TO: Chair and Members Economic Development and Planning Committee
WARD(S) AFFECTED: WARD 11

COMMITTEE DATE: August 9, 2010

SUBJECT/REPORT NO:
Application for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 345 Glancaster Road (Glanbrook) (PED10180) (Ward 11)

SUBMITTED BY:
Tim McCabe
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

PREPARED BY:
Jennifer Haan
(905) 546-2424, Ext. 1230

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That approval be given to Amended Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-2010002, by Koppercreek Developments Inc., Owner, to establish a draft plan of subdivision known as “Koppercreek”, on lands located at 345 Glancaster Road (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED10180, subject to the following conditions:

(i) That this approval apply to “Koppercreek”, 25T-2010002, as red-line revised, prepared by GSP Group Ltd., and certified by S. D. McLaren, O.L.S., dated July 7, 2010, showing 1 block for street townhouse dwellings (Block 1), 1 block for block townhouse dwellings (Block 2), and 1 block for road widening purposes (Block 3), attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED10180, subject to the owner entering into a Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, as approved by City Council, and with the Special Conditions attached as Appendix “F” to Report PED10180;
(ii) Acknowledgement that there will be no City share for any municipal works associated with this development; and,

(iii) That payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required, pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning Act, and will be calculated in accordance with the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, currently at a rate of 1 hectare for each 300 dwelling units proposed, and shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the issuance of the first building permit;

all in accordance with the Financial Policies for Development and the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, as approved by Council.

(b) That approval be given to Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-10-004, by Koppercreek Developments Inc., Owner, for Official Plan Amendment No. to amend Schedule “G”, North-West Glanbrook Planning Area - Land Use Plan, from “Low Density Residential” to “Medium Density Residential” of the Glanbrook Official Plan, for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED10180, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED10180, be adopted by City Council.

(ii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

(c) That approval be given to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-10-010, by Koppercreek Developments Inc., Owner, for a change in zoning from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to the Multiple Residential “RM2-261” Zone (Block 1) and the Multiple Residential “RM3-262” Zone, to permit the development of street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings, for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED10180, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED10180, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(ii) That the amending By-law be added to Schedule “E” of Zoning By-law No. 464.
(iii) That the proposed change in zoning is in conformity with the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, and will be in conformity with the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan upon finalization of Official Plan Amendment No. 

(d) That approval be given to Official Plan Amendment Modification No. to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to amend Map B.5.3-1, North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan, from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c”, for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED10180, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED10180, be adopted by City Council.

(ii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

(iii) That should Council’s decision on the amendment occur prior to the final decision on the Official Plan by the Province, the City request the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to include these amendments in the Official Plan, and defer them until the Official Plan Amendment to the Township of Glanbrook is final and binding.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of these applications is to amend the Glanbrook Official Plan and Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, and for approval of a draft plan of subdivision to permit the development of the subject lands for street townhouses units fronting onto Kopperfield Lane and a block townhouse development fronting on a condominium road (see Appendix “A”).

The proposal has merit and can be supported since the applications are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and conform to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. The proposed development is considered to be compatible with and complementary to the existing and planned development in the immediate area. The proposed development also provides for residential intensification of an under-utilized parcel of land within the built boundary, makes efficient use of existing services, and supports the provision of providing a full range of housing types.

*Alternatives for Consideration - See Page 39.*
Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.

Values: Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork

FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL IMPLICATIONS (for Recommendation(s) only)

Financial:  N/A.

Staffing:    N/A.

Legal:       As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider an application for approval of an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND (Chronology of events)

The subject lands, totalling 1.16 hectares, are located on the north-east corner of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane. There is currently one single-detached dwelling on the subject lands, which will be demolished in order to facilitate the proposed redevelopment of the subject lands. The existing dwelling is listed in the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest. Prior to any demolition activity, the structure’s exterior and interior are to be appropriately photo-documented and accompanied by a property history documenting the settlement of the site. Two tributaries of Twenty Mile Creek traverse the site, and a row of mature spruce trees is located along the easterly lot line. Although the trees are not located on the subject lands, the branches extend over the lot line.

Initial Proposal

The applicant submitted applications for an Official Plan Amendment, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and a Draft Plan of Subdivision, to permit the development of 18 street townhouse dwellings fronting onto Kopperfield Lane and 30 block townhouse dwellings, on February 25, 2010, following the Formal Consultation Meeting in January, 2010. As a result of discussions at the informal Open House Meeting held by the applicant, and discussion with staff, the applicant has revised the application to reduce the number of street townhouse units to 15, and reconfigure the layout of block townhouses units.

Revised Proposal

The proposed plan of subdivision (see Appendix “B”) is intended to create 3 blocks: one block for street townhouse dwellings (Block 1); one block for block townhouse dwellings (Block 2); and one block for road widening purposes (Block 3). The block townhouse dwellings are intended to be condominium ownership, whereas the street townhouses will remain as freehold ownership. Future applications will be required to establish a Draft Plan of Condominium and Site Plan Control for the block townhouse development. Street townhouse dwelling units are not subject to Site Plan Control.
The proposed Official Plan Amendment application seeks to redesignate the subject lands from “Low Density Residential” to “Medium Density Residential”, while the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application seeks to change the subject lands from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM2” (see Appendix “A” - Block 1) and Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone (see Appendix “A” - Block 2). The applicant has submitted a concept plan (see Appendix “G”), and has requested a number of modifications to Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 in order to implement the proposed development of the subject lands for street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings. The proposed modifications are summarized in the charts below, and will be discussed in greater detail in the Analysis / Rationale for Recommendation section of the report (see Page 26 - Point 3).

The proposed modifications to the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for an interior unit</td>
<td>7 metres</td>
<td>6.25 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for end unit not flanking a street</td>
<td>9 metres</td>
<td>8.25 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for an interior unit</td>
<td>210 square metres</td>
<td>165 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for end unit not flanking a street</td>
<td>270 square metres</td>
<td>230 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for corner unit flanking a street</td>
<td>360 square metres</td>
<td>350 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for end unit not flanking a street</td>
<td>2 metres</td>
<td>1.25 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>7 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback to Hypotenuse of the daylight triangle</td>
<td>6.0 metres</td>
<td>3.4 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encroachment of Unenclosed Porches into the required Front and Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>1.8 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed modifications for the Multiple Residential “RM3” Zone are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35% excluding decks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>35 dwelling units/hectare</td>
<td>37 dwelling units/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
<td>9 metres</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard (Northerly Lot Line)</td>
<td>10.7 metres, where the abutting lands are zoned “ER”</td>
<td>7 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard (Easterly Lot Line)</td>
<td>10.7 metres, where the abutting lands are zoned “R3”</td>
<td>7 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Separation Distance between two exterior walls which contain no habitable rooms</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>2 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Landscaped Open Space</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting Strip/Fencing</td>
<td>A planting strip with a minimum width of 1.5 metres and/or solid fence with a height of 1.8 metres, where property adjoins lands zoned “ER” or “R3”</td>
<td>A planting strip with a minimum width of 2.0 metres and average width of 3.0 metres, where property adjoins lands zoned “R3”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Visitor Parking</td>
<td>0.5 visitor parking per unit</td>
<td>0.4 visitor parking per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of Submitted Application

**Location:** 345 Glancaster Road

**Owner:** Koppercreek Developments Inc.

**Agent:** GSP Group

**Property Description:**
- **Frontage:** 91.82 metres along Glancaster Road
  127.25 metres along Kopperfield Lane
- **Area:** 1.16 hectares
EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Lands:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Lands:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Existing Residential “ER” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Lands:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Existing Residential “ER” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single Residential “R3-140” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single Residential “R4-188” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Residential “ER” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Agricultural “A” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides policy direction of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The Planning Act requires that, in exercising any authority that affects planning matters, planning authorities shall be consistent with policy statements issued under the Act. These applications are consistent with Policy 1.1.3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, which focuses growth in settlement areas.

Policy 1.7.1(e) outlines that long-term economic prosperity will be supported by planning so that major facilities (such as airports, transportation corridors, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, industries, and aggregate activities) and sensitive lands uses are appropriately designed, buffered, and separated from each other to prevent adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, and minimize the risk to public health and safety. Staff notes that the subject lands are intended to be developed for residential purposes, are located adjacent to Glancaster Road, and are within approximately 165 metres of Twenty Road West. The proximity of the proposed land use to road noise sources triggers the requirement for a noise study. The submission of a noise study will be addressed through the inclusion of a condition of draft plan approval (see Appendix “F”- Condition 1).
Policy 2.6.1 states that significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved. Staff notes that the subject property is listed within Hamilton's Heritage Volume II as containing a residence identified as being of architectural and/or historical interest. The former Township of Glanbrook identified the structure as part of a built heritage survey undertaken in the 1980's wherein the dwelling was identified as being constructed in the 1880's, comprising a frame structure, originally clad with clapboard and stone foundation. As the dwelling is proposed to be removed, the owner will be required to submit a property history documenting the settlement of the site, along with appropriate interior and exterior photo-documentation undertaken by an appropriately qualified built heritage consultant. This requirement will be addressed through the inclusion of a condition of draft plan approval (see Appendix “F” - Condition 2).

Policy 2.6.2 outlines that development and site alteration may be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, development and site alteration, which maintains the heritage integrity of the site, may be permitted. A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, dated January 2010, and prepared by Detritus Consulting, was submitted to the Ministry of Culture and the City of Hamilton with the submission of the applications. Staff notes that the report recommended that further archaeological work be conducted to address the archaeological potential of the subject property, which will require the submission of a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment. As the Provincial interest has yet to be signed off by the Ministry and City of Hamilton, this requirement will be addressed through a condition of draft plan approval, which is included as Condition 3.4 (a)(ii) in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, subject to the applicant satisfying the conditions of approval, as listed above.

**Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Places to Grow)**

Section 1.2.2 of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2006 provides guiding principles to achieve the vision of the Plan. These guiding principles seek to “build compact, vibrant, and complete communities”, and to “optimize the use of existing and new infrastructure to support growth in a compact efficient form”. The applications are consistent with these principles, as they propose to build a more compact community by proposing a development which will intensify the development potential on an underutilized parcel of land. Additionally, staff notes that the subject lands are located within the City of Hamilton’s built boundary. Policy 2.2.3.1 states that by the year 2015, and for each thereafter, a minimum of 40% of all residential development occurring annually within each upper and single-tier municipality will be within the built-up area.
Based on the foregoing, the proposal is consistent with the general intensification policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Place to Grow).

**Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan**

The subject property is designated as “Urban Area” within the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Official Plan. Policy C-3.1 outlines that a wide range of urban uses, defined through Area Municipal Official Plans and based on full municipal services, will be concentrated in the Urban Areas. These areas are intended to accommodate approximately 96% of new residential housing units in the Region to the year 2020.

However, Policy B-9.2 states that the City shall consider the protection and preservation of regionally significant historical and cultural resources, including recognized archaeological sites, in the review of proposals for development and redevelopment. Where possible, these attributes will be incorporated into the overall design in a manner which minimizes adverse impacts and encourages maintenance and protection. As noted above, the subject lands contain a residence identified as being of architectural and/or historical interest, and is identified within Hamilton’s Heritage Volume II. A property history and photo-documentation of the dwelling is required to be submitted, and will be addressed through the inclusion of a condition of draft plan approval (see Appendix “F” - Condition 2). In addition, the submission of a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be required through a condition of draft plan approval, which is included as Condition 3.4 (a)(ii) in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

As the nature of the application is to permit intensified residential development of the property, the proposal conforms to the policies of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, subject to the applicant satisfying the conditions of approval discussed above.

**Township of Glanbrook Official Plan**

The subject property is designated “Urban Area - Residential” on Schedule “A” - Land Use Plan, and “Low Density Residential” on Schedule “G” - North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan, in the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan. The applicant is proposing to redesignate the subject lands from “Low Density Residential” to “Medium Density Residential” in the Secondary Plan to permit the development of street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings.

The following policies of the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan, among others, are applicable to the proposed development:
“B.2.1 RESIDENTIAL

B.2.1.1 The predominant use of lands designated Residential on Schedule "A" - Land Use Plan shall be residential dwellings. It is intended that the Township provide for a variety and mix of housing types to address all housing needs throughout the Township, including but not limited to, single-detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, townhouses and apartments. Innovative housing types may also be considered by Council.

B.2.1.6 With respect to residential design Council shall encourage:

(a) The preservation of the existing vegetation, the natural topography, and the existing drainage patterns to minimize any potential ponding or flooding of lands;

(b) Residential development proposals which are innovative in design and/or materials and which are effective in reducing the cost of housing, without lowering the standard of development in the Township;

(c) The provision of affordable housing by considering appropriate planning and engineering measures which can be demonstrated to be beneficial in reducing the cost of housing, without lowering the standard of development in the Township; and,

(d) The provision of internal walkways and bikeways in the residential areas to provide access to commercial, community, institutional, and open space uses.

B.2.1.10 The specific residential density for lands designated "Residential" in this Plan will be initially identified and delineated in the applicable Secondary Plan as Low, Medium, or High Density Residential development areas, and will be incorporated into this Plan by way of an amendment.

Net residential density refers to the number of dwelling units per net residential hectare of any particular development or redevelopment. In the case of single-detached, semi-detached, duplex, triplex, and street townhouse dwellings fronting on a public road, net residential density includes only the land for residential lots, and excludes lands for public roads, public park lands and hazard lands, and public stormwater management areas. In the case of single-detached, semi-detached, duplex, triplex, and townhouse dwellings not fronting on a public road (e.g. forming part of a private condominium development), and any other housing form, net residential density includes the lands for dwellings,
private internal roads, parking areas, open space, and other associated amenities directly related to and forming part of the development and/or redevelopment.

Within each residential density designation, the Zoning By-law will restrict the use of any site to one or more of the dwelling unit types permitted within that designation. Such restrictions will be implemented to preserve the character of a neighbourhood and compatibility of a dwelling unit type with surrounding existing and proposed land uses.

### B.2.1.11

The following policies identify the range of net residential densities and the general locational criteria for each of the density categories:

(b) Medium Density Residential

Medium Density Residential development shall be comprised predominantly of a variety of multiple dwelling unit types including townhouse dwellings and all other forms of horizontal multiple dwellings. The density range for medium density residential development shall be 26 to 40 units per net residential hectare (11 to 16 units per net residential acre).

In locating new medium density residential development, consideration shall be given to the following criteria:

(i) Medium density development should abut or be within a reasonable distance from arterial and/or collector roads;

(ii) The availability of public transit services should be within reasonable walking distances;

(iii) The availability of adequate and direct pedestrian access to other required community facilities such as shopping areas, schools, churches, and parks; and,

(iv) Medium density residential development shall be sensitively integrated with and adequately buffered from adjacent land uses.

### B.2.1.17 Housing Types

(a) Housing opportunities within the Township must be responsive to a variety of housing needs. Council is committed to providing a variety of housing opportunities suitable to a wide range of housing
needs for its residents. In this regard, it is intended that the Township provide for a variety and mix of housing types including, but not limited to, single-detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, townhouses, apartments, and special needs housing.

