

**Summary of Public Comments Received**

<b>Comment Received</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
<p>The development will overburden traffic in the area.</p>	<p>A Transportation Impact Study (with Transportation Demand Management) was prepared by Trans-Plan Transportation Inc., dated October 19, 2018, and the findings were accepted by Transportation Planning staff as the road network can accommodate the site-generated traffic.</p> <p>The capacity analysis showed that the study area intersections are not expected to experience significant impacts to operations as a result of the proposed development.</p>
<p>Not in keeping with the neighbourhood, which includes single detached dwellings and townhouses. Concerns were noted regarding the size, scale, and massing of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Staff reviewed the application for compatibility, which is defined in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan as land uses and built forms that are mutually tolerant and capable of existing together in harmony within an area. ‘Compatibility’ or ‘compatible’ should not be narrowly interpreted to mean “the same as” or even as “being similar to”.</p> <p>Staff are satisfied that the proposal is compatible with the adjacent area. The proposed development is in proximity to existing bus routes being the 5A Delaware, 16 Ancaster and 16 F Ancaster. Staff find the proposed single detached dwellings and townhouse dwellings continue the existing patterns and built form of the area and provide additional housing opportunities.</p>
<p>Concerns were noted regarding the increased density and loss of green space.</p>	<p>The development of single detached dwellings and townhouse dwellings are an efficient use of land and represent an appropriate intensification of the site which will foster a complete community by adding townhouse dwellings to the neighbourhood. A Landscape Plan will be submitted at the Site Plan Control stage to ensure that the removal of vegetation will be compensated at a one to one ratio. Lastly, staff note that the subject lands were not designated “Open Space” and the existing zoning permissions did permit the development of single detached dwellings.</p>
<p>Privacy loss of the adjacent existing homeowners.</p>	<p>The proposal includes setbacks for the townhouse dwellings of approximately 10.44 metres on the north side and 10.88 metres on the south side, which is greater than the standard 7.5 metres required by Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57.</p>

<b>Comment Received</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
<p>Servicing - Stormwater management, the lands are low laying and increase of imperviousness may cause flooding.</p>	<p>Concern was raised that the existing infrastructure was not capable of supporting the additional units. The applicant has submitted a Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report in support of the applications. Development Engineering staff have reviewed the study and advised that there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development. The required infrastructure to accommodate stormwater has been demonstrated to conform with City standards.</p>
<p>Concerns were raised the development of townhouses will contribute to increased noise.</p>	<p>It is not clear how the townhouse dwellings will contribute to adverse noise. The development is subject to the Hamilton Noise By-law No. 11-185. A detailed Noise Study will be required for Lots 1 to 4 (single detached dwellings) and Block 5 which has been added as Special Condition No. 31 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision, attached as Appendix “I” to Report PED24027 to demonstrate that the townhouse outdoor amenity areas will not be negatively impacted by noise sources (i.e., vehicle traffic on Southcote Road).</p>
<p>Concern regarding a decrease in property value.</p>	<p>Staff are not aware of any empirical evidence to suggest property values will decrease.</p>
<p>A petition opposing the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment to permit 47 dwelling units.</p>	<p>Staff have included the petition as part of Appendix “J” attached to Report PED24027.</p>

December 29, 2018

From:

To: Brynn Nheiley

Planning and Economic Development Dep't, Development Planning, Heritage & Design Suburban Team  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor Hamilton ON  
L8P 4Y5

Re: File # UHOPA-18-22, File # ZAC-18-056, File # 25T-201810

Dear Ms Nheiley

We are sending this letter to explain why we are opposed to the proposed change in zoning of the lands at 26 Southcote Rd in Ancaster from residential 3 R3 Zone to a modified multiple residential RM4 zone, modified and residential 3 R3 Zone.

has lived here at 42 Elm Hill for 47 years. I have lived here close to 40. It is a quiet neighborhood of single family dwellings. Most of the homes are still the original houses. Residential development of the property that would see single family houses...the four houses as mentioned... would be appropriate. An added townhouse development is not appropriate. We would hope that the "monster" houses that have been objected to already in the neighborhood would not be allowed as appropriate designs chosen for the new residences.

We don't believe the proposal is in keeping with nor will it enhance the "existing environment and locale." The new development proposed will also "not be compatible in form and function to the character of the existing community and neighborhoods." These are design goals of Hamilton's Official Plan as you know and the neighborhood as it is meets the goals but the proposed changes will contravene these goals.

