

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED**

<b>Comment Received</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
<p>Rental units are not appropriate for the community.</p>	<p>The City is not aware of any empirical evidence to support this claim.</p>
<p>The proposed number of parking spaces is insufficient for the proposed development and will result in spill over onto adjacent roads.</p>	<p>The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (see Appendix “C” attached to Report PED24180) includes a minimum of 1.3 parking spaces per dwelling unit which results in a minimum requirement of 65 parking spaces. This is a reduction in the number of parking spaces from the requirement in Zoning By-law No. 3692-92.</p> <p>Under the modified regulation, the proposed development would be required to provide a minimum of 65 parking spaces. Under the parking regulations of Zoning By-law 05-200, the proposed development would be required to provide a minimum of 54 parking spaces. This is a decrease of 11 parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed development will provide more parking than would be required under the Zoning By-law 05-200 regulations.</p> <p>The proposed number of parking spaces is not expected to cause negative impacts such as overspill onto adjacent road. Opportunities for alternative forms of transportation are available to residents. The subject lands are located in proximity to a mix of land uses and existing public transit routes, planned rapid transit, and existing bicycle lanes.</p>
<p>The additional traffic generated by this development cannot be supported by the existing road network.</p>	<p>A Trip Generation Analysis, prepared by WEBB Planning Consultants dated September 10, 2024, has been submitted in support of this application. Transportation Planning supports the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications as the site-generated traffic by the proposed development can be accommodated.</p>
<p>The proposed development will result in a reduction of privacy.</p>	<p>An Urban Design Brief, prepared by Lintack Architects Inc. dated February 2021, was submitted in support of the proposed development. In staff’s opinion, the setbacks and stepbacks are an appropriate transition in height.</p> <p>Staff have reviewed the compatibility of the proposal by assessing the impact of the built form on the neighbouring properties and found that the proposed development</p>

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>The proposed development will result in a reduction of privacy. <b>(continued)</b></p>	<p>complies with the residential intensification policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. A detailed policy review is included in Appendix "F" attached to Report PED24180.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed development will result in negative impacts on privacy.</p>

**COPY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Date: Ongoing

To whom it may concern

They are signatures representing that we are not in favour of re-zoning the property located at 582-584 Highway 8. Stray Creek.

We all would like it to be zoned as single residential homes if they're planning on building

Many reasons we feel that re-zoning is not a good reason for our neighbourhood. Especially if they're ~~are~~ rental properties. Many of us have lived here for 20 plus years and built our single houses.

Building that was knocked down unfortunately created a lot of issues, we hope that we can come to a conclusion to make everyone happy. Traffic is already an issue in this small area.

Neighbours of Envy  
Atlantic  
Culdwelt  
Wendage Dr.  
Gibson Ct  
Voron Place  
Steward Place  
Tredonia Plg  
Royalwood Court

From: <REMOVED>  
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:30 PM  
To: Michniak, Mark; Michelle  
Subject: Re: Builder wishing to Re-Zone (ON Behalf of Sinmat Consulting Inc.) #582-#584 Hwy #8  
Stoney Creek

Good Afternoon Mark. My personal info. I feel the zoning should remain as is. If the 50 units are rentals it does not suit the community around it! I feel the parking is not adequate as most people are 2 car families & I would not want them to take over Envoy Blvd. as their overflow! Noise could be a factor & the houses closest to this property would lose their Privacy as well I would prefer the structure what ever is built not be rental units, I feel renting the people tend to be very lax in maintaining the property when owned they tend to care much more with the property & take some pride in ownership. (My Opinion). THX for listening, From: Jack Bidinost...

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY**



September 16, 2024

City of Hamilton  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

Attention: Mr. Mark Michniak, MCIP, RPP  
Planner I

Dear Mr. Michniak,

**Re:** Summary of Public Engagement Session  
Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendments, UHOPA-21-006 and ZAC-21-11  
582/584 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, City of Hamilton

---

WEBB Planning Consultants are retained by Sinmat Consulting Inc. to co-ordinate the necessary municipal approvals to facilitate the proposed residential development of the lands located at 582/584 Highway 8, former Town of Stoney Creek, City of Hamilton.

The property is located on the south side of Highway 8, immediately to the east of Envoy Blvd. The property is comprised of two adjoining parcels with a combined frontage of 60 metres and an area of 0.34 hectares. The lands were previously occupied by single detached dwellings which were demolished in anticipation of redevelopment.

Planning applications are currently under review by City Staff, seeking approval of amendments to the Western Development Area Secondary Plan and the former Stoney Creek Zoning By-law. The Applications will permit the development of a mid-rise apartment building, 4 storeys in height, containing a total of 50 dwelling units, a mix of one and two bedroom formats. The building is proposed to be established as a rental tenure and marketed as a seniors only building. The parking supply complies with Zoning requirements.