(b) New residential development that provides tenure options and a range of prices/rents for new dwellings that will be affordable to Township of Glanbrook residents shall be encouraged.

B.2.1.19 Residential Intensification

(a) Residential Intensification according to the Provincial Policy Statement on Land Use Planning for Housing is defined as the creation of new residential units or accommodation in existing buildings or on previously developed, serviced land, generally including, but not limited to the following:

(i) Creation of lodging houses;
(ii) Creation of accessory apartments;
(iii) Conversion of non-residential structures to residential use;
(iv) Infill; and,
(v) Redevelopment.

(b) Residential intensification shall be encouraged on the lands identified on Schedule "F" - SPECIAL HOUSING POLICY AREAS as Non-Residential Areas, Existing Residential Areas, and New Communities, subject to the following general criteria:

(i) The physical ability of the existing building and/or site to accommodate the identified form of residential intensification;

(ii) The ability of the existing municipal and community services to accommodate new households in the affected area; and,

(iii) The potential demand for the types of accommodation which could be produced through various forms of residential intensification based upon the housing needs of the municipality.

(c) Council supports and encourages residential development such as infilling, redevelopment, and the conversion of residential and non-residential structures that make more efficient use of the existing building stock and/or physical infrastructure provided the
development is compatible and complementary to the established development pattern.

(f) Council supports and encourages all forms of Residential Intensification within the New Communities, as identified on Schedule "F" - SPECIAL HOUSING POLICY AREAS, subject to the pertinent criteria established in Policy B.2.1.17.”

As outlined above, the “Residential” designation is intended to provide for a variety and mix of housing types, including townhouses, to address all housing needs throughout the former Township. Residential Intensification is also encouraged provided it is compatible and complementary to the established development pattern. The proposal to redesignate the subject lands to “Medium Density Residential” provides a density of 39.8 units per hectare, which falls within the density range of the “Medium Density Residential” designation. The proposal to permit the development of townhouse dwellings meets the intent of the policies of the “Residential” designation, as it adds to the mix of housing types/tenures in the existing neighbourhood in a form of development that is compatible and complementary to existing development, as discussed in greater detail in the Analysis / Rationale for Recommendation section of the report (see Page 25 - Point 2).

“B.2.1.25 North-West Glanbrook Planning Area

B.2.1.25.1 Development Objectives

The following Objectives constitute the fundamental guidelines which shall direct the development of the North-West Glanbrook Planning Area:

(a) Residential

(i) To create residential areas consisting of a range of housing types with predominantly low density residential development along with some medium density residential development. Some limited high density residential development shall also be permitted with regard to, among other matters, compatibility with adjacent land uses.

(iii) To provide a variety of housing at a range of prices including affordable residential units.

(iv) Future residential development shall consider and be sensitive to existing residential development, and shall also provide for the redevelopment of the vacant portions of existing large lot residential development.

Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.
Values: Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork
(v) To integrate the residential areas with parkland in order to provide a convenient, safe, and visually pleasing living environment.

(vi) To ensure that future residents of residential development are advised of the proximity of the Hamilton Airport and the potential for noise nuisance, at times, related to Airport activity.

(e) Engineering Services

To provide new development with adequate full municipal services including sanitary sewers, watermains, stormwater drainage facilities and utilities, in a coordinated, comprehensive, and environmentally sound manner.

(f) Environmental

(i) To ensure that all development is undertaken in an environmentally sound manner.

(ii) To take advantage of the natural features of sites by integrating existing wooded areas into development in a manner which will enhance the aesthetic qualities and enable the natural features to retain their environmental functions.

B.2.1.25.2 Development Policies

(a) Residential

The majority of the North-West Glanbrook Planning Area shall be developed for residential purposes. Lands designated Residential shall be developed in accordance with Schedule "G" - North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan, the pertinent policies of the Township Official Plan, and the following specific policies:

(i) Residential development within the North-West Glanbrook Secondary Planning Area shall proceed on the basis of providing for a total population of approximately 5,600 persons.
(ii) Housing opportunities within this Secondary Planning Area must be responsive to a variety of housing needs. Council is committed to providing a variety of housing opportunities suitable to a wide range of housing needs for its residents. In this regard, it is intended that this Planning Area provide for a variety and mix of housing types, including, but not limited to, single-detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, townhouses, apartments, and special needs housing.

(iv) The rear portion of existing large lot residential development fronting Glancaster Road and Twenty Road West shall be encouraged to be redeveloped in conformity with the designation identified on Schedule "G" North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan and in conformity with the other relevant policies of this Plan.

(v) To minimize conflicts, new residential development proposed to be developed contiguous to the existing large lot residential development shall be restricted to low density residential development.

(vii) The housing types and density and development for the Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and High Density Residential designations shall be in accordance with Policies B.2.1.10 and B.2.1.11 of the Township Official Plan and the following specific policies:

(1) The predominant form of residential development within the North-West Glanbrook Planning Area shall be Low Density Residential development, as designated on Schedule "G" - North West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan.

(ix) Future residents of residential development are advised that the Hamilton Airport is located approximately 1.6 kilometres (1 mile) south of Twenty Road West, which is the southern boundary of the North-West Glanbrook Planning Area and, as a result, there is the potential for noise nuisance, at times, related to airport activity. A warning clause to advise of this potential noise nuisance related to Airport activity shall be registered on title for residential development lands.
(e) Public Transportation

Council shall encourage the provision of public transportation facilities to service the North-West Glanbrook Planning Area at such time as the need and economic level of demand is demonstrated.

(h) Environment

(ii) The preservation of existing significant vegetation shall be encouraged by designing the future development in a manner so as to incorporate this vegetation as a natural and aesthetic component of the development.”

The proposal is consistent with the Secondary Plan objectives, as it expands the mix of dwelling types in the neighbourhood in a form of development that is considerate of the existing development pattern in the neighbourhood. The proposed development provides for a compatible built form that incorporates smaller groups of street townhouse dwellings along Kopperfield Lane, as well as consistent building height and adequate parking requirements in order to minimize conflicts with existing development. To address the potential noise nuisance generated from the airport, staff has recommended a specific condition of approval (see Appendix “F” - Condition 3), which requires the owner to include a noise warning clause in all purchase of sale and/or lease agreements. The proposal also preserves the existing significant vegetation by proposing a 2.0 metre setback from the drip line and further rear yard setback to the proposed block townhouse units. The Secondary Plan did not identify any development or redevelopment opportunities for the subject lands, or the abutting lands immediately to the north. In this regard, the Residential Intensification Polices and Residential Policies have been applied in evaluating the application.

Therefore, the proposal for street and block townhouse development conforms to the “Residential” designation and Secondary Plan policies in the Glanbrook Official Plan.

New Urban Hamilton Official Plan

The proposal has been evaluated against the policies of the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan, which was adopted by Council on July 9, 2009, and is currently awaiting approval from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The subject lands are designated “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule ‘E-1’ Urban Land Use Designations, which permits residential dwellings, open space and parks, local community facilities/services, and local commercial uses. In addition, the lands are designated “Low Density Residential 2” on Map B.5.3-1, North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan, which permits singles, semis, duplex, triplex, and street town homes, at a density of not more than 25 units per net residential hectare. As the proposed development would
not conform to the Secondary Plan, a modification to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan would be required, as per Recommendation (e) of this Report (see Page 3).

Once a final decision is given by the Province, the Official Plan can no longer be modified. The timing of the final decision is unknown and, therefore, it affects how and when changes to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan can be made.

**Prior to a final decision:**

If Council makes a decision before the final decision, staff, through the Council decision, can request the Province to incorporate the changes, but defer the changes until such time as the changes to the existing Official Plans are final and binding. Since the modification process is not a public process, and appeals are limited to persons who requested notification of the final decision, it is preferable to ensure the Official Plan Amendments to the existing plans has completed the appeals process. In addition, should there be any appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board, and changes made to the Official Plan policies or designations, then such changes could be incorporated into the new Plan.

**After the final decision:**

If Council approves the Official Plan Amendments after the final decision is made, then staff would hold these changes in abeyance until such time as we could request the Ontario Municipal Board to amend the Official Plan, based on prior Council approval, or incorporate them, through a future housekeeping amendment, if the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is not appealed to the Board.

It is prudent and part of natural justice to identify any changes to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan as part of the public notice, in the staff report, and notice of adoption.

The proposal has also been evaluated in light of the policies of Section B.2.4 Residential Intensification, as listed below:

```
"2.4.1.4 Residential intensification developments shall be evaluated based on the following criteria:

  a) The relationship of the proposal to existing neighbourhood character so that it maintains, and where possible, enhances and builds upon desirable established patterns and built form;

  b) The development’s contribution to maintaining and achieving a range of dwelling types and tenures;
```
c) The compatible integration of the development with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form, and character. In this regard, the City encourages the use of innovative and creative urban design techniques;

d) The development’s contribution to achieving the planned urban structure as described in Section E.2.0 - Urban Structure;

e) Infrastructure and transportation capacity; and,

f) The ability of the development to comply with all applicable policies."

It is noted that the provisions of the North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan were carried forward in the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan, and as previously noted, an amendment to the Secondary Plan is required to redesignate the subject lands from the “Low Density Residential 2” designation to the “Low Density Residential 2c” to permit the subject lands to be developed for street and block townhouse units. The new Urban Hamilton Official Plan defines ‘compatibility’ as “land uses and building forms that are mutually tolerant and capable of existing together in harmony within an area. Compatibility or compatible should not be narrowly interpreted to mean ‘the same as’ or even as ‘being similar to’. " The proposal meets the intensification policies of the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan as it contributes to achieving a range of dwelling types and tenures; the development contributes to intensification in the built-up area, it is compatible in terms of setbacks, height, scale, massing, and parking; and is serviced by full municipal services along an arterial and local road.

**Staging of Development**

The property is not included in the Staging of Development Plan. The Staging of Development Plan allows unscheduled applications to be processed if the plans advance the City’s goals for intensification, the application is not deemed premature from a servicing perspective, and staff resources can be allocated to it.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION**

The following Departments and Agencies had no concerns or objections:

- Hamilton Municipal Parking System.
- Taxation Division, Corporate Services Department.
- Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.
- Hydro One.
The following Departments and Agencies were circulated, but did not provide comments:

- Hamilton Police Services.
- Emergency Services.
- Hamilton-Wentworth Separate School Board.
- French Catholic School Board.
- French Public School Board.
- Union Gas.

The following Departments and Agencies submitted the following comments:

**The Forestry and Horticulture Section, Public Works Department**, advises that there are numerous Municipal Tree Assets located on the road allowance of Kopperfield Lane, but no trees located on the existing or future road allowance of Glancaster Road. Among the trees located on the Kopperfield Lane road allowance are Linden, Hickory, Ash, and Aspen species found to be in varying conditions. An Oak in good condition was observed, and there may be additional municipal trees that were not captured in the tree inventory.

A Tree Management Plan, prepared by a Landscape Architect, is required, and all trees within this proposed development area must be surveyed, identified, and accurately plotted on the plan. As the trees are located along Kopperfield Lane, and the street townhouse dwellings are not subject to Site Plan Control, this requirement has been included as a condition of draft plan approval (see Appendix “F” - Condition 4).

A Street Tree Planting Plan will be required for the units fronting Kopperfield Lane, which is included as a condition in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement (Clause 2.8). A Landscape Plan will be required for internal works, which will be dealt with at the Site Plan Control stage.

Of particular note, is the row of Spruce running north along the easterly lot line adjacent to 14 Kopperfield Lane. The homeowner has contacted the City with their concern for their well-being. The determination of ownership of all trees is the responsibility of the applicant, and any civil issues which may exist between the property owners with respect to trees must also be resolved by the applicant. In order to ensure their preservation, mitigation measures, as recommended in the Scoped Environmental Impact Study, must be adhered to, as per Draft Plan Condition 16 (see Appendix “F”), and increased setbacks are imposed through the implementing Zoning By-law.

**Canada Post** advises that the subdivision will receive mail service to a centralized mail facility provided through the Community Mailbox program. The standard conditions of approval are included in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement (Clause 1.22).
The Operations and Waste Management Division, Public Works Department, advises that the subdivision is eligible for collection of garbage, organics, recycling, and leaf and yard waste through the City of Hamilton, subject to compliance with specifications indicated by the Operations and Waste Management Division, and subject to compliance with the City’s garbage container limits. Blue box and green cart recycling is mandatory. The level of service for municipal waste collection will depend on the usage of the buildings within the subdivision. This will be addressed at the Site Plan Control stage.

The Environmental and Strategic Infrastructure Division, Public Works Department, provided the following comments:

The Environmental Planning Section advised that the subject lands are not located within an existing Environmental Assessment study area; at this time, the application does not appear to necessitate a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment study.

The Landscape Architectural Services Section advised that Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland Dedication is required. This requirement is included in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement (Section 1.6) and as Recommendation (a)(iii).

The Rapid Transit Team advised of a potential expansion of higher order rapid transit along Rymal Road in the long term. From a rapid transit perspective, the proposed development of a multi residential block does not impact the corridor and does not compromise the potential for development of this corridor for higher order rapid transit.

The Infrastructure and Source Water Planning Section, Public Works Department, advised that a system is available on Kopperfield Lane across approximately 25 metres of the subject property’s frontage. From PRISM drainage plan 98-S-58_4, provision for 2.15 hectares at 75 persons per hectare has been included in the sizing of the Kopperfield system. This provision appears to also include 305 and 315 Glancaster to the north. The density for the subject site is estimated at 100 persons per hectare on 48 units based on 3.0 persons per unit, and 117 persons per hectare based on 3.5 persons per unit. These densities exceed the capacity provision in the Kopperfield system.

The proposal can be supported on condition that re-development of 305 and 315 Glancaster Road are serviced by a different system, the options being:

1) The extension of a system southerly on Glancaster Road from the Grassysplain Drive intersection;

2) The extension of a system southerly and westerly along Street “A”, shown on the concept plan; and,
3) The extension of a system westerly on Kopperfield Lane and northerly on Glancaster Road.

The street townhouse units in the south-easterly corner of the subject lands can be readily serviced by the existing system on Kopperfield Lane. The remaining street townhouse units will require the extension of the sewer westerly on Kopperfield Lane to Glancaster Road. The block townhouse units are readily serviceable by a private yard sewer connected to the Kopperfield Lane sewer.

**The Traffic Engineering Section, Public Works Department**, requires as a condition of draft plan approval that all driveways be located, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Traffic Engineering. The driveway locations must be shown on approved engineering drawings submitted with the registered Subdivision Agreement. This requirement has been included as a condition of draft plan approval (see Appendix “F” - Condition 5).

**Bell Canada** has requested the standard conditions of approval, which are included in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement (Section 1.21(c)).

**The Hamilton Street Railway (HSR)** advised that, at the present time, there is no plan to extend or present fixed route bus service to the Glancaster area. As a result of the HSR Operational Review presentation made to Council in October, 2009, staff is presently working to provide the City with a plan to improve and develop public transit services in Hamilton over the next five years, consistent with the City’s vision of sustainable development and the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan. A range of route and service improvement options for the 2010 to 2014 time period are being reviewed.

