

## Summary of Public Comments Received

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>A concern was raised with respect to the availability of sufficient ground water to service the development's wells and the impact of the development on the wells of existing properties in the area. These concerns were issues that were commonly expressed by the interested parties. The comments outlined ongoing issues that were being experienced with respect to existing well failures, declining well water levels, and residents having to rely on cisterns.</p> <p>Concern was raised that the proposed development and other developments planned for the area will have further cumulative impacts with respect to the quantity of groundwater in the area. Additionally, concern was raised that the increased impervious surface proposed would further impact the available water in the groundwater aquifer. Concern with respect to the quality of the ground water was also noted.</p>	<p>A Hydrogeological Assessment and Pump Test Report were submitted with the applications. The studies were reviewed by Source Protection Planning and their peer review consultant. Both reviews outlined concerns with the submitted studies and noted that the information has not sufficiently demonstrated that there is adequate groundwater to service the proposed development, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal will not negatively impact surrounding lands. Source Protection Planning is therefore not able to support the applications at this time and requires the applicant to undertake further testing and review.</p> <p>In respect to groundwater quality, Source Protection Planning has a concern with one of the test wells including odour concerns which were described as "sewage like." Source Protection Planning has expressed concern with the proposed use of advance treatment systems to justify a reduced minimum lot area and the potential impact that this could have with respect to water quality and achieving compliance with the Ontario Drinking Water Standard. A full outline of the comments from Source Protection Planning is provided in Appendix "E" to Report PED26083.</p>

<p>A concern was raised that the proposed development will result in a loss of greenspace.</p>	<p>The subject lands are designated for residential use and are not planned for future open space or a municipal park. The development is for single detached dwellings on lots in excess of 0.4 hectares and will include space on site for grass, trees, and other vegetation. A City boulevard for the new municipal road will include the provision of street trees. Any development of the subject lands would require a Tree Protection Plan and would also require replacement at a compensation rate of one to one for each tree that is proposed to be removed. The trees to be replaced will need to be articulated on a revised Landscape Plan.</p>
<p>A concern was raised with the proposed development resulting in a loss of agricultural lands.</p>	<p>The subject lands are designated “Rural Settlement Area” in the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and “Settlement Residential” in the Greensville Rural Settlement Area Secondary Plan. The lands are zoned Settlement Residential (R2-14(H)) Zone, Modified, Holding in the Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law. Agricultural uses are not a use permitted in the Settlement Residential (R2-14(H)) Zone, Modified, Holding, and are not envisioned for lands designated “Settlement Residential” in the Greensville Rural Settlement Area Secondary Plan. The proposal therefore does not result in a loss of agricultural lands.</p>

<p>Concern was raised with respect to potential traffic impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding area.</p>	<p>A Trip Generation Assessment was undertaken and reviewed by Transportation Planning staff who are satisfied that the existing road network can accommodate the trips generated by the proposed development.</p>
<p>Concern was raised with there being only one road access for the proposed development.</p>	<p>The proposed development consists of a cul-de-sac with 12 lots intended to be developed for single detached dwellings. Transportation Planning staff did not require a secondary access.</p>
<p>A concern was raised with the construction impacts of the proposed development on nearby residents.</p>	<p>A Construction Management Plan to evaluate construction impacts can be required as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision approval.</p>
<p>A concern was raised about the proposed development's impact on school capacity.</p>	<p>The Hamilton Wentworth District School Board, Hamilton Wentworth Separate School Board, French Public School Board and French Catholic School Board were circulated the applications and Planning staff did not receive comments identifying any concern with respect to capacity at local schools.</p>
<p>An issue was raised with why the subdivision is for only 12 large homes and the impact that this will have with respect to affordability.</p>	<p>One of the tests for determining the number of dwelling units is the applicant demonstrating that adequate servicing via private wells and private sanitary services will be provided. According to the information provided, each of the dwellings will be custom designed. Therefore, the proposed scale of the dwelling unit will be based on the future property owners design subject to the limitations of the Zoning By-law with respect to lot coverage, building height and setbacks.</p>

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 6:03 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent - ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

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

Hi Daniel, I'm sharing my comments here on the 36 Taylor estate home proposal as a Greenville resident. I want to be clear: this is not just about one subdivision application. This is about a pattern of development pressure in Greenville that is being reviewed **piece by piece**, without a meaningful assessment of cumulative impact and that is extremely concerning.