We are concerned that the proposed development will change the neighborhood and have a negative impact for several reasons.

1. Increased Traffic. There is already a proposed condo development at the corner of Southcote and Golf Links that will increase density and traffic flow in the area. Another higher density proposal will cause more traffic problems than already exist.
2. Loss of Privacy. We have already lost privacy in our back yard because of a monster home. Adjacent homeowners should not have the same thing happen to them.
3. Flooding dangers. There is a stream that runs through the property. Groundwater is high. We are worried that adjacent owners will have more problems than they now have and others will begin to have issues if the water patterns are changed.
4. Increased Density. The proposed townhouse units are inappropriate to the single family dwellings that surround the proposal.

5. Increased Noise. As mentioned, this is a quiet neighborhood and people have chosen to live here without some amenities such as sidewalks, street lights etc. for that reason.

Thank you for seeking response from those of us living in the neighborhood. Joanne and I are concerned and do oppose the development as stipulated for the reasons we outlined.

We are happy to provide further input and look forward to a report from you that takes these concerns into consideration. We are recommending a change from the original proposal to single family dwellings only that will be compatible with this neighborhood and hope that our reasons will help bring this about.

We have notified by phone Lloyd Ferguson, our Ancaster Councillor, and will also send him a copy of this letter for his information.

Thank you for your help.

**From:**  
**To:** [Nheiley, Brynn](#)  
**Subject:** UHOPA-18-22, ZAC-18-056, 25T-201810: 26 Southcote Rd  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 19, 2018 3:08:31 PM

---

Good afternoon,

I am writing in response to the notice I received regarding the vacant lot at 26 Southcote Rd. I oppose putting a multi-dwelling subdivision in the middle of an established, mature, single detached dwelling subdivision.

I do not believe that having that density of dwellings will be a benefit to anyone already living in the area. My main concern is the additional traffic flow into Southcote from that location. I know the city is looking into upgrading Southcote, are these proposed plans on the planning committee's radar? If not, that is an issue. Most people would be leaving the lot and turning left towards the highway and the Meadowlands, and this intersection is already very busy.

As well, our property taxes are based on a low-density single-family home neighbourhood. With the approval of the 300+ unit retirement community in the neighbourhood and this proposed townhouse complex, I have concerns with how my property taxes will be assessed.

I look forward to hearing my neighbours' concerns at the public meeting.

Please keep me apprised with any further information and upcoming dates.

December 17, 2018

To the City of Hamilton –

Regarding the plan presented to many residents in the Evergreen survey, along Elm Hill Blvd. and Dorval Dr., that proposes the development of townhomes on the vacant property between Southcote and Elm Hill: there are so many things wrong with this plan that it’s hard to know where to start...

- The “field” is a flood plain of sorts. In dry times, a small creek runs through the property. In winter, it becomes a frozen pond that people can skate on it – and have! In spring it’s a small lake. Many of us have sump pumps, back-up sump pumps, and generators to ensure that the sump pumps work in the worst of conditions. Two concerns come to mind immediately:
  - If multiple homes are built on this land, where does the water go? Answer: into our basements. And into the basements of the new homes. On a personal note, the new home built behind my house resulted in a change in grade. Water now naturally drains into my backyard, and my pool liner is ruined due to ground water. My patio stones are shifting. It seems I have no recourse. Is this the fate of everyone on Elm Hill, Dorval and Southcote?
  - Do you know why Toronto has experienced problems with flooding GO trains and underpasses? Because they’ve turned all the flood plains into concrete and there’s nowhere for the water to go. Sometimes you just have to have green space because – surprise – it rains and snows here. Engineering doesn’t always trump Mother Nature.
- The proposed “plan” you distributed does not show where the road(s) might go – onto Elm Hill Blvd. turning our quiet street into a feeder street, with headlights illuminating our living rooms and increased traffic putting our kids at risk? Or onto Southcote, a few hundred metres from the lights at Golf Links? Are you deliberately keeping something from us? There are also plans for a seniors’ residence at the Southcote/Golf Links intersection – has anyone considered how these streets will handle the increased volume of vehicles? I suspect not.
- Our neighbourhood is made up largely of modest bungalows, and – now – a handful of “monster” homes. The Community Planning Section of the City of Hamilton declared their goal that “buildings respect and complement the character and unique history of the area.” It was heartening to read that the City is sensitive to the relationship of new buildings with respect to existing structures and appropriate locations. Can you explain to me, then, how a high-density townhouse complex will complement an established community of one-storey houses and gracious gardens? Let me be blunt: a first-year student in a university city-planning course would be flunked out of school for coming up with a plan like the one being proposed. Development? I suppose it’s inevitable. Five or six tasteful bungalows? Perhaps. Towering townhomes? Absolutely not. Give your collective heads a shake.

