

From: Tim Cushen

Re. The development of a residential subdivision (17 single detached homes) on the lots of 387, 397, 405 and 409 Hamilton Dr

Dear members of the planning committee,

The Notice of Public meeting from the Office of the City Clerk was dated March 28, 2025 but arrived in the mail only on Friday, April 4th, 2025.

As such, less than 72 hours, especially weekend hours, is not nearly enough time to examine all the attached documentation for this public meeting of the planning committee. Even a cursory inspection of these documents reveal major concerns with this attached rendering and the endorsement of outdated and questionable reports by the City itself. As such, my concerns are limited by the restrictive timeline imposed by the tardy delivery of this public meeting announcement and its time sensitive deadlines. By no means do they reflect my final and complete objection for this proposal and call for further review of its contents.

The traffic assessment cited in Appendix I (page 2/3) "Hamilton Drive Residential Development Transportation Impact & TDM Options Report" prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited that seemingly dismisses local and first-hand traffic and safety concerns is dated from June of 2018 and in now way, reflects the current congestion of traffic, the excessive speeding by motor vehicles and the potential mortal danger it presents to local residents, all pedestrians but especially the 35-40 Bishop Tonnos students that rely on that non-sidewalk stretch to navigate to and from school. The City endorsing this 7 year old report is just discouraging and once again, calls into question a genuine commitment to public safety.

Furthermore, the sidewalk being installed by the length of this proposed project still leaves an approximate 500m gap between the end of this new sidewalk and the existing one that ends at 445 Hamilton Dr. Regardless of its eventual installation, in the interim and during construction, surely, the staging area for all work vehicles that is not addressed at all in this proposal is going to haphazardly spill onto both sides of the street, further narrowing Hamilton Dr and exasperating existing safety concerns for pedestrians and residents. Worker parking or a staging area should be at the builder's expense and should be exclusively restricted to the Builder's lot and not on the street itself or the properties of 430 or 404 Hamilton Dr.

It is my understanding that temporary speed calming measures are about to be installed on Hamilton Dr but frankly, their installation only strengthens my argument that this report is outdated and should not be given any substantial weight. Even if these "speed bumps" became permanent, the non sidewalk section falls directly between speed bump 3 and 4 and quite possibly inadvertently make things more treacherous for pedestrians as drivers now have a 1000m stretch to vent their frustration.

We, sadly, are mourning the tragic and senseless death of one of Ward 12's City workers and an integral member to this community and I will repeat my immediate concerns, as i have expressed them repeatedly to my Councillor, Craig Cassar and his office, without a connecting sidewalk, it's only a matter of time before there is a fatality on that corner involving either a resident, a pedestrian or one of the many students that rely on that stretch to navigate to school and back. Again, I cannot fathom how the

City is siding with an outdated, 7year old traffic report over first hand accounts and video evidence supplied by local constituents.

As mentioned, there is a lot to review in this proposal but please clarify in Appendix F the mention of “cash in lieu of planted trees” how much does the builder have to pay to forego planting these proposed trees? Is there still a minimum amount of trees that have to be planted regardless if some last minute and “unforeseen” hiccup arises preventing him from fulfilling his promise. Initial renderings and finished products, as we often observe, rarely are mistaken for one another and often at the expense of promised ecological compromises. Also, I question the variance proposed for the setback from Hamilton Dr. It’s mentioned that the installed sidewalk will facilitate the proper growth of planted trees but call me creatively-visually impaired, I just don’t see it and wonder how many species of trees and their long term growth would be beholden and limited by such a small space, especially mindful of the existing telephonic and hydro infrastructure that isn’t accounted for in this rendering. I also question the accuracy of this rendering as, quaint as it may sound, I’m standing in the spot marked where three heritage trees are to be preserved and I can only see two and they’re position is smack dab, as that expression goes, in the middle of lot 12 and nowhere near the road’s edge as pictured.

