

From: David Lloyd

Sent: May 14, 2025 8:45 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Cassar, Craig <Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca>; Fiorino, Michael <Michael.Fiorino@hamilton.ca>;

Subject: Please add to May 23 planning agenda

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Planning meeting May 23, 2025 regarding 559 Southcote Road, Ward 12



Dear Planning Committee members,

I am a [REDACTED] who is fully in favour of infill development and green development standards. We need sustainability, height and density all through the city, including Ancaster.

However, will one of you please speak up at this meeting and let residents know when the City will stop recommending approval to raze EVERY SINGLE TREE ON THE LOT? We were

promised a tree protection bylaw that seems to be taking years to become a reality and so many trees are being lost in the meantime.

In this instance, please reflect on why the massive heritage weeping willow tree with a trunk that is almost two meters in diameter, and in good condition according to the tree plan, is considered ok to remove along with every single one of the 40 trees on this site? Why not save some around the edges? It has been done before by just one kilometer up the road at 389 Southcote Road where the builder Zeina Homes agreed to create space for the row of conifers on the property line by reducing the footprint of their build.

Thank you Zeina Homes! See google street image below.



Tree preservation seems to be an afterthought in Hamilton despite the rah rah about increasing our tree canopy.

The property right next door to this proposal, at 509 Southcote, has also been the go ahead to remove all of the 370s trees on that lot and they are massive, mature trees. Does the City not understand **cumulative impacts**? How can total removal be of any benefit to citizens and nature?

I will be watching and I sincerely hope to hear one of you explain we continue to approve destruction of every single tree on the lot with no thought to leaving some trees/nature in place and building density beside it.

Thank you,
David Lloyd