told in no uncertain terms that the apartment and density were not acceptable at all. If it wasn't for Brad Clark calming the irate crowd down the meeting would have ended abruptly as residents were extremely vocal and upset at the planner's comments. However when the planner returned with a second proposal he did not incorporate any of the communities concerns and actually increased the density of the plan. Obviously he wasn't negotiating in good faith and was pushing the City Planners to reject his proposal so that he could go to the OLT. He bragged in the first community meeting how he has over a 90% win rate with the OLT so we had better listen if we didn't want him to go directly there. He went there anyway after City Planners advised him that the proposal was completely unacceptable.

6. PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

Planned Community/Urban structure and Managing and Directing Land Use and Growth

The proposed Amendments are not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS)

1.1.1 b) c) f) g) i)

1.1.3.2 b) c) d) e) f)

1.1.3.3

1.1.3.6

1.2.2 Engage with Indigenous Communities

1.3.1 a) appropriate mix and range of institutional (retirement home; high school)

e) ensuring the necessary infrastructure is provided to support projected needs.

1.6.6.1 Planning for sewage and water services

1.6.6.7 Planning for stormwater management

1.6.8.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development in planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purposes for which it was identified

1.6.8.4

1.8.1 b) c) e) Energy Conservation, Air Quality

Sincerely,

John & Diane Parente

February 28, 2023

To: Brad Clark Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca
James Van Rooi James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca
Tracy Tucker [REDACTED]

Objection to File No. UHOPA-23-005 regarding the proposed By-Law to change the land use designation from “Institutional” to “Neighbourhoods” in Schedule “E-1” of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and to change the land use designation from “Institutional” to “High Density Residential 1” in the West Mountain Area (Heritage Green) Secondary Plan.

Objection to File No. ZAC-23-006 regarding the rezoning of the subject lands from the Small Scale Institutional “IS” Zone to a modified Multiple Residential “RM3-XX” Zone

I strongly object to the above proposals for the following reasons:

1. Unsatisfactory “Planning Justification Report” and “Urban Design Brief”

The ‘Planning Justification Report’ is based extensively on the Provincial governments desire to increase the number of housing units.

This is only one consideration, and given the recent extensive expansion to the Urban boundary it should be near the bottom of the list of priorities to consider, especially when the new development is in the center of a mature, established community. There are so many opposing arguments that render this High-Density “urban” proposal completely unsatisfactory as it is in the middle of a Low-Density “suburban” community (neighbourhood character; Congestion; Traffic; Safety; Pollution; Infrastructure; Mental Health; etc). The High-Density rationale does not apply to our suburb as we are a commuter-based neighbourhood that relies heavily on the Redhill Expressway and Lincoln Alexander Parkway to commute to work.

Please see the attached Addendum for a long list of points that do not adhere to the:

- Planning Act
- Provincial Policy Statement 2020
- Urban Hamilton Official Plan
- Neighbourhoods Designation General Policies
- West Mountain Area Secondary Plan
- Zoning By-laws
- Registered Professional Planners responsibility re “local needs of the community”

Furthermore, the 'Urban Design Brief' states that "the south boundary is defined by residential single dwellings screened by a densely planted landscape buffer" which is not true at all. The trees on the SW corner of the development are tall enough to provide privacy to a 3 level townhouse. However the other 3 houses in Canfield Court that back on to the South side of the lot offer no privacy to any structure over 2 stories. Nor is there any privacy for the homes on Paramount drive from the street facing Apartments and Stacked Townhouses. The townhouses will be looking directly into the bedrooms on Canfield Court and both the apartments and townhouses will be looking directly into the living rooms on Paramount Drive. In time, these trees will one day die and/or be removed and then there would be absolutely no privacy for any of the existing residents mentioned above.

2. High-Density zoning is completely unnecessary in this Community

With the recent Urban Boundary expansion announced by the Provincial government there is absolutely no need to create a High Density development in a Low Density, mature neighbourhood. The High Density zoning does not fit with the existing character of the community, which is all Low Density. It is also in complete contradiction of section 3.3.1 which states that High Density housing is to be on the outskirts of the community, not on the interior which is exactly where it is being proposed.