Greenville is not an ordinary community. It is located within a **UNESCO World Heritage Site**, and it is a complex and ecologically sensitive area that plays an important role in the region's water system and natural heritage. It is also a protected **drinking water zone**, and ALL residents rely on **private wells drawing from the same aquifer** – many of whom are already struggling to get enough water or any water.

The issue is not simply whether this proposal meets minimum planning requirements on paper. The real question is: **how many developments can Greenville absorb before the aquifer is compromised?**

When multiple development applications are reviewed independently, the true impacts are hidden. Each proposal can claim its impact is “manageable.” But together, the cumulative effect becomes a serious threat, not just to traffic and infrastructure, but to the most fundamental resource we have: **water**.

Any new development that increases groundwater extraction puts additional strain on an aquifer that must sustain this community for generations. Once groundwater supply is depleted or contaminated, it is extremely difficult, and sometimes impossible, to restore.

I also want to highlight an important contradiction in the City's planning direction.

Hamilton has invested considerable public funds into long-term planning and promotion of **waterfall tourism**. That strategy depends on protecting the very ecosystems that make Greenville special: the headwaters, the groundwater recharge areas, and the natural environment that supports the waterfalls.

Approving more development in advance of the **Waterfall Master Plan review** is putting the cart before the horse. It risks undermining the very tourism strategy the City is spending taxpayer dollars to build.

If we continue approving developments one by one, without a comprehensive plan for water sustainability, conservation, and cumulative growth limits, we are not only threatening local residents, we are threatening a major long-term economic asset for Hamilton.

Greenville cannot be treated like a blank slate for incremental growth. It is a unique and sensitive environment. It is a protected drinking water zone. It is part of a UNESCO-designated landscape. And it is central to the City's own tourism and conservation identity.

I respectfully ask Council to ensure that this application at 36 Taylor Crescent is not approved in isolation, and that cumulative impacts are fully evaluated before any further development proceeds in Greensville.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 3, 2026 3:42 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508 application.

You don't often get email from kosubovich@sympatico.ca. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Mr. Barnett,

I am writing to express my concern over the application to add 12 homes in a proposed development at 36 Taylor Cres. This area is a protected water area with concerns over diminishing ground water sources. We have received letters indicating that the water level is low and that we should be conserving water. Wells in the area continue to fail with many homes requiring delivered water to cisterns. On my street, the water truck is now seen every week as each home requires periodic delivery. When I first moved to the area 18 years ago, all wells were performing adequately and water delivery was rare and usually related only to backyard pools. As the quarry in the area expanded and the dam was removed from Crooks Hollow, the ground water was impacted and wells began to fail. Even the commercial plaza at Kirby and Highway 8 had to have a new well drilled. Further development in the Greensville area will surely have an impact on water supply. I am opposed to this development for this reason and also the loss of greenspace to the area.

Sincerely,

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 7:14 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent Estates ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

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

Dear Daniel Barnett.

I am writing as a Long time resident of Greenville to express my opposition to the proposed 36 Taylor Crescent Estates ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508. As you are aware, this is an opposition shared by many in this community.

My primary and most urgent concern is water security. This proposed development would draw from the same local aquifer that already supplies the private wells for hundreds of nearby homes. Greenville sits within a protected water source area, and our aquifer is already under strain. Many residents have experienced well failures, declining water levels, and costly repairs, with no guarantee that deeper drilling will resolve these issues. Resulting in some residents seeking use of cisterns.

A second concern is the permanent loss of additional agricultural land, the character of Greenville and the Greenbelt, which should be protected at all costs.