**The Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority** advised that the subject property is impacted by two tributaries of Twenty Mile Creek. As such, the property is subject to Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shoreline and Watercourses (O. Reg. 155/06). The watercourses are classified as a Type 2 Important Fish Habitat, and thus require a 15 metre setback. A reduction in this setback would require the completion of a scoped Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Authority is open to the relocation of the watercourse, but will require engineering drawings and natural channel design. The relocated feature will require a 15 metre setback unless an EIS can confirm otherwise. As discussed in the Analysis / Rational for Recommendation section of the report (see Page 33 - Point 6), a Scoped EIS was submitted, and the proposed relocation of the two tributaries accepted by the NPCA, subject to satisfying the required conditions of draft plan approval (see Appendix “F” - Conditions 16 - 21).
PUBLIC CONSULTATION

In accordance with the new provisions of the Planning Act and the Public Participation Policy approved by Council, 71 Notices of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation were sent to property owners within 120 metres of the subject property on March 19, 2010, requesting public input on the application. To date, 26 letters of objection and a petition containing 172 signatures have been received (see Appendix “H”). The letters expressed concerns related to increased traffic (safety, congestion), lack of on-street parking, devaluation of property values, compatibility with existing low density development, drainage issues and possible servicing restraints, obstructing natural flow of tributaries, impacts on existing tree line, lack of greenspace and community facilities, and dust from construction. This is discussed in greater detail in the Analysis / Rationale For Recommendation section of this report (see Page 35 - Point 8).

Further, a Public Notice sign was posted on the property on April 9, 2010, and Notice of the Public Meeting was given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

Based on the concerns raised by the residents as a result of the circulation of the application, the applicant held a neighbourhood meeting on May 5, 2010. The concerns brought forth at the meeting were similar to the concerns identified in the objection letters received from the residents. It was suggested at the meeting that the residents form a working group containing community representatives to work with the applicant in an effort to mitigate the issues raised. A community group, Kopper Creek Citizens Committee (KCCC), was formed and hosted several informal meetings, which staff attended, to provide information and guidance through the planning process. The KCCC also met with the agent to discuss their concerns in greater detail.

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

(include Performance Measurement/Benchmarking Data, if applicable)

1. The proposal has merit and can be supported for the following reasons:

   • It is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

   • It provides for residential intensification within the built boundary of the urban area, which is consistent with the intent of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

   • It conforms with and implements the “Urban Area” designation of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.
• It conforms to the “Residential” designation, and implements the intensification policies of the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan, which also supports the provision of a full range of housing types.

• It is compatible with and complementary to the existing and proposed residential character of the surrounding neighbourhood.

• It represents efficient use of an underutilized parcel of land and makes efficient use of existing services.

2. The applicant has applied for an amendment to the Glanbrook Official Plan to redesignate the subject lands from “Low Density Residential” to “Medium Density Residential” on Schedule “G” - North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan. The amendment is required to permit the development of street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings on the subject lands. The proposed development provides a density of 39.8 units per hectare, which falls within the “Medium Density Residential” range of 26 to 40 units per hectare.

Policy B.2.1.11(b) provides guidance in locating new medium density residential, and advises that consideration shall be given to the following:

• It should abut or be within a reasonable distance from arterial and/or collector roads;

• The availability of public transit services should be within reasonable walking distances;

• The availability of adequate and direct pedestrian access to other required community facilities such as shopping areas, schools, churches, and parks; and,

• It shall be sensitively integrated with and adequately buffered from adjacent land uses.

Staff notes that the proposed development is adjacent to Glancaster Road, which is an arterial road and adjacent to Kopperfield Lane, which serves as one of the two access points into the neighbourhood from Glancaster Road. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed development is adequately buffered from and sensitivity integrated with the existing development as it is providing large setbacks from the existing development to the north and east, and is adequately buffered by the existing row of mature spruce trees along the easterly lot line. Where there is a break in the existing row of spruce trees, enhanced landscaping will be required to be provided through the review of the Landscape Plan at the Site Plan Control stage. In addition, the layout of the block townhouses are in
such a way that the only one proposed block townhouse dwelling is adjacent to the rear yards of the two abutting properties on Bellstone Lane (see Appendix “G”). The height of the proposed units is restricted to 2 storeys, which respects and complements the existing building height in the neighbourhood, and there will be no negative impacts from shadowing or overlook. The front yard setbacks are also consistent with existing development to the east and south, and the grouping of street townhouse dwellings will be restricted to a maximum of four units in a continuous row, thereby limiting the massing of built form and providing a consistent streetscape character along Kopperfield Lane.

Staff notes that there is no public transit that directly serves the existing neighbourhood or the proposed development, as the nearest bus stop is located just south of Rymal Road, approximately 1 km north of the subject lands. Comments received from Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) advised that there is no planned extension of bus routes to service the Glancaster area. Staff notes that this criteria is a consideration and not a requirement in locating increased densities. The existing neighbourhood was planned and developed in the absence of public transit, and the Secondary Plan policies “encourage the provision of public transportation facilities to service the North-West Glanbrook Planning area at such time as the need and economic level of demand is demonstrated”. There is also adequate community facilities, shopping opportunities within the proximity of the subject lands, the majority of which are located in the Rymal Road vicinity. A future commercial block is located on the northwest corner of Twenty Road and Garth Street. A number of elementary and secondary schools (St. Therese of Lisieux, Corpus Christi, R.A. Riddell, Sir Allan McNab, Hamilton District Christian High School, and Bishop Tonnos) and churches are also located in close vicinity to the subject lands. There is a neighbourhood park (Kopperfield Park) located at the corner of Idlewilde Lane and Bellstone Lane, and a City Wide park (Turner Park) located north of the subject land off Rymal Road. An amenity area has also been identified within the block townhouse development. Based on the above, staff is of the opinion that the proposal meets the intent of the guiding criteria for locating new medium density residential development.

Policies B.2.1.17 and B.2.1.19 promote the provision of providing a range of housing opportunities and promote residential intensification through infill and redevelopment. Staff notes that the surrounding neighbourhood is predominately low density residential, with a small cluster of medium density residential internal to the neighbourhood in the form of street townhouse dwellings. The proposed development provides for a greater mix of housing types and tenures in the neighbourhood. Staff is also of the opinion that the proposal represents residential intensification in the form of infill and redevelopment of an underutilized parcel of land, consistent with Provincial legislation. The appropriateness of residential intensification can be measured in terms of how
the proposal is compatible and complementary to existing development. Compatibility with the existing neighbourhood is of important consideration, however, does not imply the development has to be identical to existing development. Compatibility implies land uses and built forms that are “mutually tolerant and capable of existing together in harmony”. Compatibility can be measured in terms of built form, density, character, traffic, and parking.

Staff considers the proposed development, as amended by staff, an appropriate form of intensification as it provides a gradation of densities into the neighbourhood and along an arterial street. The proposed development in the form of townhouses is not incompatible with the adjacent single-detached dwellings, and staff notes that the new Council adopted Urban Hamilton Official Plan considers street townhouse dwellings as a low density residential use. Staff also draws attention to the existing development at Villages of Glancaster, which provides a mix of dwelling forms (singles, townhouses, low rise apartment etc.) that are compatible and harmoniously co-exist. There will be minimal traffic impact on the existing neighbourhood from the block townhouse development as the main access is located off Glancaster Road. The street townhouse dwellings are located at the entrance to the neighbourhood and, therefore, traffic will not penetrate the local streets. Staff notes that the minimum parking requirements for the street townhouse dwellings are being provided and, as a condition of draft plan approval, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that adequate on-street parking will be provided. The block townhouse development will also provide adequate parking as each unit will provide a minimum of two parking spaces per unit, and the minimal reduction in visitor parking is compensated through the provision of 1-½ car garages and double width driveways on the corner units. The draft Airport Employment Area Growth District Secondary Plan identifies the lands on the west side of Glancaster Road as being planned for “Prestige Business”, “Utility”, and “Core Area”. The “Prestige Business” designation would permit research and development, warehousing, business/financing services, prestige/light industry, warehousing and transportation, communication and government services uses. As such, the proposed development would provide for a transition from any future employment uses to the west and the existing low density residential uses to the east.

Policy B.2.1.25.2(v) states “to minimize conflicts, new residential development proposed to be developed contiguous to the existing large lot residential development shall be restricted to low density residential development. Staff notes that only the northerly lot line of the subject lands is adjacent to an existing large lot residential development. To minimize impacts, staff has ensured that an appropriate yard setback is maintained and that fencing and enhanced landscaping will be provided and reviewed, in detail, at the Site Plan Control Stage. This will provide an adequate buffer, and staff does not feel the proposed development will negatively impact the existing development to the north. Staff
also notes that the lands to the north also have future redevelopment potential. Additionally, staff notes that the prevailing form of residential development in the neighbourhood remains low density residential, as per Policy B.2.1.25.2(vii)(1).

3. Based on the concept plan submitted with the application (see Appendix “G”), the applicant has requested the following modifications:

**Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone - Street Townhouse Dwellings (Block 1)**

- Reduce the minimum lot frontage for an interior unit from the required 7 metres to a minimum 6.25 metres;

- Reduce the minimum lot frontage for an end unit not abutting a flanking street from the required 9 metres to a minimum 8.25 metres;

- Reduce the minimum lot area for an interior unit from the required 210 square metres to a minimum 165 square metres;

- Reduce the minimum lot area for an end unit not abutting a flanking street from the required 270 square metres to a minimum 230 square metres;

- Reduce the minimum lot area for an end unit abutting a flanking street from the required 360 square metres to a minimum 350 square metres;

- Increase the maximum lot coverage from the required 35% to a maximum of 52%;

- Reduce the minimum front yard setback from the required 7.5 metres to a minimum 6.0 metres;

- Reduce the minimum side yard for an end unit not abutting a flanking street from the required 2 metres to a minimum 1.25 metres;

- Permit a minimum 3.4 metre setback to the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle;

- Reduce the minimum rear yard setback from the required 7.5 metres to a minimum 7.0 metres; and,

- Restrict the number of dwelling units attached in a continuous row to a maximum of four.
Lot Frontage and Lot Area

The applicant is requesting to reduce the minimum lot frontage and lot area requirements for the interior and end street townhouse units. Staff is of the opinion that the requested modifications are minor in nature and will not impact the streetscape character of the existing neighbourhood. The proposed reductions will also maintain an appropriate building envelope where on-site parking, sufficient area for access and drainage, and adequate amenity area can all be accommodated on site. In addition, a modification to restrict the grouping of street townhouse units to a maximum of four units in a continuous row has also been included in the amending By-law to control the built form along Kopperfield Lane to ensure massing is compatible with the existing single-detached dwellings to the south and east.

Yard Setbacks

The applicant is requesting to reduce the minimum front yard setback from the required 7.5 metres to a minimum 6.0 metres. The general intent and purpose of the By-law is to require a minimum front yard setback to ensure dwelling units maintain a consistent setback and provide sufficient space for on-site parking and landscaping. Staff notes that the existing residential development to the east and south of the subject lands (R3-140 and R4-188) permits a minimum 6 metre setback. The proposed reduction is consistent with existing built form, and provides for appropriate on-site parking and landscaping. The applicant is also requesting to reduce the minimum rear yard setback from the required 7.5 metres to a minimum 7.0 metres. The general intent and purpose of the By-law is to provide for adequate landscaping and rear yard amenity area. Staff is of the opinion that adequate amenity area will still be provided, and the reduction can be supported.

The applicant has also requested to reduce the minimum side yard setback for end units from the required 2.0 metres to a minimum 1.25 metres. Staff is of the opinion that the requested modification is minor, and will still provide adequate width for access, maintenance, and drainage purposes. A 9.0 metre x 9.0 metre daylight triangle at the intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane is required as a condition of draft plan approval. As a result of the dedication to the City of Hamilton, the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle becomes a side lot line, therefore, a setback of 6.0 metres is required. The applicant is requesting a 3.4 metre setback with further encroachment of an unenclosed porch. Staff is of the opinion that the setback will not impact visibility at the corner, as no encroachments into the daylight triangle are proposed.
Lot Coverage

An increase in lot frontage is also required for the interior and end units. Staff notes that the reduced yard setbacks create the need for an increase to the maximum lot coverage requirements. As a result, the increase in lot coverage can be supported by staff.

Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone - Block Townhouse Dwellings (Block 2)

- Increase the maximum lot coverage from the required 30% to a maximum of 35%;

- Increase the maximum density from the required 35 dwelling units per hectare to a maximum 37 dwelling units per hectare;

- Reduce the minimum front yard setback from the required 9 metres to a minimum 6 metres;

- Permit an unenclosed porch to encroach into the required front yard a maximum of 1.8 metres;

- Reduce the minimum side yard setback from the required 7.5 metres (along the southerly lot line), and required 10.7 metres adjacent to lands zoned Existing Residential “ER” (along the northerly lot line), to a minimum 7.0 metres;

- Reduce the minimum rear yard setback from the required 10.7 metres adjacent to lands zoned Residential “R3” (along the easterly lot line) to a minimum 7.0 metres;

- Reduce the minimum separation distance between two exterior walls, which contain no windows to habitable rooms, from the required 3.0 metres to a minimum 2.5 metres;

- Reduce the minimum landscape area from the required 50% to a minimum 40%; and,

- Reduce the minimum visitor parking spaces from the required 15 spaces to a minimum of 13 spaces.
Yard Setbacks

The applicant is proposing a reduction to the minimum front yard setback from the required 9 metres to a minimum 6 metres, with further encroachment of an unenclosed porch. Staff supports the proposed reductions, as they are consistent with the setbacks for the street townhouse dwellings and will provide a consistent streetscape along Glancaster Road. The applicant is requesting a reduction in the separation distance between units from the required 3.0 metres to a minimum 2.5 metres. The general purpose and intent of the By-law is to ensure there is adequate space for access, privacy, drainage, and maintenance purposes. Additionally, the applicant is proposing a reduction to the southerly side yard setback from the required 7.5 metres to a minimum 7.0 metres. As shown in the concept plan (see Appendix “G”), the yard adjacent to the southerly lot line serves as the rear yard for the two groups of block townhouse units. The proposed reduction will provide appropriate amenity area for the individual units. Staff supports the reduced side yard and separation between units, as they are considered minor and they are internal to the proposed block townhouse development. The proposed reductions will not have an impact on the existing neighbourhood.