- Several local residents have completely lost their privacy because of a massive home built on McNeil Place – trees were cut down, and second-storey windows offer unobstructed views into our yards. I do not wish this for my neighbours on Dorval Drive.
- It was somewhat irksome that your letter came as late as Thursday, December 13 to some residents in our neighbourhood, giving us a full 5 days to formulate our replies, at the busiest time of the year, no less. One might even call it unscrupulous. It’s as if you knew what our reaction might be and you wanted to contain it to a few days at most. Well, you’d be right – we’re angry and concerned, and this tactic didn’t help.

A few years ago, my husband and I made the hard decision to make a move from rural living to urban, mostly to be closer to Hamilton Health Sciences, where my husband’s specialists were. I disliked Hamilton – strongly – but agreed to move here if we could settle in Ancaster. I loved the charm of its downtown area, and the fact that the older neighbourhoods had no streetlights – we could sit outside at night and see the stars. But we were close to the amenities we needed, as well as community theatre, great shopping, spectacular lakeside attractions, a farmers’ market and more. I soon came to love Hamilton almost as much as I love Ancaster.

Over the past three years, I have seen this lovely old community gradually give way to high-density residential areas, inappropriate architecture in established neighbourhoods, traffic-flow issues and pitifully lame city planning. It is not showing any sign of improvement. Honestly, the development committees should be ashamed of themselves. For the record, I’m a designer by trade. I know a thing or two about balance and harmony and, so far, I am seeing neither in the new pop-up neighbourhoods.

Progress? Sure. Haphazardly throwing up townhome developments wherever there’s a square foot of land is unconscionable and irresponsible. Is this what you want for your legacy? That you destroyed Ancaster? That you let a city swallow up what was once a beautiful, green, charming old village?

I can see the day in the not-too-distant future when I will feel forced to sell and move to a town that respects its heritage and its tax-paying citizens. It makes me sad. First, I lost my husband. This proposed plan, if approved, means I’ll be losing my community, too.

Sincerely,

From:  
To: [Nheiley, Brynn](#)  
Subject: Prposed project ar 26 SouthcoteRoad , Ancaster  
Date: Thursday, December 13, 2018 11:43:03 AM

---

Hello Brynn and Yvette Rybensky,  
Development Planning, Heritage and Design Hamilton

Thank you Brynn for taking my phone call on December 12 regarding the applications to build at 26 Southcote Road in Ancaster.

I have a few concerns as this property is adjacent to my back yard at 518 Golf Links Road and as it has been used as a flood plain. I have water which comes from the east side of Southcote Road and continues under the road and then across the field. Then instead of being directed towards the culverts on Elm Hill Blvd. on the west side, it is directed into my yard. The neighbouring homes on the west side of my property have all raised their land (one home with a four foot high retaining wall), so the entire stream runs along my land. Their pool water was also emptied onto my property. I had complained to the City of Hamilton about this, but of no avail.

As a tax-payer, I would expect that my concerns should have been addressed in due manner.

Further to the fact of a very high water table at this properties' land level, neighbouring homes have had issues with water seepage into their basements. My question to you is about the water which will be directed into the back of my yard unless the feasibility studies done by A. J. Clarke and Associates Ltd. can prove to me otherwise.

Before you take to amending the Zoning By-law to permit the building of dwellings at 26 Southcote Road I would hope that my concerns will be addressed. I do not want to have further issues with run-off water or storm water building up in my yard in the future.

Thank you again,



Brynn Nheiley  
City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Suburban Team  
71 Main Street West  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON  
L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Nheiley,

We are writing to respond to the Notice of Complete Applications by A.J. Clarke and Associates on behalf of Active Custom Home Design Construction Ltd. for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications for Lands Located at 26 Southcote Road, Ancaster (Ward 12).

We are writing to raise our objections and list our concerns related to the above noted notice.

