

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>The additional traffic generated by this development cannot be supported by the existing road network.</p>	<p>Transportation Planning supports the Zoning By-law Amendment as the traffic generated by the proposed development is not anticipated to significantly impact the transportation network as network improvements are scheduled for the intersection of North Service Road and Parkedge Drive.</p>
<p>Overcrowding of schools.</p>	<p>Staff have circulated to all the required school boards. No comments or concerns have been received from any school board.</p>
<p>Storm drainage.</p>	<p>The applicant has submitted a revised Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report in support of the application. Development Engineering staff have reviewed the study and advised that there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development. The applicant is required to complete necessary upgrades to municipal infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the proposal. The required infrastructure to accommodate stormwater has been demonstrated to conform with City standards and detailed design will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control application. Staff note that the applicant has previously received an Environmental Compliance Approval from the Ministry and any changes will be subject to further review. As well, staff note that due to the location of the subject lands the Hamilton Conservation Authority will require a permit for any works, which will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control application.</p>
<p>Outdated infrastructure.</p>	<p>Staff note that the proposed development will be required to work with utility providers to ensure the development provides current standard service levels. Any network (i.e. cable, internet, electrical) upgrades would be completed by the appropriate service provider.</p>

From:
To: [Fiorino, Michael](#)
Subject: 560 Grays Road Concerns
Date: Friday, March 15, 2024 3:47:46 PM

Good afternoon.

I apologize for the late submission, but I have concerns to express regarding the proposed new build at 560 Grays Road.

Firstly, traffic is already an issue in this area. Between unchecked speeding, constant failures to stop at posted local stop signs, commercial truck traffic and regular daytime traffic to and from the North Service Road (particularly during morning and afternoon rush hour), residents in this area already feel unsafe and unheard. Proposing to add 94 units will add just as many vehicles, if not more. It is unlikely that new residents will include zero vehicle homes given the lack of public transportation in the area. This over-trafficked area will only become worse and more dangerous. That is especially true for all of the local residents (particularly seniors and children) who walk and bike ride throughout the area. That includes the portion of Frances that has no sidewalk between Parkedge (Drakes) and Grays. Parking on Grays Road is also already an ongoing issue because of the dozens and sometimes hundreds of people who use the Grays Road entrance to access the Beach Trail and Confederation Park. When will a traffic study and actual enforcement ever become reality in this area? We already have too many new builds that have increased traffic concerns over the past 10 years.

The infrastructure in the entire area cannot tolerate another increase in residential units. Despite supposed upgrades, internet and cable service are already slow and overused in the area. The flooding at the Northern end of Grays, and in fact the entire Northern end of the neighbourhood, increases each time more units are filled. The storm drains in the area cannot handle even more people and even less clear land to absorb water. We have also already seen how frequently the streets near to us, particularly Teal Avenue, lose power because of new builds and larger houses going in with no upgrades to the electrical system and transformers. Given the same lack of upgrades for Grays, Frances, Drakes and Oceanic, it is reasonable to expect that we too will have increasing transformer blowouts and malfunctions.

The local public and French Immersion school, Eastdale, is already filled to capacity. New portables have been added each year since Mountainview, Glen Echo, Glen Brae and Eastdale were all combined in to one school. The children barely have any room left to play or be physically active and, in fact, older children are being sent with a supervising teacher to the park adjacent to the school during nutrition breaks in order to be able to play soccer because of the lack of space. That overcrowding has not begun to be addressed but now the City wants to make it worse by bringing even more families in to our area.

While I understand the need for new housing, building more over-priced units in an already over-crowded area where the traffic, school system and infrastructure cannot keep pace and are already constant issues, is not a solution. In addition, the safety issues for the residents who enjoy walking and biking throughout the area will only be increased. Traffic is already too hazardous and there are too many street sections with no sidewalks.

I ask that the City please take the current residents and situation in the area into account before allowing any further development.

Thank you,

560 Grays Road – Open House Meeting

Date: November 20, 2023

Time: 6:30 – 7:30 PM

Attendees: Jared Marcus, Ritika Nair, Lori Havso, Sue Langdon, Jim Langdon, Cllr. Jeff Beattie