The applicant is proposing to reduce the northerly side yard and easterly rear yard setbacks from the required 10.7 metres to a minimum of 7.0 metres. Staff notes that the Zoning By-law currently requires increased setbacks between multiple residential and single residential in order to provide adequate buffering between the different built forms and densities. Based on the concept plan, the majority of dwelling units adjacent to the northerly lot line are maintaining a setback of 9.7 metres, and only three of the units will be setback 7.0 metres. The southerly group of townhouses are exceeding the minimum rear yard setback along the easterly lot line (see Appendix “G”). Staff is supportive of the proposed northerly side yard setback of 9.7 metres, as it is a minor deviation from the required setback and adequate buffering is still being provided. Staff notes that the layout of the townhouses can be revised to meet the minimum side yard setback of 9.7 metres by modifying the design of the vehicular turn-around at the end of the condominium road. The end unit of the northerly group of townhouse units is proposed to be located 7.0 metres from the rear lot line, whereas the By-law requires a minimum setback of 10.7 metres where the Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone abuts a property zoned Residential “R3” Zone. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed 7.0 metre rear yard provides adequate setback and buffering between the proposed townhouse unit and the existing residential dwelling to the east. Staff further notes that at the Site Plan Control stage, enhanced landscaping treatment will be provided along the easterly lot line to ensure adequate buffering is provided.
Lot Coverage and Maximum Density

As a result of the requested modifications to the yard setbacks, a modification to the maximum lot coverage and maximum density are also required. Staff supports the increase in lot coverage to a maximum of 35%, as it is considered minor. Staff is also supportive of the minor increase in density, to a maximum of 37 units per hectare, as it remains within the density requirements, as per the Official Plan.

Landscaped Area

The applicant is proposing a reduction in the minimum landscaped area from the required 50% to a minimum of 40%. Staff support the proposed reduction as there is adequate space on the site to provide enhanced landscaping, namely along the front lot line and in the widened limits of Glancaster Road, along the northerly lot line and within the designated amenity area, and along the easterly lot line to enhance the existing tree line.

Parking Requirements

The applicant has requested a reduction to the number of required visitor parking spaces from the required 15 parking spaces to a minimum of 13 parking spaces (0.5 parking spaces per unit / 30 units). Staff notes that each of the 30 block townhouse units will provide one parking space within the garage and one parking space in the driveway, as required by the Zoning By-law. Further, the corner units along Glancaster Road will provide a double width driveway and 1-½ car garage, which will provide additional parking on site. It can also be determined at the Site Plan Control Stage whether some of the end units can be revised to include the double width driveway and 1-½ car garage. Based on the above, staff is satisfied that adequate parking will be provided on site for the proposed development.

4. The proposed subdivision will consist of three blocks: one block for the proposed street townhouse units (Appendix “B” - Block 1); one block for the proposed block townhouse development (Appendix “B” - Block 2); and one block for road widening purposes (Appendix “B” - Block 3). The existing width of Glancaster Road adjacent to the subject lands is 66 feet (20.12 metres). The ultimate road width of Glancaster Road is 86 feet (26.21 metres). Therefore, a road widening dedication of 10 feet (3.048 metres) is required. In addition, a 9.0 metre x 9.0 metre daylight triangle at the intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane is required to be dedicated from the subject lands for road widening purposes (see Appendix “F” - Conditions 6 and 7).
A preliminary Functional Servicing Report (FSR), dated February, 2010, prepared by AMEC, was submitted in support of the application. Currently, there is an existing 300mm watermain on Kopperfield Lane and a 200mm watermain on Glancaster Road available to service the subject lands. The street townhouse units can be serviced on a lot-by-lot basis from the existing watermain on Kopperfield Lane. The block townhouse units will be serviced by a new private watermain with a connection to the existing watermain on Kopperfield Lane and may be looped to the existing watermain on Glancaster Road. Prior to any development proceeding, the applicant will be required to provide detailed engineering drawings, which will be reviewed and finalized prior to registration of the plan of subdivision.

There are no sanitary or storm sewers on Glancaster Road immediately adjacent to the subject lands. External storm runoff is currently conveyed via a 900mm CSP culvert crossing Glancaster Road, and continues northerly via a swale through the subject lands, outletting to the neighbouring properties to the north. There is an existing 250mm sanitary sewer and an existing 525mm storm sewer along Kopperfield Lane, both of which terminate just west of the easterly lot line. The FSR proposes that the street townhouses will be serviced on an individual basis by extending both the sanitary and storm sewers to the intersection of Glancaster Road. The block townhouse units will be serviced by a private sewer connection to the existing sanitary sewer on Kopperfield Lane, and a separate private storm sewer is proposed to outlet to the existing swale located along the northerly lot line. As a condition of approval, the applicant will be required to urbanize Kopperfield Lane and extend the existing storm and sanitary sewers, installed under the “Kopper Meadows - Phase 1” development, to the intersection with Glancaster Road to service the proposed development (see Appendix “F” - Condition 11). The applicant will also be required to provide for a storm sewer on Glancaster Road, adjacent to the subject lands, and provide a suitable outlet to convey minor and major flows from the future ROW, as well the external lands through the subject lands. An appropriate sewer and drainage easement, in favour of the City, will be required to be established over the subject lands (see Appendix “F” - Conditions 9 and 12).

Staff and the NPCA requested that additional information be submitted relating to the impact of the additional storm sewer flows to the downstream conveyance system, and confirmation that the system between the subject lands and the pond is adequate (see Appendix “F” - Conditions 13 and 18).

Staff has had consideration for the criteria contained in Subsection 51(24) of the Planning Act to assess the appropriateness of the proposed subdivision. Staff advises that:
(a) It is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, subject to clearance of a number of draft plan conditions which relate to archaeological potential and noise mitigation.

(b) It is not considered premature, as it is within an area of existing development that is fully serviced by municipal services.

(c) It will conform with the policies of the Official Plan, subject to approval of the proposed amendment.

(d) The lands can appropriately be used for townhouse dwellings.

(e) The proposed development is located adjacent to an existing local and arterial road, both of which provide adequate access and connection to the established road system.

(f) The dimensions and shape of the proposed lots are appropriate.

(g) Restrictions and regulations for the development of the subdivision will be included in the implementing Zoning By-law Amendment, conditions of draft plan approval, and Subdivision Agreement.

(h) Staff and the Conservation Authority are not opposed to the proposed development, and are satisfied that appropriate conservation of natural resources and flood control measures can be addressed through the applicable conditions of draft plan approval.

(i) Adequate municipal services are available, the particulars of which will be determined as part of the conditions of draft plan approval and Subdivision Agreement.

(j) School Boards did not raise any concerns with the proposed development.

(k) No land will be dedicated to the City of Hamilton for public purposes, but the owner will be required to pay Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland at a rate of 1 hectare for each 300 dwelling units proposed (Recommendation (a)(iii)).

(l) The east-west orientation of the building lots provides an opportunity for passive solar energy gain.

(m) The massing, character, and external design of the proposed buildings was considered as part of the review, and will be reviewed in further detail through a future Site Plan Control application. Landscaping design and preservation will be addressed through the conditions of draft plan
approval and review of a future Site Plan Control application for the block townhouse development.

5. At the Formal Consultation stage, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority reviewed the proposal and identified that the subject property is impacted by two tributaries of Twenty Mile Creek, which are classified as Type 2 Important Fish Habitat. As a result, any development requires a 15 metre setback from the top of bank, and any proposed reductions in the required setback would require the completion of a Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS).

As the applicant is proposing to relocate and alter the two tributaries as part of the redevelopment of the subject lands, a Scoped EIS, dated May, 2010, prepared by Colville Consulting Inc., was submitted to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority and City of Hamilton. The study concludes that the two tributaries are not direct fish habitat, but do transport flow and nutrients downstream. The proposed realignment and alterations will not lead to a loss of direct or indirect fish habitat because existing flow volumes will be maintained and the majority of the drainage features are already piped underground to facilitate existing development. The NPCA is satisfied that the Scoped EIS addresses concerns related to the alteration and piping of the tributaries subject to the mitigation measures, as outlined in the study. The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the plan:

- Off-site discharge of stormwater to existing creek should be maintained at existing volumes;

- All proposed construction and grading activities in and adjacent to the watercourse should be completed during the summer months when conditions are dry;

- A sediment and erosion control plan should be developed and implemented to minimize sedimentation of the downstream channel and the existing stormwater management pond. The sediment and erosion control plan should consider including a straw bale check dam during construction along the northern property boundary where the storm sewer discharges to the open channel. The straw bale check dam should be removed once the area is re-vegetated. Depending on the expected discharge rates, a stone check dam may need to be constructed to minimize erosion off site;

- Make use of permeable surfaces, wherever possible, to intercept, absorb, and restore the quality of stormwater runoff, and recharge groundwater aquifers, wherever possible. Permeable surfaces can be integrated into roads, parking lots, green roofs, and other landscaping designs; and,
• Retain as much of the existing vegetation as possible, particularly along the perimeter of the Subject Lands.

The NPCA has requested that the above mentioned mitigation measures be addressed through the inclusion of a draft plan condition (see Appendix “F” - Condition 16).

The Scoped EIS also addressed the presence of the coniferous hedgerow along the easterly lot line. The Spruce trees are not located on the subject lands, however, the branches do extend over the lot line. In order to protect the existing trees from the proposed development, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

• Establish a minimum two metre setback from the drip line edge of the spruce hedgerow.

• Erect temporary fencing (e.g. silt fencing) to demark the setback and prevent construction machinery from encroaching within the setback. Temporary fencing should be established in accordance with the City of Hamilton’s Tree Protection Guidelines.

• If a major root (greater than 5 cm) is torn by a non-vertical cut during grading, it is recommended that:
  • The root is sheered with a flush cut manually;
  • The vertically cut roots are covered with moist soil as soon as possible (within 24 hr of exposure);
  • The impacted trees are watered thoroughly during and following construction activities; and,
  • The trees are not fertilized for one year.

• Exposure of soil should be minimized, and exposed areas should be re-vegetated as soon as possible to minimize erosion.

The NPCA has requested that the above mentioned mitigation measures be addressed through the inclusion of a draft plan condition (see Appendix “F” - Condition 17).
6. As a result of Formal Consultation, it was identified that the subject property meets 3 of the 10 criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Culture for determining archaeological potential and, as a result, an Archaeological Assessment is required. A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, dated January, 2010, prepared by Detritus Consulting, has been submitted to the Ministry of Culture and the City of Hamilton. The report recommended that further archaeological work be conducted to address the archaeological potential of the subject property. Staff concurs with this recommendation and notes that the Provincial interest has yet to be signed off by the Ministry. As a condition of draft plan approval, the applicant will be required to conduct a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment prior to receiving archaeological sign-off for the subject property. This requirement is included as Condition 3.4 (a)(ii) in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

7. As outlined in the Relevant Consultation section of the Report (see Page 22), 26 letters of objection and a petition containing 172 signatures were received as a result of the circulation of the application (see Appendix “H”). The letters expressed concerns related to increased traffic (safety, congestion), lack of on-street parking, devaluation of property, compatibility with existing low density development, drainage issues and possible servicing restraints, obstructing natural flow of tributaries, impacts on existing tree line, lack of greenspace and community facilities, loss of privacy, and nuisances/damages from construction. The concerns are discussed below:

Increased Traffic

A number of concerns were raised related to an increase in the traffic and congestion that the proposed development would bring to the community. There were also concerns of increased accidents at the intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane. The proposal was reviewed by the City’s Traffic Section, who advised that as the proposed development is located at the entrance to the community, it is unlikely that the traffic will penetrate into the neighbourhood. The block townhouse development will be accessed by a private condominium road off of Glancaster Road, and will not impact the existing neighbourhood. The Traffic Section also advised that the street townhouse units will generate peak a.m. and p.m. trip volumes that are within the daily fluctuations of traffic and will not negatively impact the intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane. Another concern was related to safety for pedestrians along Glancaster Road. Staff notes that as a condition of draft approval, the applicant will be required to construct municipal sidewalks along the east side of Glancaster Road and north side of Kopperfield Lane. This will provide pedestrian connection into the existing neighbourhood. There is also a pathway from the proposed block townhouse development that will serve as a pedestrian connection to the neighbourhood.
Lack of Parking

A number of the letters received expressed concerns that the proposed development does not provide adequate parking, which will cause a lack of available on-street parking in the neighbourhood. Staff notes that the proposed street townhouse dwellings are providing two parking spaces per unit (one in the driveway and one in the garage), which meets the required number of on-site parking spaces, as per the regulations of the Zoning By-law. Additionally, as a condition of draft plan approval, the applicant will be required to submit an on-street parking plan to ensure that a minimum of 40% on-street parking is provided for the street townhouse units. Staff notes that the proposed block townhouse units will also be providing a minimum of two parking spaces per unit, one located in the driveway and the other located in the garage, as required in the Zoning By-law. Two of the proposed block townhouse units provide a double width driveway and 1-½ car garage, and a number of the end units have the potential to provide additional parking via the double width driveway. Also, there is a visitor parking area containing 13 parking spaces. Staff is satisfied that adequate parking is provided for the proposed development.

Devaluation of Property

There are concerns related to the proposed development reducing the property values of the existing properties in the neighbourhood. Staff is not aware of any data that would support this opinion.

Compatibility with Existing Low Density Development

Concerns were raised regarding the compatibility of the proposed development with the existing low density development, as well as the appropriateness of the proposed amendments based on the existing Official Plan policies. Staff notes that as per the Provincial Policy and Council adopted Urban Hamilton Official Plan, residential intensification is necessary in order to increase the housing stock in the built-up area to reduce the need for development beyond the built boundary. As discussed through the Report, staff is of the opinion that the proposed development is compatible to existing development in terms of built form (consistent front yard setbacks, increased side yards, limits on bulk of townhouse blocks), height, use, adequate buffering, minimal impacts on traffic, and providing adequate parking requirements.
Capability of Municipal Services

A number of concerns were raised about the capability of municipal services to service the proposed development. Staff notes that the site is serviced by municipal water, sanitary, and storm sewers. The extension of the services along Kopperfield Lane to service the street townhouses is required as a condition of draft approval. Staff has identified that there is adequate sanitary sewer capacity to service the lands. The applicant is also required to prepare a Groundwater Study to address the impacts that the proposed development would have on the water supply and sewage disposal systems on the existing properties to the north and south of the subject lands.

Impacts on Drainage and Natural Flow of Tributaries

Concerns related to the impacts on natural drainage through the site and increased water upstream were also identified. As previously mentioned, the two tributaries of Twenty Mile Creek are proposed to be relocated and altered (piped), which the NPCA has no objections to the proposed development, subject to the applicant satisfying the requested conditions of draft approval. The NPCA also requires that a permit be applied for prior to any grading on site. In response to the concerns related to how stormwater will be handled, and the potential for increased runoff, staff notes that both the NPCA and the City’s Development Engineering Section have requested that the applicant submit a detailed Stormwater Management Report. The report will have to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity of the major overland flow route and the minor storm system between the subject lands and the SWM ponds at St. Elizabeth Village in order to ensure that there will be no negative impacts from the proposed development. Development Engineering also requires, as a condition of draft approval, that the applicant provide for a storm sewer on Glancaster Road, adjacent to the subject lands, and provide a suitable outlet to convey minor and major flows from the future ROW, as well as the external lands through the subject lands. An appropriate easement, in favour of the City, will be required.