1. We believe that the timing of the notice dated December 5, 2018 and response deadline of December 19, 2018 are unreasonable in light of ongoing Canada Post disruptions and the signage on site not changing until December 12, 2018 either. Only high level comments are possible at this time and it is impossible to access legal and other expert advice in the short timeframe. As seniors in our mid-eighties, this becomes even more challenging for us. The staff report should be delayed to permit more time for community residents to thoughtfully respond.
2. We believe that there is insufficient information shared at this time regarding the proposed proponent and development to make fully informed comments.
3. Despite the foregoing point, we would like to register the following concerns:
  - a. The proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan amendment to establish a Site Specific Medium Density Residential Policy Area is out of character with the surrounding residential development which is a subdivision of single family homes built well over 60 years ago. A minimum 25 units per hectare would be too dense for this area.
  - b. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for a change in zoning from Residential 3 “R3” Zone to a modified Multiple Residential “RM4” Zone is out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential development as noted above. We believe the Residential 3 “R3” Zone should be maintained. It is difficult to integrate townhomes in this setting given the single family residences around the complete perimeter. This is unlike the greenfield Meadowlands development that was better able to integrate multiple residential development in its broader plan.
  - c. The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision premised on the above noted Urban Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments is therefore inconsistent with the surrounding residential development.

4. Despite the lack of detailed information outside of the Location Map provided, we highlight the following additional concerns:
  - a. Hydrology/hydrogeology – the location of the proposed development is in a low-lying field with significant surface/ground water and drainage issues. Existing residences on the north side of Dorval Drive, Old Oakes Place, and the south side of Golf Links Road already experience unresolved drainage and flooding issues. The proposed development may exacerbate this situation.
  - b. Ingress/Egress, Traffic and Parking – current challenges exist for existing residences attempting to exit the subdivision onto Golf Links Road and Southcote Road. No information is provided as to where the road entrance/exit to the proposed development will be, but either road will be problematic with the current traffic volumes and management methods. Any proposed traffic circulation plans to address the multi-stage retirement and long term care facility planned for the southeast corner of Southcote Road and Golf Links Road will not be sufficient to address this development as well. This proposed development involves 4 single dwellings and 24 townhouses with attendant vehicles and traffic.
  - c. Privacy and Noise – there is insufficient information provided to understand the proposed layout of the development. That being said, the density involved and layout will contribute to added noise and to a reduction in privacy. We are seniors and back onto the proposed development.
  - d. Loss of/Lack of Greenspace – there is insufficient information provided to understand the proposed layout of the development. That being said, the density involved suggests that much of the footprint of the land will be used for the multiple residential development. This will remove the existing greenspace/wildlife corridor for deer, fox, wild turkeys and other species in whole or in part.
5. We wish to be notified of:
  - a. The date of any Public Meeting
  - b. The decision of the City of Hamilton on the proposed Official Plan Amendment
  - c. The decision of the City of Hamilton on the Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment
  - d. The decision of the City of Hamilton on the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

December 16, 2018

Ms. Brynn Nheiley  
Planning and Economic Development Department, Development Planning, Heritage and Design-Suburban  
Team, City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor  
Hamilton, ON  
L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Nheiley:

**Re: File No. UHOPA-18-22, File No. ZAC-18-056, File No. 25T-201810**

I am the occupant and co-owner of Dorval Drive which is adjacent to the property located at 26 Southcote Road. I am concerned about the impact of new construction on that land given the high groundwater level in our area.

After heavy or prolonged rainfall events, there is an intermittent stream in the Lands located at 26 Southcote Road. This flow lasts for longer periods of time in the spring following snow melt and surface flow ceases during dry periods. Of more concern is the perennial ground saturation. In my dwelling, I have 3 sump pumps and a French drain in my backyard to handle the current water level. It was necessary for me to install an Automatic Standby Generator to prevent flooding of my basement from sump pump failure during power outages.

I am concerned that building on this land will increase the impervious footprint and the surface run off due to decreased ground infiltration. The building foundations may further interrupt subsurface flow and redirect flow to my property.

I would like assurances that a proper drainage management infrastructure will be incorporated into the building plans to deal with the high groundwater level and seasonal surface flooding. I would also request that a system be in place to address any flooding of property of adjacent homes to the Lands at 26 Southcote as the project progresses or after completion.

I request that my name be removed from any public documents. I look forward to hearing how you will address this issue in your report. Thank you for your consideration.

cc Lloyd Ferguson, City of Hamilton, Ward 12



December 16, 2018

Ms. Brynn Nheiley  
Planning and Economic Development Department, Development Planning, Heritage and Design-  
Suburban Team  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor  
Hamilton, ON  
L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Nheiley:

**Re: File No. UHOPA-18-22, File No. ZAC-18-056, File No. 25T-201810**

We are writing to voice our opposition to the proposed change in zoning of the Lands at 26 Southcote Road from the Residential 3 "R3" Zone to a modified Multiple Residential "RM4" Zone, Modified and Residential 3 "R3" Zone.