3. Recent Precedent for Ward 9 regarding zoning density

Just 4 km away a new development was approved at 15 Ridgeview, which is in Ward 9 as is the proposed development at 1065 Paramount Drive. The property at 15 Ridgeview is 5 hectares and a total of 105 residential units (25 single family homes and 80 three-level townhouses) was submitted and approved. That is only 21 residential units per hectare of land.

Comparatively, the proposal for 1065 Paramount Drive is on a lot that is only 1.63 hectares but they are proposing 299 residential units. **The proposed density is 187 residential units per hectare of land. The present by-law states a maximum 40 residents per hectare.**

In regard to the 15 Ridgeview development, The Hamilton Spectator reported that Jeff Beattie (Stoney Creek councilor) said that the proposed development will be similar to the existing housing blocks that have already been built. In other words, they were very cognizant of the existing community and made every effort to ensure the new development fit in.

The closest elementary school to the 15 Ridgeview development is Eastdale which is 6 km away from it whereas the High-Density proposal for 1065 Paramount Drive is within meters of both Billy Green and St. Paul elementary schools. The safety of children making their way to both schools cannot be measured, however it is painfully obvious that having a High Density development with upwards of 600 new cars in the area coming and going during morning and afternoon rush periods will only increase the risk of traffic accidents and injuries.

4. Job Markets not easily accessible via public transit from this area

The argument provided by the planner that there is public transit right on Paramount drive which will help newcomers commute to work and will reduce the number of residents owning vehicles is not valid for this community as it is basically a suburb to Hamilton. Anyone who lives and commutes in this area knows that a bus ride to most work areas is a very lengthy, time consuming journey. A bus to downtown Hamilton takes an hour easily. This community is not close to any major job markets, most people commute. In fact many new people entering the community are probably from out of town and will certainly be driving, creating more congestion and air pollution than is necessary. This High-Density plan is inappropriate for a suburb such as ours and lends itself more to downtown where residents do in fact walk, ride or take public transit to work.

5. Traffic considerations to include the impact on the Red Hill Valley Expressway and the Lincoln Alexander Expressway

The fact is there will be more traffic. Anyone who lives in this area knows that the Red Hill Valley Parkway and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway are already stop and go every morning and afternoon. We know that the planners comment "Traffic will take care of itself" is simply not true for this area as evidenced by years of backlog on the Redhill/Linc. Adding approximately 300 more cars to the morning and evening commute is definitely going to compound this problem and traffic will only get worse.

6. Insufficient Parking

The Planner's goal of not providing enough parking spots in the hopes of attracting residents without cars is not realistic for this community because as previously stated it is a suburb in which most people commute to and from work. Most residents in this area have at least 2 cars per household, townhouses included. This is because there are very few employers in the area and the vast majority of workers have to commute.

Using the HSR is a last resort because it takes forever to get anywhere and the routes are extremely limited to and from this community. The proposal allows for 369 parking spaces for 299 units instead of 558 that is presently required in our by-laws. The overflow of parking will obviously spill over to Billy Green's parking lot; the strip plaza parking lot; and neighbourhood side streets. Parking on the side streets is already a daily drama so adding all these extra cars will only increase local residents' anxiety and create so much congestion that snow plows and traffic will be an ongoing problem. Also, there are an unacceptable number of Physically Challenged Parking spots of only 6 instead of 37 as required (1%). Again, this High-Density plan is inappropriate for a suburb such as ours and lends itself more to downtown where residents are more apt to not own cars and walk/ride/transit.

7. **No regard for the Character of our existing community or the mental health of existing residents**

This high-density proposal in no way considers the character or desires of the local community. There is nothing like this in all of Stoney Creek. To take the last plot of land in the center of a very mature neighbourhood and change the whole complexion of it is extremely disrespectful to the existing community. Absolutely no regard has been shown for the lifelong investment residents have made to live and retire here. Not to mention the **mental health issues** this is creating in our community. I know for a fact that there are a LOT of residents who are quite outraged about this. The stress and anxiety this is creating is completely unnecessary. ***The fact that this is listed as a major consideration for both Registered Professional Planners and as a ByLaw consideration but is not being addressed is cause for great concern***

In conclusion, I respectfully ask the Planning Committee to reject this proposal in its entirety and start from scratch, with community involvement.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Addendum to Objection Letter

6.1 Urban Design Brief

The height of these buildings provides a comfortable transition between higher building masses and the surrounding neighbourhood character

This is not true as the transition between a 3 storey **stacked** townhouse and a single family home is not a “comfortable” transition at all.