Existing Hedgerow of Spruce Trees

There were numerous concerns related to preserving the existing row of mature spruce trees along the easterly property boundary. The Scoped EIS identified the need to provide a 2 metre setback from the drip line of the existing hedgerow, within which no development shall occur. This is to ensure there are no negative impacts to the existing natural feature. The applicant has proposed that the amending By-law incorporate a provision to require the 2 metre setback from the drip line.
Lack of Parkland and Greenspace

Concerns related to a lack of parkland and greenspace were raised. Staff notes that as there is no parkland proposed to be dedicated to the City as part of the draft plan, the applicant will be required to pay Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland for the proposed development. There is an existing neighbourhood park, Kopperfield Park, located at Idlewilde Lane and Bellstone Lane. The block townhouse development is also proposing a private amenity area for the future residents use.

Waste Collection / Snow Removal

A few concerns related to how garbage collection and snow removal would be handled were also received. The City’s Waste Management Section has advised that the proposed development is eligible for municipal waste collection. The street townhouse dwellings will receive curb-side pickup and snow removal, similar to the existing neighbourhood. Waste collection and snow removal for the block townhouse development will be looked at in greater detail, and be determined at Site Plan Control stage.

No/Overpopulation of Schools

A few concerns were raised about the overpopulation of existing schools or lack of schools in the immediate neighbourhood. Staff notes that the four School Boards were given the opportunity to comment on the proposal regarding any objections, requirements, or conditions pertaining to the application. Only the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board provided written comments toward the application and identified that they have no concerns related to the proposal. The other three School Boards did not provide any comments.

Loss of Privacy

Some letters expressed concerns that the proposed development would result in a loss of privacy for existing residents. Staff notes that the existing tree line provides enhanced buffering between the existing and proposed developments. Staff has also requested that the amending By-law maintain large setbacks from the existing development to the north and east. Should the need for additional buffering be required, such as in the area where there is a break in the tree-line, staff notes that additional plantings can be required as part of the Site Plan Control application. Staff feels that the natural buffer from the hedgerow and the increased setbacks provide adequate separation and, therefore, any potential loss of privacy can be mitigated.
Nuisances and Damages Related to Construction

Other concerns were expressed related to nuisances and damages related to construction. These concerns are addressed in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, which provides requirements for: prohibition against debris on the subject lands; street cleaning, deficiencies in work; state of site; stop work; maintenance of works; inspection, testing and emergency repairs; snow removal; and liability of the owner.

Based on the foregoing, staff is satisfied that all of the concerns outlined above have been addressed.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

If the proposed applications are denied, the subject lands could be developed for uses permitted within the Existing Residential “ER” Zone, which include one single-detached dwelling.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN  (Linkage to Desired End Results)


Financial Sustainability

• Delivery of municipal services and management capital assets/liabilities in a sustainable, innovative, and cost effective manner.

• Generate assessment growth/non-tax revenues.

Social Development

• Everyone has a home they can afford that is well maintained and safe.

Environmental Stewardship

• Natural resources are protected and enhanced.

• Reduced impact of City activities on the environment.
Healthy Community

- Plan and manage the built environment.
- An engaged Citizenry.
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Amendment No. [BLANK]

to the

Official Plan for the Former Township of Glanbrook

The following text, together with Schedule “A”, Schedule “A” - Land Use Plan and Schedule “B”, Schedule “G” - North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan, of the Official Plan of the former Township of Glanbrook, attached hereto, constitute Official Plan Amendment No. [BLANK].

Purpose:

The purpose of this Amendment is to redesignate the subject lands from “Low Density Residential” to “Medium Density Residential” on Schedule “G” North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan, to permit the subject land to be developed for street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings.

Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are located on the east side of Glancaster Road, north of Kopperfield Lane, in the former Township of Glanbrook.

Basis:

The intent of the Amendment is to permit a medium density residential development in the form of street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings. The basis for the redesignation is as follows:

- The proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

- The proposed development provides for residential intensification within the built boundary of the urban area, which is consistent with the intent of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

- It conforms with and implements the “Urban Area” designation of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

- It conforms to the “Residential” designation, and implements the intensification policies of the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan, which also supports the provision of a full range of housing types.

- The use is compatible with and complementary to the existing and proposed residential character of the surrounding neighbourhood.
• The proposed development is located at the periphery of the residential neighbourhood, and is adjacent to an arterial road.

**Actual Changes:**

1. Schedule “A”, Land Use Plan, be revised by identifying the subject lands as OPA No. [redacted], as shown on the attached Schedule “A” to this Amendment.

2. Schedule “G”, North-West Glanbrook Planning Area Land Use Plan, be revised by redesignating the subject lands from “Low Density Residential” to “Medium Density Residential”, and identifying the subject lands as OPA No. [redacted], as shown on the attached Schedule “B” to this Amendment.

3. That the following Policy be added:

   B.2.1.27 Lands Located on the North side of Kopperfield Lane, East Side of Glancaster Road

   Notwithstanding Policy B.2.1.25.2(v), the lands consisting of an area of approximately 1.13 hectares, situated on the northeast corner of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane, identified on Schedule “G” as OPA No. [redacted], may be developed for street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings in accordance with the “Medium Density Residential” designation of the Plan.

**Implementation:**

An implementing Zoning By-law Amendment will give effect to the intended use on the subject lands.

This is Schedule "1" to By-law No. [redacted], passed on the [redacted] day of [redacted], 2010.

The

City of Hamilton

___________________________  ___________________________
Fred Eisenberger          Rose Caterini
Mayor                    Clerk
WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap.14, Sch. C. did incorporate, as of January 1, 2001, the municipality “City Of Hamilton”;

AND WHEREAS the City Of Hamilton is the successor to certain area municipalities, including the former area municipality known as “The Corporation of the Township of Glanbrook” and is the successor to the former Regional Municipality, namely, The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth;

AND WHEREAS the City Of Hamilton Act, 1999 provides that the Zoning By-laws of the former area municipalities continue in force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook) was enacted on the 16th day of March, 1992, and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on the 31st day of May, 1993;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item of Report 10- of the Economic Development and Planning Committee, at its meeting held on the day of , 2010, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook) be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Official Plan of the City of Hamilton (the Official Plan of the former Township of Glanbrook) upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. ;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Schedule “G”, appended to and forming part of By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook) is amended by changing the zoning from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to the Multiple Residential “RM2-261” Zone (Block 1) and to the Multiple Residential “RM3-262” Zone (Block 2) on the lands, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.
2. That Section 44, “Exceptions to the Provisions of the By-law”, be amended by adding new Special Exemptions, “RM2-261” and RM3-262”, as follows:

“RM2-261” 345 Glancaster Road

Notwithstanding the regulations of Subsection 18.2 - REGULATIONS FOR USES PERMITTED IN PARAGRAPH (a) OF SUBSECTION 18.1 (STREET TOWNHOUSE DWELLINGS), of SECTION 18: RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE “RM2” ZONE, Clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (k), the following regulations shall apply to the lands zoned “RM2-261”;

(a) Minimum Lot Frontage .................. 6.25 metres per dwelling unit, except:
   (i) For a dwelling unit end unit which does not abut a flanking street, the minimum lot frontage shall be 8.25 metres.
   (ii) On a corner lot, the minimum lot frontage for an end dwelling unit adjacent to the flanking street shall be 12 metres.

(b) Minimum Lot Area ............... 165 square metres, per dwelling unit except:
   (i) On an end lot which does not abut a flanking street, the minimum lot area shall be 230 square metres; and,
   (ii) On a corner lot which abuts a flanking street, the minimum lot area shall be 350 square metres.

(c) Maximum Lot Coverage ....................................................... 52 percent

(d) Minimum Front Yard........................................................... 6 metres

(e) Minimum Side Yard
   (i) End dwelling unit not abutting a flanking street .......... 1.25 metres
   (ii) End dwelling unit on a corner lot abutting a flanking street ......................................................... 6 metres
   (iii) Setback to the Hypotenuse of the Daylight Triangle .... 3.4 metres

(f) Minimum Rear Yard .............................................................. 7 metres

(k) Dwelling Unit Placement
   (i) and (ii) Not more than four (4) dwelling units shall be attached in a continuous row.
Notwithstanding the regulations of Subsection 7.26(b) - **ENCROACHMENT INTO YARDS**, of **SECTION 7: GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL ZONES**, unenclosed porches may project into any required front yard or side yard a distance not more than 1.8 metres.

Notwithstanding the regulations of Subsection 7.29 - **DAYLIGHTING TRIANGLES**, of **SECTION 7: GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL ZONES**, a 9 metre x 9 metre triangle at the intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane shall be required.

“**RM3-262**” 345 Glancaster Road

Notwithstanding the regulations of Subsection 19.2 - **REGULATIONS FOR USES PERMITTED IN PARAGRAPH (a) OF SUBSECTION 19.1 (BLOCK TOWNHOUSE DWELLINGS)**, of **SECTION 19: RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE “RM3” ZONE**, Clauses (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (j), and (k), the following regulations shall apply to the lands zoned “RM3-262”:

(c) Maximum Lot Coverage .................................................. 35 percent

(d) Maximum Density ....................................................... 37 units per hectare

(e) Minimum Front Yard ...................................................... 6 metres

(f) Minimum Side and Rear Yards ............................................. 7 metres, except 9.7 metres where the abutting lands are zoned Existing Residential” ER” Zone.

(g) Minimum Separation Distance

   (i) Between two (2) exterior walls which contain no windows to habitable rooms, a minimum of 2 metres shall be provided.

   (j) Minimum Landscaped Area .................. 40 percent of the lot area, which may include the required privacy area.

(k) Planting Strip/Fencing

Where the boundary of a Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone adjoins lands zoned Existing Residential “ER” Zone, a planting strip with a minimum width of 1.5 metres and/or a solid fence with a height of 1.8 metres adjoining such boundary shall be provided and thereafter maintained.

Where the boundary of a Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone adjoins lands zoned Residential “R3” Zone, a planting strip with a minimum width of 2.0 metres and average width of 3.0 metres adjoining such boundary shall be provided and thereafter maintained.
Notwithstanding the regulations of Subsection 7.26(b) - **ENCROACHMENT INTO YARDS**, of **SECTION 7: GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL ZONES**, unenclosed porches may project into any required front yard a distance not more than 1.8 metres.

Notwithstanding the regulations of Subsection 7.35(b) - **MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS**, of **SECTION 7: GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL ZONES**, a minimum of two (2) parking spaces per dwelling unit shall be provided, plus 0.4 visitor parking spaces for each dwelling unit.

3. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered, extended, or enlarged, nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used, nor shall any land be used, except in accordance with the “RM2” and “RM3” Zone provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Section 2 of this By-law.

4. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this By-law, in accordance with the Planning Act.

PASSED and ENACTED this [redacted] day of [redacted], 2010.

__________________________   __________________________
Fred Eisenberger             Rose Caterini
Mayor                       Clerk
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Amendment No. [Redacted]

The following text, together with:

Schedule “A” - North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan - Volume 2: Map B.5.3-1,


1.0 Purpose:

The purpose of this Amendment is to:

1. redesignate the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c” on Map B.5.3-1 - North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan; and,

2. add Area Specific Policy - Area D to on Map B.5.3-1 - North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan;

...to permit the subject land to be developed for street townhouses dwellings and block townhouse dwellings.

2.0 Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are located on the east side of Glancaster Road, immediately north of Kopperfield Lane, in the former Township of Glanbrook, and have an area of approximately 1.13 hectares.

3.0 Basis:

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows:

- The proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

- The proposed development provides for residential intensification within the built boundary of the urban area, which conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.
• The proposal complies with the “Neighbourhoods” designation and the residential intensification policies in Section B.2.4 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. In particular, the proposal increases the range of housing forms, types, and densities in the area.

• The use is compatible with and complementary to the existing and proposed residential character of the surrounding neighbourhood.

• The proposed development is located at the periphery of the residential neighbourhood, and is adjacent to an arterial road.

4.0 Changes

4.1 Volume 2 - Secondary Plans

Text and Maps

Text
4.1.1 That Chapter B-Secondary Plans of Volume 2, Section 5.3 - North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan, Section 5.3.8 - Area Specific Policies be amended by adding the following new Policy 5.3.8.2:

“5.3.8.2 Notwithstanding Policy B.5.3.2.3 f), for the lands designated “Low Density Residential 2c”, located on the east side of Glancaster Road, immediately north of Kopperfield Lane, with an area of approximately 1.13 hectares, and identified as Area Specific Policy - Area D on Map B.5.3-1 - North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan, street townhouse dwellings and block townhouse dwellings shall be permitted adjacent to the existing large lot residential development.”

Map
4.1.2 That Map B.5.3-1 - North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan be amended by:

a) redesignating the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c”; and,

b) adding Area Specific Policy - Area D;

as shown on the attached Schedule “A” to this Amendment.
5.0 Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-law Amendment shall give effect to this Amendment.

This is Schedule “1” to By-law No. passed on the day of , 2010.

The
City of Hamilton

____________________  ______________________
Fred Eisenberger     Rose Caterini
MAYOR               CITY CLERK
Special Conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval for “Koppercreek”

1. That the owner/applicant shall investigate the noise levels on the site and determine and implement the noise control measures that are satisfactory to the City of Hamilton in meeting the Ministry of the Environment’s recommended sound level limits. An acoustical report, prepared by a qualified Professional Engineer, containing the recommended control measures, shall be submitted, to the satisfaction of the City of Hamilton, Director of Planning. Should a peer review of the acoustical report be warranted, all associated costs shall be borne by the owner/applicant, and shall be submitted, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

2. That, prior to preliminary grading, the owner submits a property history documenting the settlement of the site, along with appropriate interior and exterior photo-documentation of the existing dwelling, prepared by an appropriately qualified built heritage consultant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

3. That the owner agrees, in writing, to include the following noise warning clause in all agreements of purchase and sale for all lots and blocks within the draft plan, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning:

   “Residents of this development are advised that the John C. Munro Hamilton International Airport is located in the vicinity of the subject lands and, as a result, there is a potential for increased noise levels at times related to airport activity.”

4. That, prior to preliminary grading or servicing, the owner submits a tree preservation study and plan, prepared by a certified arborist or landscape architect, for review and approval by the Director of Planning, and provides written certification from the owner’s landscape architect/arborist to the Director of Planning that all measures for the protection of isolated trees, tree clusters, and woodlands, in accordance with the Detailed Tree Preservation Plan approved by the Director, have been implemented and inspected, prior to any clearing or grubbing of the lands within the draft plan.

5. That, prior to the registration of the plan of subdivision, all driveways be shown on the engineering drawings, and be approved, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Traffic Engineering, and the Manager of Engineering Design and Construction. The driveway locations must be shown on the approved engineering drawings submitted with the registered Subdivision Agreement.
6. That, **prior to registration of the draft plan**, Block 3 be revised to 10 feet (3.048m) and transferred to the City of Hamilton for road widening purposes, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

7. That, **prior to registration of the draft plan**, a 9.0 metre x 9.0 metre daylight triangle be established on the final plan of subdivision at the widened limit of intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane and transferred to the City of Hamilton for road widening purposes, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

8. That, **prior to registration of the draft plan**, the owner pays for the future urbanization of Glancaster Road based on the City’s “New Roads Servicing Rate” in effect at the time of payment, to the satisfaction of Director of Development Engineering.

