

**From:** Rosemarie Morris

**Sent:** Monday, April 28, 2025 10:44:09 AM

**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca) <[clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)>; Wilson, Maureen <[Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca)>; Kroetsch, Cameron <[Cameron.Kroetsch@hamilton.ca](mailto:Cameron.Kroetsch@hamilton.ca)>; Nann, Nrinder <[Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca](mailto:Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca)>; Hwang, Tammy <[Tammy.Hwang@hamilton.ca](mailto:Tammy.Hwang@hamilton.ca)>; Francis, Matt <[Matt.Francis@hamilton.ca](mailto:Matt.Francis@hamilton.ca)>; Pauls, Esther <[Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca](mailto:Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca)>; Danko, John-Paul <[John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca](mailto:John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca)>; Beattie, Jeff <[Jeff.Beattie@hamilton.ca](mailto:Jeff.Beattie@hamilton.ca)>; Tadeson, Mark <[Mark.Tadeson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Mark.Tadeson@hamilton.ca)>; Cassar, Craig <[Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca](mailto:Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca)>; Wilson, Alex <[Alex.Wilson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Alex.Wilson@hamilton.ca)>; McMeekin, Ted <[Ted.McMeekin@hamilton.ca](mailto:Ted.McMeekin@hamilton.ca)>

**Subject:** Proposal for Rosewood Estates by Elite Developments

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments

Dear Members of the Planning Committee,

I am responding to the application to build 17 single-family luxury homes on a site that would require grading and removal of over 600 trees, including mature trees and at-risk species like butternut.

I strongly urge you to reject this application for the following reasons:

Approval of this proposal would send a signal to developers that regardless of what might be said in the City's Climate Plan and Urban Forest Strategy, Hamilton does not value its mature trees. If I was a developer, I don't think the cost of cataloguing the trees and then cutting them down would be in any way prohibitive, especially when a mature tree can be cut down for the price of a sapling.\* Is this the signal that Council wishes to send?

The Ministry letter regarding species at risk should be brought up to date so that proposals can be assessed based on current and accurate information.

The Secondary Plan that currently allows for development in this area should be updated to provide appropriate protection to any remaining woodlots and wetlands.

If Council is serious about the Urban Forest Strategy and the climate first policies enacted years ago, then it should give guidance to developers to plan around mature "heritage" trees and species at risk, not just be prepared to pay a fine to cut it all down.

Significant woodlots such as this one should be protected for the benefit of the entire community today and into the future. While it is something to not demolish trees while birds are actively nesting in them (as outlined in the proposal), there seems to be no thought given to the cumulative loss of habitat for migratory birds that will return to the site in the following year to find no place to nest or feed.\*\*

Ancaster has lost countless heritage trees to development in the last decade. This proposal would accelerate that kind of approach when there are other ways to meet our urgent need for affordable housing.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Morris

\*The one for one ratio is wholly inadequate for replacement value of trees. This should be changed to **at least** equivalent trunk diameters in the new trees. Even that would not compensate for the actual benefits to the community provided by mature trees. Trees that took 80 years to grow will not be replaced in our lifetime (even if the sapling lives), so the current practice results in a net loss to the community.

\*\* I have personally witnessed a new homeowner chasing away migratory birds that were trying to nest in the porch of a house where there were trees the year before.