Summary of Comments

Concern	Question / Comment	Arcadis Response
Drainage	<p>Will there be sufficient capacity for stormwater drainage?</p> <p>Will there still be a ditch to the north of the property?</p>	<p>Stormwater management was addressed through the previous Site Plan review and an ECA has been issued by the Ministry. Any changes will be addressed through the future Site Plan process.</p> <p>A ditch is still proposed within the municipal boulevard along Frances Avenue. Exact details will be confirmed through the future Site Plan process.</p>
Planning Process	<p>Will this application proceed directly through the OLT?</p> <p>Will there be further opportunities for public input?</p>	<p>A Zoning By-law Amendment application will be made to the City of Hamilton. It is our opinion that the development proposal is considered good planning and is supportable.</p> <p>Residents were welcomed to provide written comment to Arcadis after the open house meeting.</p> <p>Residents within 120 metres of the subject property will be circulated on further opportunities for public input, including at the Council meeting stage.</p>
Amenity Space / Parkland	<p>Is there an opportunity for a mixed-use development on the site?</p> <p>Will there be sufficient amenity space on site? Are any play areas for children planned?</p>	<p>Only residential uses are currently contemplated as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Landscaped amenity spaces have been included in the current version of the concept plan. All dwelling units will have access to either an at-grade patio or balcony. The current design does not specifically include a playground facility, but there are other significant public open spaces near the development.</p>
Parking	<p>Will the proposed number of parking spaces / parking rate be sufficient for the number of residents and visitors?</p>	<p>The proposed number of parking spaces is in line with other developments of a similar scale and consisting of a similar unit size and structure. A parking analysis is included as part of the TIS report.</p>

	<p>Will the proposed development increase the existing rates of on-street parking?</p>	<p>There is currently no on-street parking allowed on the streets surrounding the subject lands. Based on our experience with other similar area developments, the observed parking rates for occupants and visitors is consistent with the current proposal. On-street parking is not factored in the current parking rate.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, on-street parking is currently available within the surrounding neighbourhood and would be available for use by anyone regardless of whether they currently reside in the neighbourhood. On-street parking is not owned by residents.</p>
	<p>Where will residents and visitors park if there are insufficient parking spaces?</p>	<p>While we are confident that the proposed parking rate will be sufficient for the development, there is no way to ensure that there will never be a scenario where there is insufficient parking. Similar to how existing residents in the neighbourhood utilize on-street parking when visitors attend, if there is insufficient on-site parking then on-street parking, or other transportation methods will have to be utilized.</p> <p>Parking rates are not the same for single detached dwellings as they are for a stacked townhouse use, so current parking usage is not a good indicator of future patterns.</p>
	<p>Is underground parking a possibility?</p>	<p>Given the price of construction, underground parking is not a viable option.</p>
<p>Traffic</p>	<p>What traffic controls will be present at the access point for the site? Will the proposed development be signalized?</p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Study recommends stop control at the site entrance. Given rates of background traffic increases there may be additional upgrades that the City can make at the area intersections. There are no upgrades that are required based on the development.</p>
	<p>Concerns regarding speed and congestion issues on Frances Avenue.</p>	<p>Existing traffic safety concerns on area streets will not be exacerbated by the proposed development, and upgrades to address safety concerns would have to be addressed through an appropriate review by City staff.</p>
	<p>Is it possible to get access onto North Service Road?</p>	<p>No, access from this site onto North Service Road is not permitted by the City. The existing approved development concept includes access to Parkedge Drive and that entrance location will be continued through the current design concept.</p>

Transit	<p>What is the timeline for transit in the neighbourhood?</p> <p>Will the proposed number of parking spaces be sufficient if transit is not an option?</p>	<p>The City is currently reviewing overall transportation network needs through the Strategic Transportation Network Review, as well as HSR route options specifically through the HSR (re)Designed Network review project. Any changes to route network would occur through Council decision and are not linked to this development application.</p> <p>As noted throughout the Planning Justification Report, the proposed parking rates are consistent with the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law, as well as consistent with observed rates from similar developments in the area.</p>
Construction	<p>Where will workers park during the construction phase?</p> <p>How long will construction take to complete?</p> <p>Concerns regarding noise during the construction phase.</p>	<p>While detailed construction plans are not known at this time it is anticipated that workers would park on site. Since there is no associated underground parking garage there will be sufficient space within the site to accommodate construction activities and parking. Workers would not be permitted to utilize on-street parking and it is typical that a construction and parking management plan would be required.</p> <p>The exact length of construction is not known, but it would be expected to last approximately 1 year.</p> <p>Construction activity impacts, such as noise, dust, etc., are governed by by-laws that are enforced by the City. In addition, it is typical for the construction team or developer to provide notice to residents with contact information where concerns can be raised.</p>
Proposed Units	<p>What is the price of the units?</p> <p>What is the proposed tenure of the units?</p> <p>Concerns regarding Airbnb.</p>	<p>This is unknown at this time.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed units will be condominium units.</p> <p>Short term rentals, such as Airbnb, are governed by City by-laws and would not be subject to enforcement by the developer and are not part of this application.</p>
Snow Removal	<p>Is there a designated area for snow removal?</p>	<p>A formal Site Plan process will unfold following Zoning approval where specific design details, such as snow storage, will be reviewed and approved by City staff.</p>
<p>Public Comments received November 14, 2023</p>		