At the request of the Ward Councillor, it was agreed the project would benefit from further public consultation as the applications were initially circulated back in mid 2021. The objective of the public engagement to present the updated development proposal and seek feedback in advance of planning staff completing a Staff Report and scheduling of a Public Meeting before the City’s Planning Committee.

The public consultation event was held on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024, the meeting held at the Stoney Creek Municipal Service Centre, 777 Highway 8, a location in close proximity to the proposed development and easily accessible for people within the affected area. Based on the record provided by the sign-in sheets, a total of approximately 9 people attended the event including the Councillor for Ward 10, Mr. Jeff Beatie. .

Attn.: Mr. Mark Michniak, MCIP, RPP  
Re: 582/584 Highway 8

September 16, 2024  
Page 2

The following table is structured to reflect the comprehensive outline of consultation that is required for consistency with the City’s Public Consultation Guidelines. The table outlines the key elements for the consultation process and provides a summary of the event that was held on September 4<sup>th</sup> for the specific purpose of engaging with the public on this particular development application.

Certain materials such as copies of the meeting invitation, presentation boards and sign-in sheets are attached to this letter as Appendices.

<b>Key Messages from the Consultation Event</b>	
Target Audience of the Consultation	Residents and landowners within 240m of development parcel and the broader public with an interest in the development.
Names & Roles of Participants	Rick Lintack– Lintack Arch. – Lead Designer James Webb, MCIP, RPP, WEBB Planning, Agent Joseph Trombetta – owner
Type of Activity & Tools Utilized	Open House format Display Panels and Presentation
Date and Time of Event	September 4 <sup>th</sup> , Open House from 6:30 – 8:30pm
Key Information Presented	Background on existing Planning Policy framework, evolution of development proposal, architectural plans illustrating scale and massing of project, overview of supporting studies.
Key Contacts for Follow-up	Contact details provided for Project Manager, and Agent (James Webb, WEBB PC)
Opportunities for Public Feedback	Public provided opportunity to speak directly with Planning Consultant and project team to address any questions or comments, participants encouraged to provide written feedback via Comment Forms and/or email.
<b>Record of Notification</b>	
Record of Circulation Area	Notices hand delivered to all properties within 240 metre radius of subject property
List of Stakeholders Invited	Ward Councillor, Neighbourhood Association (by Councillor), City Development Planning Staff
Efforts to accommodate Special Interest Groups	Meeting invitation confirmed facility as fully accessible.
Ward Councillor and Manager of Development Planning Notification	Ward Councillor and Manager of Development Planning received Meeting Notices via email
Methods of Notification	Hand delivery of Invitations to properties within 240 metres of subject property, email of Notices to Ward Councillor and distribution on social media, copy of Meeting Invitation attached at Appendix “A”
Date of Notification	Meeting Invitation distributed by email and hand delivered on August 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2024.



Attn.: Mr. Mark Michniak, MCIP, RPP  
Re: 582/584 Highway 8

September 16, 2024  
Page 3

<b>Record of Consultation</b>	
Copy of Presentation	Copies of the presentation panels are provided in Appendix “A”
Sign-in Sheet of meeting participants	Refer to Appendix “A” for sign-in sheet
Meeting Minutes	Refer to discussion below
Copy of Feedback Received	No written comments were submitted by attendees
Email Responses	A single email was received in response to the meeting invitation, copy attached at Appendix “A”
<b>Response to Comments</b>	
Summary of Comments Received	<p>The comments and questions were generally supportive of the development proposal as an appropriately scaled development that adds a missing component of the housing supply (apartment building/multiple dwellings) to the established neighbourhood.</p> <p>Enquiry on unit tenure – rental or condominium.</p> <p>Questions regarding affordability, unit sizes, assuming a rental building enquiries on potential added costs for residents, ie: utilities.</p> <p>Would the building utilize sustainable practices.</p> <p>Additional comments questioned the evolution of the development proposal and changes to the scale and massing since inception.</p> <p>Comments acknowledged that the parking supply meets and exceeds the City’s new Standards for automobiles and bicycle storage.</p> <p>Questions regarding provision of permitter fencing to buffer or screening adjoining properties.</p>
Responses to Comments	<p>Assurances provided that development will incorporate high standards of design excellence.</p> <p>On-site parking to be provided in accordance with Zoning By-law Regulations.</p> <p>Project not specifically planned as Affordable Housing with no connection to municipal or provincial programmes.</p> <p>Project will be marketed as a seniors lifestyle building at market rates.</p> <p>Perimeter fencing and landscaping to achieve appropriate buffering and screening to adjoining properties to be implemented at Site Plan Phase.</p> <p>Sustainable building guidelines including use of geothermal systems to be addressed at the Site Plan Approval phase.</p>
Describe modifications to proposal resulting from responses received	No modifications to the development proposal are warranted based on the feedback provided at the meeting. Agreement to provide feedback to Ward Councillor as project advances to Site Plan Approval