I strongly object to the statement endorsed by the City that this project’s connection of Braithwaite to Hamilton Dr will facilitate free movement and not create further traffic congestion and will not further exasperate existing safety concerns. The City, if it hasn’t already, should consider not allowing any parking on Hamilton Dr proper but especially adjacent to this new development. This is, after all, still a crucial and main artery for emergency vehicles to navigate in the most time sensitive and dire circumstances.

Thank you for your time and your consideration. It’s an honour and one of life’s little pleasures to exercise one’s Civic duty through peaceful discourse and objection, especially at the Municipal level.

Respectfully,

Tim Cushen

From: Tim Cushen

Sent: April 28, 2025 11:45 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Hurst, Nancy <Nancy.Hurst@hamilton.ca>; Cassar, Craig <Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Re. The development of a residential subdivision (17 single detached homes) on the lots of 387, 397, 405 and 409 Hamilton Dr

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments



Dear planning committee.

This a follow-up comment to my previous objection to the development of the Hamilton Dr development.

The very first Heritage tree, designated on this rendering and formal document as being saved, is a diseased Elm tree that overhangs both the telecommunication and Hydro wires and will either die of disease or from maintenance by either company. I also question its location and whether or not the developer actually owns the land that it is located. As

such, I question the accuracy and sincerity of any horticulture or ecological survey submitted by this developer as well as their promised intentions.

I ask you, the esteemed members of the planning committee, to not sanction this development until a proper assessment and ecological survey is conducted by a neutral party a la Hamilton Conservation Authority or the like. In addition, as one of the oldest areas of Ancaster itself and particularly mindful of its agricultural and Indigenous origins, I think that no development should take place before the local Indigenous communities are allowed to conduct their own assessment of this land for cultural, historical and ecological significance unique to their traditional and contemporary way of Life. They are, after all, the rightful owners of that land.

Thank you for your time,

Tim Cushen

From: Mary Love

Sent: April 7, 2025 10:19 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: 8.2 of April 8 planning agenda written delegation

Dear Clerk and Planning Committee,

Please register my utter dismay that a developer wants to destroy 683 trees in an area with known species at risk, to accommodate 17 low density single family houses in Ancaster. Their plans represent these trees as "neighbourhood", whereas it is a significant tree lot with some butternuts in it. Even if this were a good place for a small subdivision, why on earth would they think it's a good idea to deny this neighbourhood the benefits of all those trees?

We can't possibly meet our tree canopy targets if we allow trees to be removed for no good reason. Please hold the line on the urban boundary and raising the tree canopy!

Sincerely,
Mary Love

From: Don McLean

Sent: April 7, 2025 10:39 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Kroetsch, Cameron

<Cameron.Kroetsch@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Francis, Matt

<Matt.Francis@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther

<Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Alex <Alex.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Cassar, Craig

<Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca>; Ted McMeekin; Spadafora, Mike <Mike.Spadafora@hamilton.ca>; Tadeson,

Mark <Mark.Tadeson@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Ward 4

<ward4@hamilton.ca>; Beattie, Jeff <Jeff.Beattie@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Item 8.2 of the Planning Committee agenda tomorrow

Dear councillors

Item 8.2 asks the planning committee to approve a low-density subdivision in place of a forest! The staff report notes "The subject lands include a large, wooded area and are adjacent to a "Core Area" (significant woodland)." and "683 trees are proposed to be removed. The applicant has proposed to retain 125 trees and plant 157 trees on site.

In addition, cash in lieu for tree compensation for approximately 526 trees will be provided." Only 45 have been deemed "invasive species". It is unbelievable that this is being recommended, but apparently a reflection of how out of date the secondary plan is, since that document appears to be the main justification. The proposal clearly violates the city's biodiversity action plan and its commitment to substantially increasing the urban forest canopy. This should not proceed, and a public investigation should take place to determine how this area was designated "neighbourhoods" in the secondary plan. We need to correct this mistake, but also ensure it isn't repeated here or elsewhere.

Ancaster (and indeed Hamilton) has no shortage of low density subdivisions. The proposed 17 singles on over 2 hectares of land are far below the density objectives for greenfield sites. Although density requirements have been savaged by the current provincial government, Hamilton has not agreed with eliminating those requirements. I also note that even the provincial policy statement requires that "Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term." This is clearly being grossly violated and ignored!!!