7.1 Planning Act

Planning Comment:

“The proposed layout will ensure compatibility with neighbouring land uses, by placing the lower-density three-storey stacked townhouses on the southern portion of the subject lands, adjacent to the existing single detached dwellings along Canfield Court”

This is not true as the proposal is completely incompatible with the existing community and especially the dwellings along Canfield Court and Paramount Drive.

7.2 Provincial Policy Statement

Policy 1.1.1 f)

This proposal does **NOT** improve accessibility for persons with disabilities and older persons because there are not nearly enough Physically Challenged Parking spots available (6 proposed 37 required)

Policy 1.1.2 is inadmissible as it is based on intensification targets “which shall be established through a **future** Amendment to the UHOP

Policy 1.1.3.4

Planning Comment:

The surrounding neighbourhood is comprised of primarily single detached residential dwellings and block townhouses. The abutting built form is predominantly single detached residential and open space/institutional, which makes the location of the proposed three-storey stacked townhouse units and eight-storey apartment building appropriate

This is not true either as it is extremely inappropriate to put these buildings in the center of a mature neighbourhood, which goes directly against section Policy number 3.3.1 which states that **high density development should be on the outskirts of a community**. Also, putting 3 storey “stacked” townhouses adjacent to single family homes is completely unacceptable.

Policy 1.4.3 b) 1.

This proposal does **NOT** meet the social, health, economic and well-being requirements of current and future residents! The property values will be greatly reduced for current residents; the Mental Health of current residents is already being adversely affected; an insufficient number of physically challenged parking spots will seriously impact future residents, especially as they are targeting seniors to retire there.

Policy 1.6.6

I have not seen any studies to support the claims that the existing sewage and water services can accommodate this proposal. From what I understand these studies have not yet been done.

Policy 1.6.7.4

Again, being a commuter-based community driving is essential. This proposal will **NOT** minimize the length and number of vehicle trips in this community.

Policy 1.8.1

The significant increase of vehicles in such a small area will increase air pollution. Also, this proposal is in a commuter’s neighbourhood and will not reduce motor vehicle trips and congestion but increase them both.

7.4 Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)

Policy 2.4.1.4

Planning Comment:

It represents a form of intensification, which is compatible in terms of scale and built form with the surrounding neighbourhood, by placing the lower-density three-storey stacked townhouses on the southern portion of the subject lands, adjacent to the existing single detached dwellings along Canfield Court.

This is **NOT** true as the proposal is not compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood in the least. There is nothing in this neighbourhood that resembles this proposal at all. The skyline and character of the neighbourhood will be ruined forever.

This proposal is not a compatible integration with the surrounding area!

Planning Comment:

It is not anticipated to adversely impact the existing transportation network

This is obviously not true. Any increase in traffic will adversely impact any area.

Planning Comment:

The proposed development will make more efficient use of the local road than existing conditions.

This too is not true as Paramount Drive is the only road in and out of the subdivision. Adding another 300 – 600 cars will definitely reduce its efficiency

Policy 2.4.2.2

Planning Comment:

The proposed development is a respectful form of residential intensification, as it will not result in shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting or traffic concerns. The layout will ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses,

Judging by the residents overwhelming outrage at the February 16 meeting this proposal is anything but 'respectful' with regard to both residents or compatibility. It is not compatible with adjacent land uses nor the height, massing or scale of nearby residential buildings (single family homes). The shadows created over Billy Green Elementary school will block out sunlight until mid-day. Furthermore, there are no 'amenity' provisions at all.

Policy 3.3.2.3: Urban design should foster a sense of community pride

Not one of the 7 principals listed below were satisfied:

- a) Respecting existing character – Not at all
- b) Consistent with locale and surrounding environment – Not at all
- c) Recognizing and protecting the cultural history - No
- d) Conserving and respecting the existing build heritage features - No
- e) Conserving, maintain, and enhancing the features of its communities - No
- f) Demonstrating sensitivity toward community identity – Not at all
- g) Contributing to the character and ambiance of the community - No

Planning Comments:

The proposed development respects the existing community character, by proposing a compatible building layout with appropriate provisions,

The proposed frontage along Paramount Drive contributes to the character of the streetscape, as the four stacked townhouse blocks will be aligned with the existing street to form a consistent street wall.