Residents specifically moved to this area because of the beauty in Greenville and agricultural/water protection.

A further concern, is the potential impact of increased population on both traffic and use of the school system, which is already at maximum capacity.

Thank you for your time and consideration for the voices of the residents most directly impacted by this decision.

Sincerely,

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2026 10:11 AM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent - ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments.

Good morning.

This particular development is one of several pending developments in the general area near Taylor Crescent that could have a significant impact on the quantity and quality of water in the upper Greenville area.

There are currently two other projects in the immediate area that are in the process of being approved. One is a potential industrial area at 471 Moxley Road, adjacent to the existing Taylor Crescent area which will see multiple industrial buildings erected over the next several years. Another is a development immediately south of Spencer Creek Drive which will involve up to 7 additional estate homes. There is also the potential for several more homes to be built on some existing vacant land immediately east and south of Taylor Crescent which could mean an additional 3-4 houses.

All of these developments will cause an additional burden on the existing ground water source for existing properties along Old Brock Road and Moxley Road. Additionally, the community well east of Brock Road and north of Harvest is being serviced by a community well which is fast approaching the end of its useful life. I'm told it is scheduled to be replaced by a new well within a couple of years.

Please note that this area is currently designated as a water protection zone.

As a resident of Old Brock Road, I am deeply concerned that once the area is fully developed, the strain on the existing water infrastructure will be significant.

It behooves the city to delay any approvals until all of these developments are evaluated for their aggregate impact on the water supply.

At the very least, additional development should be delayed until the new community well is completed.

I await your response.

Regards,

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 31, 2026 12:27 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Cc:** lupiaed@gmail.com  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent -Files ZAC 25 037 and 25T 202508

Dear Planning Department,

As a Greenville resident for the past 23 years, I am writing to strongly urge you to reject the proposed residential development at 36 Taylor Crescent, identified under Files ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508. This proposal, which introduces 12 new homes, forms part of a larger wave of residential applications in our immediate area—12 homes at Moxley, 12 additional homes extending from Midsummers Lane on the opposite side of Spencer Creek Estates, and 5 large “mega-homes” at the corner of Crookes Hollow Road and Highway 8. Together, these developments total 29 new homes, all drawing on the same vulnerable groundwater system. Given Greenville’s designation as a protected water source region, this level of intensification poses serious risks to our aquifer, our natural environment, and the long-term well-being of existing residents.

Greenville’s aquifer, shared by hundreds of homes, is exceptionally sensitive to overuse and contamination. Recharge rates here are measured only in millimeters per year, meaning the aquifer replenishes extremely slowly. Even modest increases in residential water demand, private irrigation, and new septic or servicing loads contribute cumulatively to aquifer drawdown and contamination vulnerability.

I must also note the commercial rezoning at 417 Moxley Road. While this letter specifically objects to the Taylor Crescent applications, the Moxley proposal—together with the additional 12-unit residential proposal extending from Midsummers Lane and the 5 large homes proposed at Crookes Hollow Road and Highway 8, all within a 1 km radius—would all add to the same constrained aquifer and watershed. Any commercial development proposing to take more than 50,000 litres per day from the environment would require a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) in Ontario, with reporting of actual takings. Given the Greenville Drinking Water System’s documented sensitivity and the City’s ongoing work to ensure redundancy and reliability, Council should require the Moxley proponent to disclose peak and average day water demand, confirm whether a PTTW is required, and submit a hydrogeological impact assessment and water budget demonstrating no adverse effect on the aquifer, private wells, or baseflow-supported streams before any rezoning is considered. Unlike large industrial facilities, individual residential subdivisions may not each trigger very high daily withdrawals—but the cumulative impact of multiple new subdivisions in a slow-recharge aquifer is substantial.

These files are not substitutes for one another: addressing any one of them while approving another still drives the system toward a tipping point, where any single approval can become the “last straw” that pushes a slow-recharge system past sustainability. The only responsible path is to avoid new approvals that increase draw or impervious cover until a comprehensive, cumulative-effects review demonstrates no adverse impact.