I understand that our Official Plan heritage mapping shows these lands as Core Natural Heritage areas. Again it is outrageous that their effective destruction is being considered!

Don McLean

From: Marie Covert
Sent: April 7, 2025 10:42 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Section 8.2 of the April 8 planning agenda

Hello,

Please include my email in the upcoming planning meeting re: 387, 397, 405, and 409 Hamilton Drive, Ancaster.

I am writing to request rejection of the plan to build 17 low density houses in this area which is home to 683 trees which will be butchered to make room for sprawl. Please use all your wits and resources to combat this travesty of everything that Hamilton and its citizens regard as important: our Urban Forest Strategy and our commitment to build within the core, i.e. no more sprawl

This area is home to wildlife and songbirds of all types. They will surely die as their habitat is cruelly savaged. Destroying these trees makes a mockery of Hamilton's Tree Canopy program which will become even more important as we fight climate change (think flooding, erosion, heat domes). These trees will help mitigate against future climate impacts.

Please, also consider our current situation. You must acknowledge that Hamilton cannot operate as an island in the midst of everything surrounding us:

- the massive storm in northern Ontario which downed trees and power lines and where some home owners are still without power, 10 days later. More than 1900 hydro poles were snapped and have to be replaced. As yet, there has been no count of the 1,000's of trees which were felled by ice and wind. Please acknowledge that terrible loss and not compound it by adding 100's of healthy trees to the mix. We are all connected.
- with the federal election only 3 weeks away, there will be new building/housing priorities and policies. Both Poilievre and PM Carney will promote their projects over all else. They may reverse provincial regulations. As all of Canada faces increased prices through tariffs and huge supply chain issues, now is NOT the time to embark on an expensive building spree outside of the federal remit. Hamilton is not an island.

Except for the huge profit to be made by the developers, I cannot think of even one valid reason to carry through with this ill-considered proposal.

Many thanks for your consideration,
Marie Covert

From: Kate Whalen

Sent: April 7, 2025 10:43 AM

Subject: Please Oppose Item 8.2: Say No to the Removal of 683 Trees on Hamilton Drive

Dear Members of the Planning Committee,

I'm writing to express my deep concern and strong objection to the proposed removal of **683 trees** to make way for **17 low-density, single-family homes** at **387, 397, 405, and 409 Hamilton Drive in Ancaster** (Item 8.2 on the April 8 Planning agenda).

This proposal raises serious questions about Hamilton's commitment to sustainable development, climate resilience, and the protection of our natural heritage. Here's why:

- **It undermines the Urban Forest Strategy.** Approving this application would be a devastating blow to the integrity of the Urban Forest Strategy, which is meant to protect exactly this kind of mature, ecologically significant urban canopy.
- **The site includes dozens of "heritage trees"**—still undefined by staff, but undeniably important—many of which cannot be replaced once lost.
- **It's fiscally irresponsible.** Hamilton is facing a **\$3.8 billion infrastructure deficit**. The taxes generated by 17 new homes will not begin to cover the lifetime costs of installing and maintaining the required infrastructure—roads, water, sewage, stormwater ponds, electricity—especially in a natural area that currently requires none.
- **It contradicts the Urban Hamilton Official Plan**, which identifies this site as part of a **"Core" Natural Heritage Area**, meant for protection—not development. Yet, the Shaver Road Secondary Plan labels it "Neighbourhood," allowing natural features to be bulldozed in favour of sprawl.

This inconsistency raises serious concerns:

- **Why was this parcel designated "Neighbourhood" in the Secondary Plan when it clearly forms part of a significant woodlot?**
- **If this plan is flawed, how many others are similarly inaccurate—and when will they be reviewed and corrected?**

Removing over **680 mature trees**, in a city that claims to value environmental leadership, should not even be on the table. This is not the kind of development that meets Hamilton's climate, equity, or economic goals.

Please do the right thing. **Reject this application** and uphold Hamilton's stated vision for a green and livable city.