Neither of these statements are true. This proposal has totally disrespected our community and the stacked townhouses are not in alignment with the existing street. The style and height of single family homes and townhouses that are already on Paramount Drive would be aligned properly, not stacked townhouses and an 8 storey apartment building.

Policy 3.3.2.4: Quality Spaces

Planning Comment:

The siting of the stacked townhouse blocks and apartment building is logical and fits within the existing neighbourhood context

This is False as it does NOT fit within the existing neighbourhood context

Policy 3.3.2.6: New development and redevelopment should enhance the character of the existing environment

Not one of the 4 sub-sections were satisfied

This is False as it does NOT enhance the character of the existing environment. In reality it will become an eyesore and will deter from the character of the existing environment destroying the skyline of the entire neighbourhood.

Policy 3.3.2.8 Urban design should promote the reduction of greenhouse emissions, ability to adapt to the impacts of a changing climate now and in the future, and protect and enhance the natural urban environment

This is false. Nothing in this proposal will reduce greenhouse emissions or protect/enhance the natural urban environment. Fewer residential units and more green space will protect and enhance the natural urban environment.

Policy 3.3.2.9 Urban design plays a significant role in the physical and mental health of our citizens.

Again, not one sub-section has been satisfied (high quality, safe streetscapes; no development of places for active and passive recreation; no variety of land uses; increased air, noise, and water pollution)

This may be the single biggest concern that is being overlooked. The mere proposal in itself has caused such intense stress and anxiety in the community. The **mental health** of our citizens is obviously not a concern of the developer but we as a society depend on our City officials/planners to act in our best interest. Presently the mental health of this community is on a steep decline and will get progressively worse with developments like this.

Policy 3.3.3.1

Planning Comment: As previously discussed, the proposed development has been designed to fit within the surrounding neighbourhoods, in terms of scale, and ensuring adequate privacy and sunlight to neighbouring properties. It will be compatible with the surrounding low-density context,

This is not true because in no way does this development fit within the surrounding neighbourhood.

Policy 4.5.8.4

The proposed development will make more efficient use of the Collector Road, by increasing residential density on the subject lands, without hindering the current traffic flow.

This is false. More cars will undoubtedly hinder the current traffic flow. In fact, traffic flow will be at a stand--still in the morning and afternoon when school starts and ends.

Policy 5.3 Lake –Based Municipal Water and Wastewater Systems

Again, I have not seen any studies to support the claim that existing systems can accommodate a development of this size. I find it hard to believe that 40+ years after planning a community that the existing infrastructure could accommodate another 299 units on such a small piece of land. Surely the planners never anticipated this happening that long ago.

Chapter E – Urban Systems and Designations

Subsection 2.6 Neighbourhoods

Scale Policy 2.6.7

Neighbourhoods shall generally be regarded as physically stable areas with each neighbourhood having a unique scale and character. Changes compatible with the existing character or function of the neighbourhood shall be permitted.

Planning Comment: The proposed development is compatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood, as a functional layout of differing typologies has been created to ensure that there are significant adverse impacts on any adjoining lands.

This is not true. It does NOT fit with the existing character of the neighbourhood and it will have a significant impact on adjoining lands, specifically residents of Canfield Court, Paramount Drive and both elementary schools.

Scale and Design - Policy 3.2.4

The existing character of established neighbourhoods designated areas shall be maintained. Residential intensification within these areas shall enhance and be compatible with the scale and character of the existing residential neighbourhood.

This proposal does not satisfy this policy at all. In fact the complete opposite is true --- the existing character is NOT maintained and intensification is NOT compatible with the existing residential neighbourhood

Policy 3.3.1

Lower Density residential uses and building forms shall generally be located in the interiors of neighbourhood areas with higher density dwelling forms and supporting uses located on the periphery.

This proposal is for the exact opposite of 3.3.1. The proposed High-Density development is right in the middle of the Low-Density neighbourhood.

Policy 3.3.2

Development or redevelopment adjacent to areas of lower density shall ensure the height, massing, and arrangement of buildings and structures are compatible with existing and future uses in the surrounding area.