The surrounding area is a mature neighbourhood that is a low-density residential area consisting of single detached dwellings. We feel that the current zoning of the Lands at 26 Southcote Road is in keeping with the neighbourhood.

The Official Plan for the City of Hamilton outlines Urban Designs Goals including to: "Ensure that new development is compatible with and enhances the character of the existing environment and locale." and "Promote intensification that makes appropriate and innovative use of buildings and sites and is compatible in form and function to the character of existing communities and neighbourhoods." The current proposal for the Lands at 26 Southcote Road is not consistent with either of these goals.

We are concerned that the development proposed for 26 Southcote Road will negatively impact our neighbourhood by:

- a. Increasing traffic flow
- b. Increasing noise exposure
- c. Decreasing privacy of adjacent homeowners
- d. Exacerbating flooding secondary to a negative effect on the already high groundwater level

Please see attached signatures in support of this letter.

We look forward to hearing how you will address this issue in your report. As indicated in your letter, we would like copies of the staff report. Thank you for your consideration.

cc. Councillor Lloyd Ferguson, Ward 12

I oppose the change in zoning and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment for the Lands at 26 Southcote Drive. Road

Name: Signature:	Address	I request that my personal information be removed from public documents
	Dorval Drive	Yes.
Carole L-Whitaker	523 Dorval Drive	No
Robert W Whitaker	523 Dorval Drive	No
Jeanne Baker	42 Elm Hill Blvd	<del>No</del>
Road Conway	42 Elm Hill Blvd.	No.
Patricia Law	529 Dorval Dr.	No
	Dorval Dr	Yes
	DORVAL DR.	Yes
	DORVAL DR.	Yes
Robert [Signature]	18 Elm Hill BLVD	No
Awen [Signature]	18 ELMHILL BLVD	No
Jan Rabicki	30 ELMHILL BLVD	No
Paul Clemens	45 Elm Hill Blvd	No
Michelle Stretton	45 Elm Hill Blvd.	No
Lois Gordon	36 Elm Hill Blvd	No
	Elm Hill Blvd	YES
	(Elm Hill Blvd)	YES
Gue Rabicki	30 Elm Hill Blvd.	No
	Tamahawk Cr.	Yes

I oppose the change in zoning and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment for the Lands  
at 26 Southcote Drive, Road

Name: Signature:	Address	I request that my personal information be removed from public documents
DAVE VIDAL <i>[Signature]</i>	518 DORVAL DR ANCASTER	NO
MARY MENTYRE <i>[Signature]</i>	518 DORVAL DR. Ancaster	NO
<del>Scott Straker</del> Scott Straker	530 DORVAL DR, ANCASTER	NO
Wendy Rayner Wendy Rayner Steve Rayner <i>[Signature]</i>	24 Elm Hill Blvd. Ancaster, ON	NO
KEBECCA TAYLOR <i>[Signature]</i>	24 Elm Hill Blvd. Ancaster, ON	NO
CARLO GHERASIN <i>[Signature]</i>	530 GOLF LINKS RD ANCASTER, ON	NO
Laura Dundas	530 GOLF LINKS RD ANCASTER, ON	NO
JOHANN VERBUNT <i>[Signature]</i>	14 Southcote Rd Ancaster ON	NO.
	9 OLD OAKS PLACE ANCASTER ON	NO
	Dorval Drive	YES
KIRK + LATHY BAROSYAN <i>[Signature]</i>	61 Elm Hill Blvd ONT.	NO.
Colton Breasted ALLIEN MONTAUX <i>[Signature]</i>	61 Elm Hill Blvd	NO
BLAIR MONTAUX <i>[Signature]</i>	72 SOUTH COTE RD	
OWEN MONTAUX <i>[Signature]</i>	72 SOUTH COTE RD	
TAMMY MAUSFIELD <i>[Signature]</i>	72 Southcote Rd.	NO
<del>Kimberly Strecker</del>	488 Golf Links Rd.	NO.
Kimberly Strecker <i>[Signature]</i>	530 Dorval Dr.	NO
Trevor MacLaggan <i>[Signature]</i>	3 Old oaks Place	No
Barbara MacLaggan <i>[Signature]</i>	3 old oaks Place	No
TERRY BENSON <i>[Signature]</i>	536 DORVAL DR	NO