1	<p>Oddy, the lot is showing on the City of Stoney Creek By-laws as being zoned RM3-58 with 3 variances to the standard zoning regulations. 1. a minimum rear setback for apartments of 11 m, a max density of 99 uph and a max height of 15 ms. That zoning, I believe, was the 2nd vision which received approval under By-law 16-227. Do you know why the City records have this zoning on file?</p>	<p>We cannot answer for the upkeep of the online Zoning By-law; however, the provisions did not appear to reflect By-law 19-014 which was approved by LPAT decision for file #PL190056. Regardless, the proposed development would require additional modifications to the Zoning By-law that do not match the previous approval.</p>
2	<p>Assuming the correct RM3-58 with the 7 variances sought and approved in the 3rd vision is what should be on file, has an application for a ZBA been made to the City? Or is the applicant going to attempt this rezoning as 'minor' variances and submit an application to the Committee of Adjustments? There is nothing showing on the city's open data so it would be helpful to know at what stage this new proposal for back-to-back towns is at please</p>	<p>At the time of receiving the correspondence the owners had only engaged the City in the Formal Consultation review and were in the process of coordinating the information meeting. No application had been submitted. The FC review identified that the proposed development would require a Zoning By-law Amendment.</p>
3	<p>If a development application has been made with the City, can you please provide a copy of it along with any supporting Studies that may have been conducted to date. Presumably (a) an updated Noise Impact study was conducted (now that this latest vision will now require the development to have a noise barrier fencing/berm), (b) an Environmental Impact statement was completed (now that it appears there will be a significant reduction in the permeable surfaces/significant increase in stormwater runoff to the private properties backing onto the Big Pond) (c) an updated Traffic study has been completed (now that this proposal no longer precedes the massive development at 310 Frances Avenue & other infills along the North Service Road); and (d) an updated Functional Servicing / Stormwater Management plan was completed (now that perhaps the plan to direct stormwater through Confed will change and perhaps there is no longer a requirement for an oil/grit separator on site).</p>	<p>As note above, at the time of receiving the correspondence formal applications had not been submitted. A Noise Report, Functional Servicing Report and Transportation Impact Study have been included with this submission package. An Environmental Impact Study was not required.</p>

4	<p>As you may know, the residents in this area have 2 major concerns when infills are proposed in our community: Public Safety & Environment. Although some were concerned about the 4/6 storey heights approved in 2019/2020, this proposal for 94 stacked townsh presently appears to have a greater negative impact than all the previous 4 versions in the last 8 years. It appears to be a significant loss of landscaped open space, and a reduction in the parking ratio from 1.65 spaces (majority underground) / unit down to 1.19 spaces (all surface) / unit which results in overflow parking away from the site (adjacent roads are no parking zone) & directed to narrower streets causing safety issues. Do you have any comments on this and/or can you provide a copy of the Planning Justification Report if one was submitted?</p>	<p>As outlined within this report, parking rates in the Stoney Creek Zoning By-law are based on a building typology that didn't exist at the time the By-law was created, and the parking rates are not representative of current City direction. The proposed dwelling types are more representative of an apartment-style use and observed parking rates for comparable area developments are consistent with what is proposed.</p> <p>Similarly, landscape requirements for different built forms can't be directly compared. The proposed development provides a sufficient amount of landscape open space which balances appropriate amounts of parking and building density. In addition to landscaped open space, each unit will have access to a private at-grade patio or balcony.</p>
5	<p>Lastly, why hasn't this meeting notice been sent to property owners in the area that are affected by whatever eventually gets developed on that piece of land? I live 180 metres from the site. I fully appreciate the notice notifications in the Planning Act. I also understand that the Planning Act provides the bare minimum 'distance' for Public Consultation however when a proposal impacts stormwater flow to my private property, I don't believe it is unreasonable to receive Notice of such a proposal. All of the residents who own the waterlots/the Big Pond should have received invites to this upcoming Monday night meeting. It's not like the very long history of water damage to our properties due to soil erosion/flooding is a big deep dark secret.</p>	<p>Notice for the meeting was hand delivered to all residences and businesses within 120 metres of the subject lands. This was done in accordance with the Planning Act and City guidelines.</p> <p>Stormwater management is addressed in the enclosed Functional Servicing Report, as well as through the ECA obtained through the Site Plan Control application for the previous development concept. If updates or changes are required, it will be dealt with through the future Site Plan review process. It has been established through the ECA that stormwater drainage will be directed from the site to a new outlet to Lake Ontario. Stormwater drainage will not be directed to the "Big Pond".</p>