This proposed development is not at all compatible with the existing areas of lower density with regard to height, massing and arrangement of buildings.

Policy 3.6.1

High Density residential areas are characterized by multiple dwelling forms on the periphery of neighbourhoods.

Again, this high-density proposal is NOT on the periphery but right in the center of the mature, low density neighbourhood

Policy 3.6.8 d)

This item is also not adhered to as the proposal has inadequate parking, amenity features and is not compatible with existing residential heights. Furthermore it will cast shadows on Billy Green Elementary school for at least 50% of the school day.

Neighbourhoods Designation – High Density Residential

Design Policy 3.6.8

Planning Comment: The proposed development is a respectful form of residential intensification, as it will not result in shadowing, or overlook concerns

This is not true! Residents on Canfield Court and Paramount Drive will have residents in the Stacked Townhouses and apartment looking directly in their bedrooms and living rooms, respectively.

Appendix E Highlights the Significant short-comings of the proposal

Physically Challenged Parking Spots:	1% required = 37	Proposed 6
Minimum Number of Parking Spaces:	558 required	Proposed 369
Minimum Front Yard	7.5m required	Proposed 3.25m
Minimum Side Yard	6.0m required	Proposed 3.0m
Maximum Density	40 units/Ha	Proposed 187
Minimum Landscape Open Space	50%	Proposed 30%

RM3 Zone: Stacked townhouses Not permitted

Policy 6.2.6

Planning Comment: While the Institutional Designation allows for low-density residential uses, an amendment is required for the proposed development as it does not allow high-density residential uses.

One of the main reasons everyone in this neighbourhood chose to live here is because it was not zoned high-density. Obviously the City Planners had a very good reason not to zone it High Density, mainly because it is a suburb. To suddenly decide after 40+ years that the zoning should be changed to high-density simply to accommodate a developer is outrageous and nothing short of criminal to the existing community.

If we wanted to live downtown or in Toronto we would have moved there.

9 School and City Recreation Facility and Outdoor Recreation/ Parks Issues Assessment

As noted throughout this report, the subject lands directly abut Billy Green Elementary School to the north and St. Paul Catholic Elementary School to the south-west. The development of the subject lands will be compatible with the surrounding institutional uses, as it does not create significant shadow impacts upon the schools

This is completely false. The 8 story apartment will completely block out any sunshine that Billy Green's kindergarten classrooms/playground presently enjoy. Furthermore, the apartments will be looking directly into the classroom windows of Billy Green school all day long.

11 Planning Justification

Registered Professional Planners ("Planners") have a responsibility to acknowledge the interrelated nature of planning decisions and the consequences for natural and human environments, and the broader public interest. The public interest reflects a balance between the local needs of the community with the interests of stakeholders. In order to determine whether the proposed development is within the public interest

Both the Councillor and the Planner stated that they have never had as many people at a public meeting in their entire careers as were present at the February 16, 2023 meeting. This in itself tells the whole story.

The unanimous outrage and opposition displayed at the meeting cannot be simply disregarded. If the above Professional Planners code of ethics is to be respected at all then based on this meeting alone the existing High-Density plan needs to be thrown out and a new Low-Density plan submitted, hopefully one that has community involvement and fits the character of the neighbourhood.

11.1 Environment

The proposed development will provide residential density in close proximity to commercial and institutional uses and allow residents to live, work and play within the same neighbourhood, thus being active transportation supportive

This is not true as very few residents work in this neighbourhood. There are no employers of any size near this community.

The proposed development will capitalize on the advantage and provide reduced parking ratios to encourage an increase in transit usage. Overall, by

promoting transit and active transportation, it decreases the need for automobile travel and greenhouse gas emissions, which contributes to a higher energy consumption and declining air quality.

In reality, this High-Density development will accomplish the complete opposite of what is stated in section 11.1

Once again, this proposal is more fitting to downtown and not a suburb like 1065 Paramount Drive. Residents living here generally need a car. This might be the case in places like downtown where it is easy to ride a bike or take a bus to work. This concept is not applicable to a suburban community that depends on driving and having an adequate traffic infrastructure, which this proposal will certainly affect in an adverse manner.