In addition to the residential proposals, the ongoing quarry expansion and existing heavy industrial uses compound these risks. Taken together—the Taylor Crescent files, other residential applications, the potential Moxley commercial rezoning, the Rothsay industrial operation, and quarry activity—these pressures threaten water quantity (through reduced recharge and increased draw), water quality (through higher pollutant loads and sediment), and the stability of streams and waterfalls fed by groundwater baseflow. Approving the Taylor Crescent files now, amid these combined pressures, risks pushing the system past a sustainable threshold.

Your decision will either protect our water supply or put it at risk—potentially leaving residents with insufficient or contaminated water. Additionally, impervious surfaces such as large roofs and paved areas dramatically increase stormwater runoff, which reduces natural groundwater recharge and carries pollutants into connected creeks, wetlands, and aquifers. Ontario’s own stormwater planning guidance emphasizes preventing increases in runoff, preserving baseflow, and avoiding cumulative watershed impacts associated with expanding impervious cover. The City recently introduced a runoff-related tax for residents; approving a major commercial property that would generate significantly more runoff—while increasing costs for residents who contribute far less to the runoff burden—is deeply concerning.

Beyond water withdrawal, the addition of new roofs, driveways, and roadways will significantly increase impervious surface area in an already stressed watershed. Research in watershed hydrology consistently shows that increasing impervious cover elevates stormwater runoff, reduces natural groundwater recharge, and transports pollutants into connected streams and aquifers—effects Ontario’s stormwater and LID guidance seek to mitigate by preserving groundwater/baseflow and addressing cumulative impacts through watershed/subwatershed planning and low-impact development.

Past city councils worked diligently to protect Greensville’s water and limited growth for exactly these reasons. Recently, however, there appears to be increased pressure to approve developments with insufficient consideration of their environmental impact. I hope the current council will continue to prioritize sustainability over short-term growth and tax revenue.

#### **Key Environmental Risks**

- **Aquifer Vulnerability:** Recharge occurs in millimeters per year—extremely slow replenishment. Even moderate increases in demand strain the system.
- **Cumulative Residential Impact:** Multiple small developments combine to create long-term pressure on a shared aquifer.
- **Regulatory Trigger for High Draws:** Any taking over 50,000 L/day requires a PTTW; proponents must disclose peak/average demand and demonstrate no adverse effect before approvals.
- **Runoff, Recharge & Water Quality:** Increasing impervious areas raises runoff volumes and pollutant transport unless mitigated through LID/green infrastructure.
- **Industrial & Quarry Stressors:** Existing heavy industry and quarry activity add significant cumulative pressure on water quality and watershed stability.

I implore you to do the right thing: **reject Files ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508**, protect our groundwater resources, and preserve Greensville’s natural landscape and ecological stability for future generations.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, January 26, 2026 1:12 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** File No ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

Good afternoon Daniel

We received notice of plans regarding the application of development on 36 Taylor Crescent in Dundas. My wife and I own and reside at . We are not opposed to this new development in our area BUT am opposed to the ONLY one entry and one exit which will be directly in front and near our home. Prior to full residency of new home buyers moving in, there is going to be a heavy amount of construction vehicles coming and going along Taylor Cr in front of our beautiful home. This is going to make our time outside our home unbearable with the constant barrage of large heavy trucks entering and exiting daily.

I am writing to the City and the developers with concern of the sites ONLY roadway.

Can both parties consider planning the roadway off of 441 Old Brock road adjacent to OneSchool Global protected fence line and / or off 15 Spencercreek drive - Spencercreek Estates Park - at which very little park activity is ever used.

Please take ours and other neighbours (some may submit to you) concerns to heart as this barrage of construction in the coming years will be miserable and frustrating as a homeowner.