9. That, **prior to registration of the draft plan**, the owner establishes drainage and sewer easement over the subject lands in favour of the City of Hamilton to provide for an outlet for flows from external lands that drain through the subject lands, to satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

10. That, **prior to registration of the draft plan**, the owner agrees to construct municipal sidewalks along the north side of Kopperfield Lane, adjacent to the subject lands, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

11. That, **prior to servicing**, the owner agrees to include in the Engineering design and cost estimate schedules provision to reconstruct Kopperfield Lane, full width, to its urban cross section, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

12. That, **prior to servicing**, the owner agrees to include in the engineering design and cost estimate schedules provision to install storm sewers on Glancaster Road adjacent to the subject lands, at his expense, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

13. That, **prior to servicing**, the owner submits a SWM Report, prepared by a qualified professional, to address the following issues, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering:

   i) Current scenario: impact of the proposed development on the existing downstream developments, the existing watercourse drains through, in case of the 100 year storm event.
ii) Ultimate scenario, minor flows should be controlled on the site to the
capacity of downstream storm sewers proposed under Glancaster Meadows Extension Subdivision; and to demonstrate that major flows
from the north property line of the subject lands can be conveyed to
the proposed overland flow route under the above noted development.

14. That, prior to servicing, the owner shall prepare a Groundwater study,
which shall address the impact that the proposed development would have
on the water supply and sewage disposal systems on the existing properties
to the north and south of the subject lands. Pending the outcome of the
Study, the owner shall propose appropriate measures to address raised
issues, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

15. That, prior to servicing, the owner shall submit a Hydrogeological Report
to the City, prepared by a qualified professional, to assess impacts,
identify any significant recharge and discharge zone, and provide
recommendations to mitigate the groundwater impacts during any
construction within the subdivision, including but not limited to house
construction, and to undertake the works, as recommended, including
monitoring. The Report shall also provide a groundwater contingency plan
to ensure that an appropriate mitigation strategy is available to be
implemented in the case whereof: i) an aquifer is breached during
excavation; ii) groundwater is encountered during any construction within
the subdivision, including but not limited to house construction; iii) sump
pumps are found to be continuously running; and iv) water supply and
sewage disposal systems and any surface and groundwater related
infrastructure are negatively impacted, all to the satisfaction of the Director
of Development Engineering.

16. That mitigation measures, as expressed in the Environmental Impact
Study, are adhered to and shown on the site plan and grading plan, to the
satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

17. That prior to preliminary grading or servicing, the Niagara Peninsula
Conservation Authority will require a limit of work fence be installed 2
metres from the drip line of the existing trees located along the eastern
property boundary, as per the scoped EIS.

18. That as stormwater quantity control for the subject site is proposed to be
provided in facilities located downstream, the Niagara Peninsula
Conservation Authority will require confirmation that the capacity of the
major overland flow route and the minor storm system between the
subject site and the St. Elizabeth Village ponds be submitted to the NPCA
for review and approval, in order to ensure that there will be no negative
impacts as a result of the proposed development.
19. That since the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority understands that the storm sewer is proposed to discharge onto private lands to the north of the subject site, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority will require that confirmation be submitted to our office (i.e. drainage easement, agreement on title) in order to ensure that the stormwater outlet is provided with a perpetual, unimpeded drainage route.

20. That prior to construction, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority will require that detailed plans for grading, storm servicing, stormwater management, and construction sediment controls be submitted to this office for review and approval.

21. That a permit for Development, Interference with Wetlands, and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses (Ontario Regulation 155/06) must be obtained from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority prior to alterations to the watercourse.

22. That prior to registration of the final plan, the owner relocate the existing Bell pedestal on Kopperfield Lane, at the owner’s sole expense, if required, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.
22 Kopperfield Lane
Mount Hope, ON.
L0R 1W0

May 5, 2010

Alexandra Rowlings
Co-ordinator
Economic Development & Planning Committee
City of Hamilton,
77 James St. N.
Suite 220
Hamilton, ON. L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. Rowlings:

I have just returned from the presentation by Koppercreek Developments for lands located at 345 Glancauster Rd., Glenbrook.

Please be advised that we are totally against the BY-law zoning amendment to change the existing “ER” zone to Multiple “RM2” and Block 2 “ER” zone to “RM3”.

There are several reasons:

Though the dwellings are attractive, there are far too many. The area cannot handle the extra traffic that 68 units would entail. Kopperfield Lane is a very narrow street. If cars are parked on both sides of the street, two cars cannot pass each other.

There would 18 townhomes added to the top of Kopperfield. Most homes have two cars, where would they park?

There is no added “green” area.

Families, walking to the park would have access through a passage way on to Kopperfield Lane in order to get to our so-called park. Can you imagine 68 dogs going to the park?

We already have water drainage problems. The explanation of how the water would be contained did not satisfy us.

Would there be a row of “blue boxes” and garbage cans on Glancaster since condominium townhouses would have to bring them to Glancaster on pick-up days?

Where would snow be put? There isn’t room now for snow removal. Sidewalks are planned for both sides of the street. This just does not seem feasible. There isn’t the space now.

Since it is not mandated to put people on top of one another by the provincial gov’t, please reconsider this rezoning. IT IS JUST TOO MUCH.

We were told at the meeting that we could still contact you and receive information from the city re this development. Please advise us of any further information and of any further meetings,

Sincerely,

Vic Uzbalis/Nanette Uzbalis
From: Mark.Amorosi@guelph.ca
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 10:49 AM
To: Haan, Jennifer
Subject: File No: OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010, 2ST-201002

Hello Jennifer, I am a resident at 51 Bellstone Lane, Mount Hope, and received correspondence on March 19, 2010 re: the file referenced above.

I would like to ensure I will receive notification (as other residents) regarding the public meeting, i.e. Committee Meeting.

Also can you confirm I will receive a copy (as other residents) of the staff report prior to the public meeting.

Thank you.

Mark Amorosi

----------------------------------------------------------------- This e-mail message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and erase this e-mail message immediately.
Pick up at the Kopperfield/Clagcaster Road intersection. The chance of accidents would be increased.

In closing we feel the city needs to take a stand and protect existing "R" zoned residential areas and prevent the development of multiple type units located where they can be a detriment to established communities (such as the proposed Koppercreek plan).

C. C. D. Mitchell

Yours truly

William and Joan Norris
80 Brook Heath Lane
Mt. Hope Ont. A0R 1W0

[Signature]

[Signature]
MT HOPE ONT.  
APRIL 9 2010  
RECEIVED APR 16 2010

To: Planning Division, Planning and Economics Development Dept.

Re: Draft Plan of Proposed New Development by Kopper Creek at 345 Glanraster, Glanbrooke
File OPA-10-004; ZAC 10-010 & 25T-201002

Dear Sir or Madam,

We wish to be notified of the City of Hamilton's decision in respect of the proposed draft plan of subdivision.

Thank you,
Yours truly,

William and Joan Norris
80 Brook Heath Lane
MT. HOPE ONT. LOR1W0

[Signature]

[Signature]
Charlotte Dishke  
36 Kopperfield Lane  
Mount Hope, ON  L0R 1W0

City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division, Development Planning, East Section  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, Ontario  L8R 2K3

Attention: Jennifer Haan

April 9, 2010

RE: File No: OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T201002

I am writing to comment on the proposed plan to build multi-family units on the property located at the intersection of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane. My husband, Gordon, and I have several objections to this plan, the first being that we are concerned that it will reduce property values in our neighborhood. We purchased here in an area that was zoned for single family dwellings, and we would like to think that the Planning Department would honor our trust that this would remain so in future.

Our second concern regards the huge increase in traffic this development will bring to our neighborhood. There are no sidewalks on Glancaster Road, nor on some of the streets in our neighborhood. There is already a large traffic volume on Glancaster Road, and it is difficult to walk there without sidewalks now. I can only imagine that this will be worse in future with so many new housing units in such a small area. This intersection is the beginning of our neighborhood, and should only be zoned for single family homes in keeping with the rest of our neighborhood.

We are also concerned about water drainage, which is already a problem in our area. City officials have been in our area many times to assess the problem. We are aware that there is a creek on the site of this proposed development and the elevation is higher there than here. We are worried that the drainage will only contribute to the water problems with which we are already dealing.

In your letter of March 19, 2010, is vague on the height of buildings, size of lots, driveways etc. and where they would be placed. I would like to think that the Planning Department would be investigating these things before making a decision regarding this proposal, and also that the information would be shared with people living in the neighborhood.
We feel very strongly that the application received by the Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc. for the location of 345 Glencaster Road, Glanbrook should be denied. It would be a decision favoring the neighborhood over the developer and consistent with existing homes, safely flowing traffic and people.

In closing, I would like to request that we be included in any and all correspondence which is sent out to the neighboring property owners regarding this application. We would also like to request a copy of the decision made by the Planning Committee in this matter.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns. We trust that they will be seriously considered, and the action taken will be in the best interests of our neighborhood.

Yours truly,

Charlotte Dishke
Renata Vaughan  
301 Glancaster Road  
Glanbrook, Ontario  
L9G 3K9

April 6, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Haan  
City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division, Development Planning, East Section  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. Haan,

Re: OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002  
Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and  
Approval of draft plan of subdivision  
345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook  
Kopper Creek Developments

I reside at 301 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook, Ontario.

I acknowledge receipt of notice dated March 19, 2010 with respect to the above matter.

It is premature for me to make comments regarding the above applications. However, I reside immediately adjacent to the south of the subdivision known as Glancaster Meadows Extension. In that draft plan of subdivision, there is an allowance for a road running southerly from Grassyplain Drive to the northerly boundary of my property. The name of the contemplated road is Mouskos Street and I understand that road is intended to link up with Kopper Field Lane in the future. I notice in the draft plan of subdivision submitted by Kopper Creek Developments there is no suggestion or contemplation of a road running northerly from Kopper Field Lane to join up in the future with Mouskos Street. This is the only comment I wish to make at this time prior to any public meeting. I am requesting that I be notified of any and all decisions with respect to the draft plan of subdivision.

Yours truly,

Renata Vaughan
Haan, Jennifer

From: Ph Haverty [redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 5:16 PM
To: Haan, Jennifer
Subject: Proposed development of 345 Glancaster Rd. Glanbrook

As new family residents of 71 Kopperfield Lane, Mount Hope/Glanbrook, Ont. We want to voice are strong objection to proposed development of land located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook for the purposes of townhouses and condominium townhouses. We purchased our new detached home just right around the corner of this proposed development and purchased because of similiar detached dwellings surrounding our home in the area. We feel building townhomes in the proposed location will undermine the value of existing detached homes in the area and take away from the class of neighbourhood that currently exists. We would more than welcome building of more detached family homes of quality construction on these lands or nearby; but building multi- unit townhomes in the area will take away and degrade the existing neighbourhood and undermine the general community and future home values for existing residents who chose to live here based on current dwellings and quality of neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Lara St.Clair
Eamon P Haverty
Ciara Haverty

Owners and residents of 71 Kopperfield Lane, Mount Hope/Glanbrook, Ont. L0R1W0

Yahoo! Canada Toolbar: Search from anywhere on the web and bookmark your favourite sites. Download it now!
"NEW TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT ON KOPPERFIELD LANE"

Dear Sir/Madam;

This letter is in regard to a recent proposal of the Kopperfield Townhouse Development located at the North East corner of Kopperfield Lane and Glancaster Rd in the Township of Glenbrook.

I ____ Tracy Pring ____ being a resident at ____ 69 Brookheath Lane, Mount Hope ON ___ strongly appose this type of Development due to several reasons, which I shall elaborate on shortly. I would also like to stress the fact that I've been a resident of this community for several years, and have seen it flourish with new Housing Developments that have brought a diverse culture and has added substantial financial value to our properties. Keep in mind, these new Houses have all been Single Detached and with plenty of curb appeal to attract new potential buyers and their Families to our Community.

Unfortunately this New Development that has been proposed will undermine everything we have achieved over the years as proud residents of this Community. We all have noticed that recently pre-existing homes that have been or are up for resale, have been more difficult to sell.. We as a Community can't help it but feel that this New Proposal somehow has played a vital role in this issue... This is the general consensus within our Community.

Furthermore, we as a close nit Community feel that the Townhouse Development would not only bring our property values down, but also create a negative curb appeal to Families thinking of buying Detached Homes.. The location of these Units is just not consistent with the already existing Homes, ie; style, size, location, traffic, parking, etc...

Let's review our concerns;

-Lack of Information
-Kopperfield Street Traffic
-Curb Appeal
-Parking (Street Parking,)
-Property Values
-Glancaster Rd. Traffic
- Schools already over populated (Elementry, Secondary)
- Elevation of Townhomes (ie; Existing Homes)
- Storm water Management
- Sanitary Sewer Capabilities
- Existing Trees close to proposed Development
- Natural Habitat (Any wildlife that grows within the Proposed Site)
- Conservation Report (Cutting existing Trees)
- Water main (Is this going to affect our water supply)
- City of Hamilton Planning Requirements (Have they been met)

In closing, we would like to ask you the City of Hamilton, is this New Townhouse Development going to put any financial strain on us? We all know that with any New Project, a price tag of Updating pre-existing services comes with it, whether it be Water or Sewer or any other Utilities that may be needed to supply the demand. Again we the Community of "THE LANES OF GLANCASTER", strongly OPPOSE and OBJECT to this New Townhouse Development.

Yours Truly

Tracy Pring

Proud Resident and Tax Payer of "THE LANES OF GLANCASTER"
April 9, 2010

Jennifer Haan
Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development Planning Section - East Team
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
P: (905) 546-2424 x 1230
F: (905) 546-4202
Jennifer.Haan@hamilton.ca

In regards for the rezoning of the proposal at 345 Glancaster Road

My wife and I are very concerned with the half measures that the city is taking on this. Ourselves and many neighbors did not receive the letter of March 19, 2010 “for rezoning of 345 Glancaster Road” that by law is supposed to go to all within 1000 feet of said property. Where it not for our neighbors we would know nothing of it till it was too late.

We are new to this community and one of the reasons for us to move here was that there is no high density housing in this area. To change the zoning to medium and high density residential makes no sense except to the builder to fill his pockets, and to our existing homes lower the value considerably. We can go on and on about this but it has all been said by fellow neighbors. We are set against the rezoning.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our opinions, and hope they will be considered, hoping that you will keep us informed of all details, decisions, meetings for 345 Glancaster Road.

Sincerely,

Linda and Joe Kreuzer
20 Bellstone Lane
Mount Hope, On. L0R 1W0

4/12/2010
Dear Ms Jennifer Haan:

Please accept this email as my comment concerning the Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Development Inc., for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook. (File No: OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002).

Let me begin by clearly stating that my wife and I are opposed to the change in zoning for this piece of property. The reason is that this will allow a very dense housing development of a parcel of land that is not conducive to such a development. The reasons are:

1) Glancaster Rd. is only a two-lane road with a very small shoulder (3-4 feet) on either side. To add 48 dwellings on a small parcel of land, from which the automobiles will all exit onto Glancaster Rd. from a small frontage of land will be a potentially serious danger for auto traffic on that narrow stretch of road.