12 Conclusions and Recommendations

I would argue that it does NOT maintain the intent of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and West Mountain Area Secondary Plan. Sure it may satisfy one such factor, to build more units, but I'm certain the original intent was much more inclusive than that: Fitting in with the Character of the existing neighbourhood; Acceptance by the existing neighbourhood; not creating traffic and parking chaos in an existing neighbourhood; not creating buildings high enough to invade upon the privacy of existing residents.

I also highly doubt that the Former City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-Law would have intended a development such as this. In fact I would argue that the Former City Planners would have shut this down immediately.

It definitely is NOT compatible with the surrounding build form.

It definitely does not represent good planning that is in the public interest. It is only in the developers best interest, not the communities.

My take on the Second Public Meeting held on June 27, 2023.

If I've missed some points or misinterpreted some points please feel free to add comments.

IBI group seemed to intentionally withhold Traffic, Noise and Shadow studies from the residents prior to the meeting as they didn't want us to be prepared for this meeting. They could have shared these with us prior to the meeting but decided not to. Therefore they seem to have intentionally withheld them.

The new proposal added a lot of new parking spots, most of which are in garages that are too small to park cars. This will displace the cars from the unused garages out onto the street for parking and will create even more congestion on our streets (problems for snow plows; safety). However this change alone indicates that the IBI Group admits that High-Density is not appropriate for this area and that more parking spaces were needed. If this area was truly suitable for High-Density as John Ariens suggests then he would have stuck by his previous claim that less parking is needed, which is congruent with High-Density. However he has abandoned that claim and increased the number of parking spots considerably. Still not nearly enough, but an admission of residents needing cars to commute. Our community polls indicate that 98% of the residents drive to work; 92% of residents in this community do NOT use Public Transportation; only 3% of residents work in our community; 25% of local residents are already parking on the street. This suburb is not suitable for High-Density!

John continues to argue that households do not have on average 2 cars. His 'perception' of our reality is much different from what is actually going on in the real world we live in. Our poll indicates that most people in this community have more than 2 cars per household. In fact our one neighbor has nine, yes 9 cars in their driveway. John wants to believe that this is downtown Toronto where residents do walk and take transit to work. It isn't. The large majority of residents in this neighbourhood use the Lincoln Alexander and Red Hill Parkway to commute to work.

With regard to our community's concern from the first meeting, it was pointed out that the IBI Group completely missed the mark. John is being forced by Mikmada to argue that the 8 storey apartment is in character with the rest of the community. As was pointed out there isn't a building over 3 storey's within a 10 -20 km radius. It is painfully obvious that this proposal is completely out of character with the rest of our neighbourhood.

Underground parking is not suitable for this area because as several people pointed out that in order to do this blasting will be required. Blasting for the 4 storey townhomes will affect adjacent homes on Canfield Court. The Apartment is a no go anyway but blasting for that would definitely affect Billy Green School and houses along Paramount.

Parking is such a problem right now that teacher's are getting tickets for parking on the street. The new boulevards along Paramount have made it much narrower and more difficult picking up and dropping off children at Billy Green. Paramount is no longer the main artery it was initially designed to be. The boulevards are beautiful but they definitely restrict the flow of traffic along Paramount.

The construction safety, noise, pollution is a great concern. With the proposal trying to jam so much into such a small area it is developing right up to the property lines. This leaves no room for controlling the amount of dust that will be created and puts the danger area for children right up against the path to St. Paul as well as Billy Green school. A smaller development could be contained within a smaller perimeter, thereby safeguarding the children walking to and from school over the next 2-4 years of development.

Concern was also expressed about the 8 storey apartment setting a precedent for possible future expansion across the street where the strip plaza is. What is preventing the strip plaza from rebuilding upwards in the future to match this proposal's height and density? This is an unacceptable precedent to set in our community. As was pointed out, some people have recently moved here, specifically because it wasn't high-density. We invested our life's savings 37 years ago in this community and some of our neighbours prior to that because of that same reason; it wasn't high-density. For Mikmada who has no vested interest in our community to come in and have priority over everyone else living here is totally unacceptable. If Mikmada made a bad investment and paid too much for the property the City shouldn't make that our problem. It's his. Our City Planners and Council need to shut this down and let developers know under no uncertain terms that the City of Hamilton is not going to be abused for profit.