Sincerely,

Kate Whalen (Ward 1)

Kate Whalen

From: Peter Appleton
Sent: April 7, 2025 10:46 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: respecting item 8.2 of the April 8 Planning agenda.

Hello Clerk

The destruction of 683 trees, including species at risk for 17 low density multi million dollar mansions is exactly the opposite of a strong housing strategy to get more hamilton citizens housed.

-Approving this makes a mockery of Hamilton's Urban Forest Strategy, we desperately need mature trees to absorb water and reduce flooding. our biodiversity strategy NEEDS species at risk to be saved and protected

-Hamilton has a \$3.8Billion infrastructure deficit and the taxes collected from these 17 houses will not cover the lifetime costs of building the infrastructure - road, stormwater pond, sewage, water, electric that will need to be installed and maintained... forever

-This parcel is listed on the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Natural Heritage Map and identified as a "Core" area. Core areas require protection.

-However, on the Shaver Road Secondary Plan this parcel is identified as "Neighbourhood" which means neighbourhood use trumps natural heritage because Secondary Plans trump the Official Plan.

-WHY was this parcel identified as "Neighbourhoods" when it is clearly part of a significant woodlot? Woodlots of this size are to be SAVED!!

-If this particular Secondary Plan got it so wrong, what other Ancaster secondary plans are also inaccurate and when will they be updated?

thank you for your help

PETER APPLETON

From: Lesia Mokrycke
Sent: April 7, 2025 11:15 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Item 8.2 of the April 8 Planning Agenda

Dear Planning Committee,

I am writing regarding the properties at 387, 397, 405 and 409 Hamilton Drive, Ancaster.

This site needs to undergo a comprehensive ecological assessment prior to the initiation of any development plans. This includes a detailed inventory of all heritage trees and the presence of any known species at risk. The current proposal indicates the removal of 683 trees—some of which are of significant size and potential heritage value.

It is important to note that this site is designated as a “Core” area on the Urban Hamilton Official Plan’s Natural Heritage Map, indicating its importance to the city’s ecological network and the need for its protection. However, it appears that under the Shaver Road Secondary Plan, this parcel is identified as “neighbourhood.”

This raises a critical question: why is this parcel categorized as “neighbourhood” in the Secondary Plan when it is clearly identified as a Natural Heritage Area?

Additionally, this woodlot plays a vital role in supporting the local ecosystem, serving the surrounding community, and contributing meaningfully to the City’s urban forest and carbon sequestration efforts—functions that cannot be replaced. The added strain on stormwater infrastructure required to support 17 new units in this area also raises concerns about sustainability and potential long-term deficits for the City.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

With best regards,
Lesia Mokrycke

From: Neil San
Sent: April 7, 2025 11:51 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Files No: 25T-201809

Attention: Planning Committee

I would like clarification on concerns regarding the draft plan of subdivision (File No: Zac-18-048 and 25T-201809):

1) I would like to understand the impact on traffic on Hamilton Drive. As a long residing resident on this street, traffic conditions have become increasingly poor year over year. This includes high volumes, no traffic mitigation in place, and missing sidewalks to protect pedestrians. This street has now become an Arterial Road however it is clearly not designed for this. I would like to understand what the impact will be by opening up Braithwaite Avenue to Hamilton Drive? The concern is opening up the traffic access via Braithwaite Avenue (and its large subdivision /community of residents) onto Hamilton Drive, will overburden the already high volumes on this street. Will sidewalks be completed on Hamilton Drive?

2) Grading & Drainage: Hamilton Drive currently floods after rainfalls and snow melt. Year after year the ponding of water is getting worse on roads and ditches. How will this new development impact these flooding issues? These issues have been brought to the City's attention previously .Will the proposed stormwater management facility solve for this as well? Or is there potential for this proposed development to add more water issues to Hamilton Drive?

2) What is the environmental impact from changing the zoning from Agricultural to low density residential to the subject lands and neighboring properties? Is there an environmental assessment that exists detailing how this development (including stormwater facility) will impact trees and wildlife in this area?

Thanks,
Neil San