Appreciate your time

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 17, 2026 1:18 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent File ZAC-25-037 25T-202508

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

Tuesday February 17, 2026

Dear Daniel Barnett

We have serious concerns about the proposed zoning bylaw amendment of a subdivision of 12 new residential lots at 36 Taylor Crescent Flamborough, File # ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508. It is well known among local residents that water shortages are an ongoing concern, which we have also experienced in our home. With no access to municipal water services, residents are financially responsible for their own drinking water (e.g., drilled well) and sewage (e.g., septic system). Local aquifers are stressed causing year-round water shortages. Household wells are drying up. Throughout the winter, a local water truck company continues to make deliveries, filling cisterns built to supplement depleting aquifers. Why are wells running dry in the dead of winter? We need to be proactive and make responsible choices about water use. The Greensville area continues to experience challenges with water access. If this bylaw proposal is approved and 12 homes were to be built, is it guaranteed their drilled wells would have a consistent supply of good quality drinking water? How would these additional wells impact the current homes neighbouring the proposed development? A recent Toronto Star article stated "Kitchener-Waterloo's billion-dollar building industry grinds to a halt as city water shortage fears grow," shows that water issues are not unique to this area.

Shouldn't we be preserving our agricultural green space? Grasslands provide many benefits to our environment: (1) carbon sinks, sequestering carbon underground (2) provide habitats for our pollinators like bees and butterflies (3) absorb rainwater to enhance groundwater recharge and reduce flood risk (4) improve air quality. Development will destroy habitats, negatively impacting local biodiversity and water quality in the nearby watershed. Once the land is severed, the resultant housing construction will reduce permeable surfaces, increase storm runoff into Spencer Creek and disrupt local water tables.

We can't look at this proposal in isolation. We must look at the cumulative impact this proposed development and others will have for the residents. Numerous development proposals are currently being proposed in the Greensville area, all of which will impact the fragile water infrastructure. Should we build more 12 more homes in an already water sensitive area?

We need to think about the impact that our decisions will have on future generations. We are asking you to make responsible decisions this proposed bylaw change will have on our community. Protecting our green space and precious water supply should be at the forefront of any decisions being made regarding any proposed bylaw changes for development.

Sincerely,

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2026 10:34 AM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** re: 36 Taylor Crescent, Flamborough, File No: ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments.

'for the record'

With respect to the 36 Taylor Crescent 12 house project, I am FOR this development.

It will add a few much needed houses in Greenville, increase the property taxes collected and makes use of the late Red Neeb's old farm property.

It has been clearly demonstrated that there is LOTS of water, both the test well on subject land as well as the '471 Moxley' lands.

These 12 properties are MUCH larger than those on Taylor Cres. so there will not be an impact on water volume or septic systems.

Based on what happened at the Spencer Creek Estates project, it will probably take 5-10 years before all 12 lots are sold and built.

Again I am FOR this development to take place.

Sincerely

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 4, 2026 1:38 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** Drinking Water

You don't often get email from . [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hi Daniel,

My question is in regards to the drinking water for these houses. Will these houses be serviced by the City? If they are using well water. Has there been an assessment to determine if the area can support additional wells? Or, will they be required to run off of a cistern?

I ask because if allowing these houses to tap into the well water system negatively affects all the other existing homes that have been on well water for years, not only is it not fair to the current residents I also worry about the chance for a lawsuit against the City for not completing its due diligence.

I know that I would be seriously angry if a new development drained my well causing me to invest in a cistern which would be thousands of dollars that I don't have and then require me to purchase water on an ongoing basis.

Thanks

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 21, 2026 1:57 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent, Flamborough File No: ZAC-25-037 & 25T-202508

c/o Daniel Barnett, Planner 2  
Planning and Economic Development Department

Hi,  
I am contacting you as the property owner of \_\_\_\_\_ in regards to the above proposal.