A comparative development in the area is 3 times the area and has only 104 townhouses (15 Ridgeview I believe). That developer/planner had the common decency to consider the surrounding community and decided to "fit-in" rather than to be so extremely greedy. Mikmada is trying to force a High-Density development into a Low-Density, established neighbourhood primarily because it made a bad investment decision when it bought the over-priced land. High-Density is not suitable in this community which is supported by recent comparable developments. Why should Mikmada be given preferential treatment?

To build in such close proximity to Billy Green school is totally irresponsible and inconsiderate. Billy Green Kindergarten will be in the shade all school day long. For the Public School Board not to object to this is unconscionable. Any new structure should give much more clearance between itself and Billy Green. This property should be re-zoned to low density, which will provide more green space between all adjacent properties, thereby helping ensure the safety and well-being of all school children.

The fact that the planner is proposing a High-Density development in the middle of a mature neighbourhood goes directly against the Professional Planner's Guidelines, but John appears to be arguing high density in order to satisfy the developer.

John once again tried to explain his analogy of a Kleenex box to us. If, as John states, the box upright or laying flat has the same density (which it does) then we would like to see it laying flat. Oh, but this would take up the rest of the real estate and there would be no room for townhouses. For some reason John doesn't go on to explain that part of it.

The complete absence of green-space is very concerning. John said it hasn't been incorporated yet, however the fact of the matter is that there isn't room for the inclusion of any green space in the proposal they have presented. All of the land is consumed by parking and townhouses.

The addition of roof-top patios is completely unacceptable. Not only will the noise from the townhouse residents carry over most of the neighbourhood, from that vantage point they will be able to see every inch of my backyard, bedroom windows and family room. Complete invasion of privacy and disregard of nearby residences.

I thought it was unrealistic for John Ariens to come back with a higher-density proposal after stating during our first meeting that they want to work with the community and will listen to our concerns. After all, he is a Professional Planner and appears to have a solid planning history. Instead he did the complete opposite of what we asked --- total disregard for the existing residents --- which is directly against Professional Planner's Guidelines. Also, this is in complete opposition of the IBI Group's mission statement as stated on their website:

"committed to improving the quality of life for our clients, people and partners **and the communities** we all serve."

Unfortunately the IBI Group is an URBAN design group trying to force an URBAN design in a Suburban neighbourhood. The IBI Group would do well to disassociate itself with Mikmada as Mikmada's operating principals do not appear to be in line with the IBI Group's. Mikmada will definitely tarnish IBI Group's reputation if this is the case.

To add insult to injury a farmer sprayed Round Up and Eragon on the field on Father's day. Driving nearby residents indoors and subjecting them to direct spray. No signs were posted afterwards so the children walking to school the next morning were probably subjected to it as well. Pedestrians were directly subjected to the spray as well as no signs were posted warning of what was taking place. This demonstrates the apparent lack of integrity Mikmada operates under. The \$6 million class action lawsuit against Mikmada from a development in Guelph should be of concern to the City.

Guelph Today – April 11, 2022

"The defendant has sought to terminate the agreements solely in order to allow it to market and sell the same development project at a later date at prices which will significantly increase Mikmada's profits as compared to its anticipated profit on original sales with the Royal Valley project."

Salamone, Salvatore

From: clerk@hamilton.ca
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2024 2:59 PM
To: Kelsey, Lisa; Carson, Katie
Subject: FW: Planning Objections for UHOPA-23-005 & ZAC-23-006
Attachments: Letter of Objection dated 02February2024.docx; Zoning Objection.docx; Second Public Meeting 27Jun2023.docx

Magda Green

Administrative Assistant II to the City Clerk
Office of the City Clerk, Corporate Services
City of Hamilton
magda.green@hamilton.ca

City Hall is located on the ancestral territory of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, the Anishinaabe and many other Indigenous peoples. It is also covered by the Dish with One Spoon Wampum agreement, which asks that all sharing this territory do so respectfully and sustainably in community.

From: John Parente [REDACTED]
Sent: February 2, 2024 2:51 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>; Ribaric, Robert <Robert.Ribaric@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Planning Objections for UHOPA-23-005 & ZAC-23-006

Attached is my objection to both planning proposals for 1065 Paramount drive in Stoney Creek along with supporting documents.

Thank you very much.
John Parente