2) To add 18 townhouse units at the intersection of Kopperfield and Glancaster will add to the congestion and traffic danger at this intersection. Assuming that the 18 town homes will have driveways from garages onto Kopperfield, this provides congestion and traffic danger for this major entrance into the subdivision. As autos turn onto Kopperfield from Glancaster, there is the real danger of colliding with autos that are backing out of their townhouse driveways onto Kopperfield. If townhouses are allowed on this parcel, autos from the driveways should exit into the interior of the development onto a road through the townhouse development. Then, they could exit the parcel at a safe intersection with Glancaster without the danger of traffic coming into the subdivision of predominantly detached single-family homes.

3) There is continuing development and building of single-family homes on the south side of Kopperfield Lane. (It appears that there could be 40-50 new homes built, depending on lot sizes.) These homes are being built on a street that joins Kopperfield at the eastern border of the proposed new development. This is already adding to the congestion and potential traffic danger right near the entrance into the subdivision on Kopperfield. To add another 18 townhouses, whose driveways join Kopperfield so close to Glancaster would add to the congestion and traffic danger.

4) There will also be increased pedestrian traffic from the 48 townhouses and condominiums. Since there is such a narrow shoulder on Glancaster Road, this also increases the danger of people being struck by traffic on Glancaster.

5) There is no green space indicated on the plan for this development. What is the green space to be provided in this development?

4/9/2010
6) There is a park in the subdivision on Idlewilde Lane and Bellstone Lane. Assuming that adults and children (some in strollers, and walking with parents or alone) will be going to this park, they would be walking along Glancaster, where it is not safe. There are houses on properties on Bellstone behind this property, so there is no place for a safe footpath from the townhouse units to Bellstone Lane. This increases the potential for a pedestrian to be struck by an auto.

6) It seems contrary to good land management and traffic flow to have a high density development at the entrance to a subdivision which consists predominantly of low-density single-family homes. Would it not make better sense to have the high-density housing in the middle of a subdivision, and the low density housing on the major streets, especially near the entrance into the subdivision from the major thorough-fare?

For the above reasons, my wife and I are opposed to the zoning by-law change and the proposed development.

Note: we would like to be informed of all further proposals, meetings and opportunities for input on the development of this parcel of land.

Sincerely,

Guenther & Dana Haas
3 Idlewilde Lane
Mt. Hope, Ontario
L0R 1W0

[Handwritten note]
"NEW TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT ON KOPPERFIELD LANE"

Dear Sir/Madam;

This letter is in regard to a recent proposal of the Kopperfield Townhouse Development located at the North East corner of Kopperfield Lane and Glancaster Rd in the Township of Glenbrook.

I ___ Carlos Almeida__________________________ being a resident at ___ 5 Idlewilde Lane__________________________ strongly appose this type of Development due to several reasons, which I shall elaborate on shortly. I would also like to stress the fact that I've been a resident of this community for several years, and have seen it flourish with new Housing Developments that have brought a diverse culture and has added substantial financial value to our properties. Keep in mind, these new Houses have all been Single Detached and with plenty of curb appeal to attract new potential buyers and their Families to our Community.

Unfortunately this New Development that has been proposed will undermine everything we have achieved over the years as proud residents of this Community. We all have noticed that recently pre-existing homes that have been or are up for resale, have been more difficult to sell... We as a Community can't help it but feel that this New Proposal somehow has played a vital role in this issue... This is the general consensus within our Community.

Furthermore, we as a close nit Community feel that the Townhouse Development would not only bring our property values down, but also create a negative curb appeal to Families thinking of buying Detached Homes... The location of these Units is just not consistent with the already existing Homes, ie; style, size, location, traffic, parking, etc...

Let's review our concerns;

-Lack of Information
-Kopperfield Street Traffic
-Curb Appeal
-Parking (Street Parking,)
-Property Values
-Glancaster Rd. Traffic
- Schools already over populated (Elementry, Secondary)
- Elevation of Townhomes (ie; Existing Homes)
- Stormwater Management
- Sanitary Sewer Capabilities
- Existing Trees close to proposed Development
- Natural Habitat (Any wildlife that lives within the Proposed Site)
- Conservation Report (Cutting existing Trees)
- Watermain (Is this going to affect our water supply)
- City of Hamilton Planning Requirements (Have they been met)

In closing, we would like to ask you the City of Hamilton, is this New Townhouse Development going to put any Financial strain on us? We all know that with any New Project, a price tag of Updating pre-existing services comes with it, whether it be Water or Sewer or any other Utilities that may be needed to supply the demand. Again we the Community of "THE LANES OF GLANCASTER", strongly OPPOSE and OBJECT to this New Townhouse Development.

Yours Truly

Carlos Almeida

Proud Resident and Tax Payer of "THE LANES OF GLANCASTER"
Appendix "H" to Report PED10180  (Page 16 of 61)

Haan, Jennifer

From: S and J Payton [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 10:03 PM
To: Haan, Jennifer
Subject: File No: CPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002

Dear Ms Haan:

We are writing as residents of 40 Kopperfield Lane, just down the street from the proposed plan of subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook.

We did not receive any official notification of this proposed plan of subdivision, which would result in 18 street townhouse dwellings on our street and 30 condominium townhouse dwellings immediately adjacent, on Glancaster Road. This lack of communication is troubling. We are indebted to a neighbor who has called this to our attention: we should have heard about it from your office or some other city government office, so that we could respond.

We are absolutely opposed to this proposal. It would drastically change the character of the neighborhood as it has developed.

When the homes on Kopperfield were built, they were advertised to and bought by people who are retired or are empty-nesters. This has resulted in a peaceful neighborhood, and we hope it can stay that way.

To add 18 street townhouse dwellings at the end of Kopperfield Lane will significantly alter the neighborhood. The houses that have been built on the street and on the crescent that runs off it are all single-family dwellings. They are of a size and distance apart that is consistent. But to crowd in 18 street townhouses will drastically affect the look of the neighborhood -- and, in all likelihood, significantly reduce the selling value of the homes that have already been built here. A crowded block of townhouses at the opening of the street is hardly an attractive introduction to Kopperfield Lane.

Adding 18 street townhouses will also mean many cars parked on the street. The townhouses are to have single car garages, with a second car able to be parked in the driveway. But young families -- as we know from our own experience - - rarely use the garage for the car. It is almost always a storage area. So, both cars get parked: one in the driveway and another on the street. To have another 10-18 cars parked regularly on the street will be an eyesore and make driving on Kopperfield Lane much less safe. Beyond that, with snowplowing in winter, a car parked on the street offers a hazard for travel, since the snowplow must avoid the vehicle. That will mean that the entrance onto Kopperfield Lane from Glancaster Road will almost certainly not be well plowed and clear for much of the winter.

Further, there is no readily accessible place for young children to play, except on the crowded street (with the cars parked on it). It is almost certain that many if not all of the purchasers of these street townhouses would have children: that is simply the statistical likelihood.

In addition, there are no schools for children in the vicinity to attend. They will have to be bused to a school -- thereby significantly increasing the traffic on the street again.

We are absolutely, definitely opposed to this proposal. We trust that it will be rejected. We look forward to and, indeed, expect that the entire neighborhood on Kopperfield Lane will be kept aware of the discussions and decisions which relate to this issue in the coming days and weeks.

Yours,

Dr James R. Payton, Jr., and Sharon Davis-Payton

4/9/2010
14 Kopperfield Lane
Mount Hope ON L0R 1W0

April 8, 2010

Mr. Peter J. De Iulio
Senior Project Manager
Planning and Economics Development Department
Planning Division, Development Planning, East Section
77 James Street North, Suite 400,
Hamilton ON L8R 2K3

Dear Mr. De Iulio

Re File No: OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002

As owners of one of the properties adjacent to this proposed subdivision, we have several concerns.

The hedgerow of spruce trees to the east of the subdivision:

According to the survey of our property (Plan 62M-873, Lots 47 and 48, City of Hamilton), our frontage is 22.71 metres (74.8 feet). Our lot contains 19 of the spruce trees in the current hedgerow, which is 50 years old and 50 to 60 feet tall. In the site plan the developer plans a rear yard setback of 7.5 metres (this also provides backyards for the condos) but there is no buffer allowance for the trees at the southeast corner adjacent to the end unit of the four unit townhomes. In fact, according to Figure 3 of the Concept Plan, some of the trees will be removed (not acceptable to us) and three of those that remain will have very little setback, putting their health and safety at risk. We require assurance that none of the trees will be harmed during excavation and building. We feel strongly that the setback of 7.5 metres should be included for the entire tree line on the east boundary of the subdivision (removal of the end unit should ensure adequate space for these trees). We also suggest that a city tree specialist be appointed to make certain the trees are protected.

Townhomes in this neighbourhood of single family detached dwellings:

The homes on Kopperfield Lane are all single detached family dwellings, with those on the north side a combination of bungalows and bungalowts. In keeping with the streetscape, we would like to see detached single family homes on Kopperfield Lane. At a minimum, the number of units facing onto Kopperfield Lane should be decreased, thereby increasing the amount of green space. The condominium units could be used for the higher density housing the city is looking for. We are also concerned about the stress the large number of units planned will place on neighbourhood parking and the traffic flow on Glencaster Road. All of these concerns, unless addressed and resolved, will have a negative impact on property values throughout the neighbourhood.
Drainage:

Water flows from west to east through a large culvert on Glancaster Road to the north part of the proposed subdivision. This affects both sides of Glancaster Road and eventually runs behind some houses on Bellstone Lane. This is a major concern for everyone affected.

There have been problems in the past of rainwater and melting snow pooling on properties on the north side of Kopperfield Lane and the south side of Bellstone Lane. The proposed site is undulating and will require a lot of excavation of the high areas and fill in the lower areas. The concern is that this development will again cause drainage issues for the bordering properties as the rain and melting snow currently drain onto and across these properties.

There is currently a drainage ditch with a catch basin in the southeast corner of the proposed subdivision. At times of heavy rain, water runoff waiting to disperse involves approximately one foot of water over a 15 by 6 foot area. What will happen to this water when the land is changed; will our property be where it ends up?

We appreciate the opportunity to voice our concerns. We do want to bring to your attention that the letter sent out by your department on March 19 was not received by us, or by the new home owners on the south side of Kopperfield Lane.

Sincerely

James Beesley BASc, MBA

Nancy Beesley Sleeth

c.c.: Councillor David Mitchell, Ward 11
P. Mallard, Director, Planning Division
S. Robichaud, Manager, Planning Division
Hello Jennifer,

I hope all is well. We are writing to you regarding the file number above (345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook). Our neighbour Fran, has been the one taking on so many of our concerns, and mentioned to email you, prior to the Economic Department and Planning Committee of City Council meeting. Today is April 8, 2010.

We are residents, as mentioned to you on your voicemail, of 27 Kellogg Ave. We have a multitude of concerns, although I am certain the builders, Chairavalle family, will build beautiful homes and have a dignified, solid, amazing reputation.

The property value of fellow homeowners, including ourselves is a tad gray with town homes/condos going up. So so so many of us have purposely decided to reside here, in the peace and quiet, as compared to our previous home(s). It is a long, cost saving process to decide and our family love the tranquil scenes, traffic flow, golf course, neighbourhood and close community.

I cannot imagine a pathway, for those who will live in the lower income town home, to now be able to hang on my street, next to these +$400K homes - you really do not have any business to be on our street, unless you live on it or within it. It is so bad to see traffic super speeding down Kopperfield Road from Glancaster as it is - it is super silly, unsafe, dangerous and a serious injury/death is waiting to happen as people come out of a pathway onto our "once quiet" neighbourhood - keep in mind that I, as many others, have very small, dependant children who need to walk down Kopperfield in order to get to our "once enjoyable" local park. It is ridiculous to imagine the unimaginable. I know, I know "you've heard all that before" - but imagine that your kid.

Keep them in an area we once were - we live here now... away from that hectic eastern mountain - again, our backyard faces the golf course, on a quiet one lane each, Twenty Road ... off a quiet one lane each Glancaster Road. I hope that ASAP, as ASAP as today that slow down measures, speed bumps, highly paid traffic control, police, laws, fines, and all others I've missed are letting people who live across these homes, horse stables, and green spaces know that it makes zero sense to be here.

The amenities are not convenient - the closest school is Garth and Rymal - St. Therese of Liseux - closest variety plaza or supermarket is Paradise as far as Mohawk - just silly. It makes zero sense - we are Hamilton/Ancaster boarder ... not Upper Gage & Stonechurch

Will these town homes address guarantee ZERO water issues to us? Again as early as last year, we faced horrible floods, water damage and lost insurance privileges where we once lived - again another reason we moved here. I'd hate to be the horse/stable owners and look at my property .. oops there are town homes, many speedy cars, less greenery people wandering, etc .... Isn't a future, sensitive topic today "green"?

Lastly, will these townhomes' backyards, brick, siding going to face Kopperfield? um, can you say 'value'? We pray not -- is there going to be increased traffic even more so if they make another street to go into the complex? Keep these kids/punks away from our place we want to finally call "OUR HOME". Keep my kids safe and keep people like Fran, my neighbour, not wanting to move "again" and sell "again" because her home's front porch will almost connect to a path to town homes.

4/8/2010
Again, we have ZERO doubt that it will happen, but also know that the attempt and success of a close knit community just built will end up like the others - just a house, not a home or a kick in the 'value' butt.

Thanks for your time, Jennifer Haan and Peter J. De Iulio. We too are concerned parents. I would hate to feel unsafe and isolate my kids to their backyard. Day or night!

Sincerely,

C & E Bizzarro
27 Kellogg Ave

Got a phone? Get Hotmail & Messenger for mobile!
Haan, Jennifer

From: Miran Mes

Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 11:46 AM

To: Haan, Jennifer

Subject: Fw: File. OPA-10-004,ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002

Hi Jennifer,

I hope you got this now

Original Message------

To: Jennifer.Ham@hamilton.ca
Cc: Miran Mes
Subject: File. OPA-10-004,ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002
Sent: Apr 7, 2010 12:04 PM

Hello Jennifer

Just a concern in regards to a letter that we have come across but did not receive. We live at 19 Kellogg Ave and have not received the notice in regards to this application for change of zoning. We need an extension to the deadline of April 9th.

Do you know why we were not on the mailing list?

If you can not grant the extension please use this email as my form of Not in favor of the new land use

Kopperfield lane has already become a very busy road with cars and pedestrian traffic. We have lived in the area for many years first on Kopperfield and now here we do in fact love the area. We have every intent of staying in the area for a long time. My wife and myself have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in our home with the intent of keeping the value of our home. Not losing value after a year due to a town house project that now wants to be built. And I know that a project of this nature will devalue the area.

We would like to be informed of any future proposals

I would not oppose single family detached homes

Miran Mes

4/8/2010
March 30, 2010

File No. OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010

And 25T-201002

Dear Jennifer Haan

This is in response to your letter for the application to rezone the land located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glenbrook from the existing residential “ER” Zone to the Multiple Residential “RM3” Zone.