In advance of the Public Meeting scheduled for April 14, would you be able to provide the information/answers to the following questions;

1. Studies showing the impact of additional wells and septic beds in the new development. With regards to wells, what is the impact of home sprinkler systems? Where will the septic beds be located?
2. Expected duration of construction (roads and buildings) and what actions are being taken to minimize disturbances (noise, dirt etc) for adjacent property owners?
3. Impact of the daily blasting / ground movement from the Quarry to new and existing structures?
4. Studies showing the impact of the new development on water drainage to existing, adjacent structures?
5. A few years ago, it looked like there were some archaeological assessments in the proposed development area. Are those available for review?

Thank you.

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 3, 2026 6:46 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Cc:** Ward 13  
**Subject:** 36 Talyor Cres - ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

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

We would like to oppose this application, on the grounds that these large homes will draw additional water from our aquifer that Greenville and Taylor Cres residents depend on. There is already issues with water and water quality and not be able to draw enough water at some homes for laundry. These types of estate homes typically use a lot of water for their lawns and gardens. Add to this the other proposal a commercial development at 471 Moxley where again residents are afraid of its water impact. At present drilling is occurring there to aid the proponents application.

I would expect the city to peer review the hydrogeological reports from this developer. Consultants for a proponent typically always side with the developer, that is why a peer review is required. Its my understanding that the city does not have the expertise on hydrogeology so therefore accepts the findings of the proponent?

Greenville has water issues for quite some time and to allow more penetration into our aquifer is unacceptable. Greenville is designated as a "Water Protection Zone" by the City. Also the issue of the City Waterfall Master Plan depends on enough water going over the falls for tourism. We understand the hydrogeological conditions of this area quite well due to a past Environmental Assessment for the Steetly Landfill in the South Quarry. The aquifer here and its fractured limestone is almost impossible to predict water flow and water level drop.

Water is a precious resource here and we cannot continue to extract it for the benefit of developers.

I represent the community as chairman under the Dundas and Greenville Environmental Concern Group.

Please advise receipt of our comments.

Thank You

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 6:55 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent Estates ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

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

Dear Daniel Barnett.

I am writing as a resident of Greenville to express my strong opposition, shared by many in our community, to the proposed 36 Taylor Crescent Estates ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

Our primary and most urgent concern is water security. This proposed development would draw from the same local aquifer that already supplies the private wells for hundreds of nearby homes. Greenville sits within a protected water source area, and our aquifer is already under strain. Many residents have experienced well failures, declining water levels, and costly repairs, with no guarantee that deeper drilling will resolve these issues.

Another concern is the permanent loss of additional agricultural land, the character of Greenville and the Greenbelt, which should be protected at all costs.

Residents specifically moved to this area because of the beauty in Greenville and agricultural/water protection.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the voices of the residents most directly impacted by this decision.

Sincerely,

Concerned Greenville Residents

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 21, 2026 5:04 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Cres, Flamborough

File No: ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508

Hello Daniel, I'm a resident of Taylor crescent. Recently moved here in may of 2025 and have lived in flamborough my entire life. As a 27 year old tradesman I am always excited about new developments. Taylor crescent holds just shy of 50 well built family homes on very generous sized lots. Enough room to have a nice lawn to enjoy many outside activities and plant a vegetable garden, but small enough to have a good relationship with the neighbours. What I cannot understand with the new subdivision is why we are building 12 large houses? We are currently in a housing crisis, and we decide to build 12 homes for only the elite to afford. My girlfriend and I are very fortunate to buy our home but we have a lot of friends and family struggling to afford their first. Building houses of this caliber gives them no hope of stepping foot inside.

Looking forward to a response, thank you.

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2026 10:29 AM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** 36 Taylor Crescent, Flamborough, and file number, ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508, of the application.

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

Dear Mr Barnett

I am supportive of the new application for the 12 houses in Greenville. I understand these are executive homes but this will help increase revenue for the city of Hamilton as well.

I would like to see more development and more mixed used that includes small businesses. We need to build up this tax base and create a sustainable community. I would like to see more affordable homes surveys and possible rentals for new tenants and retirees. If we want to traffic we need to increase opportunities for workers to live closer to their homes.

Respectfully