I do not feel this fits in with the existing Low Density Residential area located on Kopperfield Lane and will greatly change the streetscape in this area.

The entire area Kopperfield Lane is homes of either bungalows or not too large two story homes with enough green space between them. It is not a concrete village. This makes it a great and quiet neighborhood for going for walks.

I feel putting 18 street townhouses and 30 condominium townhouses in this small area 1.2 hectares will destroy the appeal of the neighborhood and take away the quietness and small community feel.

The nearest city bus stop is over a mile (1.6 kilometers) away and the nearest grocery store is 3 miles (4.8 kilometers away). This will require the need for people to own more than one car resulting in more traffic and parking problems with so many houses located on such a small area. Parking on both sides of the Street. The Street Townhouses will have two parking stops (one in the driveway and the other in the garage) most people with children use a single car garage as a shed for hockey nets, bikes etc.

The 30 Condominium townhouses have one driveway parking spot with a single car garage which will be used for a shed resulting in
street parking. There are not enough proposed visitor parking resulting again into additional street parking.

There are no public or catholic schools close to the neighborhood resulting in added traffic from schools buses. There is a catholic located on Garth St which is full (St Therese Of Lisieux) also a private Christian high school located on Glancaster Rd Sir Allan MacNab is 6.64 miles away and R.A. Riddell 3.10 miles away.

St Thomas More Catholic is overloaded so the closed catholic is Bishop Tonrus S.S

The Townhouses under construction on Rymal Rd where there is a school proposed also states children may need to be bussed outside the area.

The 30 Condominium townhouses will not have a back yard area for the children to play resulting in again them moving to the street to play (hockey, basketball, etc) The Park is about a kilometer away.

Medium density development should abut or be within a reasonable distance from arterial and or collector roads; ii) The availability of public transit services should be within reasonable walking distances

iii) the availability of adequate and direct pedestrian access to other required community facilities such as shopping areas, schools, churches and parks and,

iv) Medium density residential development shall be sensitively integrated with and adequately buffered from adjacent land uses.

I do not believe that this townhouse complex meets these by-laws. We should not allow the by-laws to be amended for this subdivision.
Along Kopperfield Lane should be single bungalow or two storey homes with adequate back yards and parking for two or more cars.

The row of trees on the north side of Kopperfield Lane should not be touched because improve the streetscape.

Cars right now only have one entrance onto Kopperfield lane and area, which has increased traffic because of this. With so many townhouses and distance to amenities there will additional cars and the overflow will park on the street causing potential accidents. There will be additional problems in the winter with snow.

We worry about the sanitary sewer system and whether it can handle the additional strain from all the homes. If there are going to be pumps to drain the sewers because of low of slope of the pipe and a backup systems due to power failures.

The effects on city water supply and pressure due to additional homes.

Flooding problems from storms, snow melting etc on Kopperfield Lane and surrounding area.

According to the Medium Density Residential designation consideration shall be given the following criteria;

I hope you take our concerns in the decision-making and turn down the application for rezoning the land located at 345 Glancaster Road Glenbrook to Medium Density Residential and instead rezone it Low Density Residential.
Thank you very much,

Brian McNamee

Frances Borsellino

Rebecca Borsellino

P.S. We were informed that there are more single family homes going in along Keppenfield Lane on the South side.

We’re not opposed to more homes but this also should be taken into consideration with respect to traffic flow along Keppenfield Lane.
From: Mitchell, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 9:10 PM
To: Haan, Jennifer
Subject: Fw: New Development

Just another one I have received. Did you get this one

Sincerely
David L Mitchell
Councillor Ward 11 Hamilton Serving, Glenbrook, Winona and Upper Rural Stoney Creek
Office 905 546 4513
Fax 905 546 2483
Home 905 692 5379

The contents of this e-mail transmission are privileged and confidential, intended only for the recipients named above. This message may not be copied, forwarded, reproduced, published or used in any manner without the express written permission of the sender. If you have received this e-mail and are not the intended recipient, please destroy it and call 905/546-4513. Thank-you.

From: Keith Ruddy <Email Address>
To: Mitchell, Dave
Sent: Wed Apr 07 17:49:42 2010
Subject: New Development

David
As a resident at 18 Kopperfield Lane in Mount Hope I am very concerned about the proposed development based on the corner of Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane.

My issues are the following:
1. Where is all the run-off to go, since the area will be covered with homes and pavement?
   My existing property is well below the current level of the proposed site and I already suffer from excess werrrun-off.
2. There is a row of beautiful pine trees that separate the existing single detached homes on Kopperfield from the proposed development. Who will insure these tress will be untouched and will allow sufficient space from new development?
3. The area of Kopperfield is single detached homes. I am very concerned about the high density that allows 48 townhomes to be crowded into such a small space.
   What about our property values, schools, school busing, increased traffic, playgrounds etc., etc.
4. Glancaster Road is a poor two lane road that badly needs upgrading, and that is before any additional traffic is added.

I will be attending future public meetings on this proposal to register my concerns.
As our ward representative, you need to be aware of the issues and concerns your citizens have with this project.

By the way please make sure City Hall informs all residents about any meetings on this issue. I bring this up, since many residents did not receive the initial city letter informing residents of the proposal.

Keith Ruddy

Hotmail & Messenger. Get them on your phone now.
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Wednesday, April 7, 2010

Jennifer HAAN, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Section
77 James Street North, Suite 400, Hamilton

Dear Ms HAAN:

We are writing to you in accordance with the correspondence received in your letter dated March 19, 2010. We are requesting that our opposition be placed in the public record and that we are notified of any and all direction involving the application for the Draft Plan, Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of the subdivision submitted by Koppercreek Developments Inc., for lands located at 345 Glancaester Road in Glenbrook.

We would be negatively effected by such a development for several reasons:

1. The road infrastructure is inadequate in this area for added traffic. Kopperfield Lane and Glancaester Road has a stop sign to control the traffic at this intersection. Due to traffic volume on north-south bound traffic on Glancaester Road, we have waited up to five minutes to make a turn from Kopperfield onto Glancaester. The surface on Kopperfield Lane is terrible. The development on Kellogg and continuing housing development on the south side of Kopperfield has left the road surface covered in mud, patched asphalt with deep elevation drops, construction vehicles parked on both sides and poor visibility for local children boarding and disembarking from school buses. Enforcement to keep the road surface free of mud and compacted soil has been invisible.

2. Our home is located on the north-west corner of Bellstone Lane and Blackburn Lane. During heavy rain storms, the road is continuously flooded. The rain pools rise above the top of the curb and flood the lawn. The storm sewer system in our neighbourhood is insufficient. Adding more roof lines, downspouts and weeping tiles will increase this problem as opposed to the natural ability for the soil at 345 Glancaester to absorb these rains.

3. The prevalent south-west winds in our geographical area cause allergy hardships in our home. The dust that will be created by this development will be ongoing and persistent for a lengthy period of time causing us to lose the ability to reasonably enjoy the outdoors at our home. My spouse will continue to be imprisoned inside our home, as she has for the past two years during the current construction process and will remain in such a state during this planned development.

Although progress and building the tax base is a wonderful concept, if development at this address is approved, ONLY single family homes should be considered due to the above listed reasons.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike Cole and Pat Stevens
3 Blackburn Lane
Mount Hope, Ontario
LOR 1W0
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April 6, 2010

Jennifer Haan, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Section
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Jennifer.Haan@hamilton.ca

Re: File No: OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002, 345 Glancaster Road

We are deeply concerned that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact to the watershed of the natural creek. This natural waterway drains and goes through the property under consideration and shortly after, passes directly through the full width of our property.

Our experience with neighboring development has not been positive. The most recent development adjacent to our property does not appear to conform its original design and construction. Consequently, excess ground water & drainage now enters our property. We cannot have a repeat of this. This new proposal has even higher potential for a greater negative impact, particularly in view of its scale, location and the increased incidence of high precipitation events.

As our property cannot sustain more water, we need full assurance & confirmation, that the design and construction on properties upstream from us will not have any impact on the characteristics of the creek as it enters our property, including, but not limited to, water volume, velocity and sediment levels. We respectfully request that this be confirmed by thorough studies both prior to and two years following construction.

Yours truly,

Charlie and Flory Fluit
305 Glancaster Road
Ancaster, Ontario 3K9

cc: Councillor David Mitchell, Ward 11 david.mitchell@hamilton.ca
Dear Jennifer,

Regarding the townhouse development application for a zoning by-law: 345 Glancaster Road. Putting 18 street townhouse dwellings at the entrance to our survey will cause a traffic problem in this area as it is during the morning rush to work there is usually a line of cars stopped to turn onto Glancaster Rd.

Having 18 units will also lower the value of our homes. Will these units be solely owned or rental property units? Will there be condominium fees charged to the owners of these units? Will they be freehold units? Will these units be for Seniors? Where will the children play if these units are not for use as an “Adult lifestyle” or “Executive lifestyle”? The view for turning will be obscured. Water usage infrastructure inadequate for 48 new buildings! This parcel of land has a natural creek running through it buildings may obstruct natural water flow.

Single homes should only be put on this lot. I am unhappy that the city did not notify us of the plans to put townhome units in this area!! My husband and I have concerns with this situation.

Regards.

Kim Hachey
From: Thomas
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2010 4:31 PM
To: Haan, Jennifer
Subject: Koppercreek Development at 345 Glancaster Road

City of
Hamilton
April 5, 2010
Hamilton City Hall
77 James Street North
Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3

Attention:
Jennifer Haan, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Section
77 James Street North, Suite 400, Hamilton Ontario, L8R 2K3
Quoting File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002

Copies to:
Peter J. De Iulio, BES, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager Development Planning - East Section.
Councillor David Mitchell, Ward 11
P. Mallard, Director, Planning Division
S. Robichaud, Planning Division

Dear Jennifer Haan,

This letter is to inform you that we (Thomas and Jamie Miller) with our residence adjoining the proposed development, are in total opposition for the application File No. OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002 Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glenbrook dated March 19, 2010.

We join with others in our neighborhood in respectfully requesting the City’s Planning and Economic Development Department to REJECT this Developers application to Amend existing Plans and Zoning by-laws to permit construction of a High-Density Condominium Project in this Existing Single-Family, Single-Dwelling, Residential Community. We believe that overall negative impacts from a High-Density Condo Proposal are likely to hurt existing Lifestyles, Values, and Marketability of Homes, which were constructed and purchased in accordance with the City’s then, and still existing, Plan and Zoning Regulations.

We appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention, and wish to be kept informed about all aspects of this request to Amend existing City Plan and Zoning, which, we repeat, we are opposed to because of it's potential adverse effects on existing real estate values and residents life-styles.

Thank you

4/6/2010
From: marilyn shackleton [marilyns@city.hamilton.on.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2010 2:18 PM
To: Peter Delullo; Haan, Jennifer; Robichaud, Steve; Mallard, Paul
Subject: Proposed Amendment to Kopperfield/Glancaster Rd, 345

City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Hall
77 James Street North
Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

March 31, 2010

Attention: Jennifer Haan, Planning and Economic Development Department,
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Division

Copies to: Peter J. Delullo, BES, MCIP, RPP,
           Senior Project Manager, Development Planning - East Division
           - Co-ordinator, Economic Development and Planning Committee, City of Hamilton
           -P Mallard, Director Planning Division, City of Hamilton
           -S Robichaud, Manager, Planning Division, City of Hamilton
           -David Mitchell, Councillor

Dear Sir/Madam:

We writing to place on record our opposition to the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Approval of a Draft plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., to permit building of forty eight (48) Condominium Townhouses on the property located at 345 Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane, Glanbrook as represented in your letter dated March 19, 2010, which we received on March 24th, 2010.

We searched for many years before retiring in this little neighbourhood of single family dwellings. We looked into The Village of Glanbrook but these streets/ neighbourhood was not condo oriented and yet quiet and just the right size for our present lifestyle. We loved this area because of the country effect and that's why we chose to move into this area September 2002. Our property (25 Bellstone Lane) borders near this proposed new development. We truly believed this area was zoned for single family homes for empty nesters and retirees. We would not like to think you would put us in a position of having to move once again.

The homes in this area are quite expensive and we're sure with townhouses and condos just to the west of us (100feet), the property value will plummet. We have worked very hard all of our lives so we could live in this lovely home and now we are being betrayed if the City allows this development to proceed.

We have no problem with the development of the property as long as it conforms and maintains the present character of the area.

Our feelings are in agreement with the rest of the residents in this area that have sent you letters outlining all of the issues, eg:
  High Density,
  Inconsistent Planning,
  Property Values,
  Drainage,
  Flooding,
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Congestion,
Security,
Privacy Preservation of existing trees and tree lines,
Condo overflow parking on neighbourhood streets,
design and curb appeal impressions impacting the existing neighbourhood.

This area has been well planned in the past, so why spoil it now.
The proposal sent out states nothing of what the developer has in mind.

We would very much appreciate it, if you would keep us informed about all aspects of this request to Amend existing City Plan and Zoning and we trust your wisdom to find good reason to "REJECT" this proposed development as it stands at present.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Frank & Marilyn Shackleton
25 Bellstone Lane
Mount Hope, Ontario
L0R 1W0

4/6/2010
Haan, Jennifer

From: Joan Tonellotto
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2010 11:56 AM
To: 'Paul Scott'; polloway; Marg & Sid McKay; Joe Kreuzer; Frank & Marilyn Shackleton; Dave Goddard; Haan, Jennifer
Cc: Mitchell, Dave
Subject: High Density subdivision application for 345 Glancaster Road/Kopperfield Lane, Glanbrook

City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Hall
77 James Street North
Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

April 5, 2010

Attention: Jennifer Haan, Planning and Economic Development Department,
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Division

Copies to: Peter J. Delullo, BES, MCIP, RPP,
Senior Project Manager, Development Planning - East Division
- Co-ordinator, Economic Development and Planning Committee, City of Hamilton
-P Mellard, Director Planning Division, City of Hamilton
-S Robichaud, Manager, Planning Division, City of Hamilton

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing to place on record my opposition to the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Approval of a Draft plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., to permit building of forty eight (48) Condominium Townhouses on the property located at 345 Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane, Glanbrook as represented in your letter dated March 19, 2010, which we received on March 24th, 2010.

I grew up on Twenty Road West within walking distance of Kopperfield and Glancaster Road. I've always loved this area because of the country effect and that's why I chose to move back to this area almost three years ago. My property (33 Bellstone Lane) borders the proposed new development. I was always led to believe that this property was zoned for single family homes for empty nesters and retirees. If I had known this was coming, I wouldn't have even considered purchasing a home here.

I will be one of the most affected homes, since I will be losing my privacy. I have two huge picture windows that face the new project and I'm sure I won't be able to open my blinds without a million eyes peering in. The homes in this area are very expensive and I'm sure with townhouses and condos behind me, the property value will plummet. I worked very hard all my life so I could live in this lovely place and I would feel very betrayed if the City allows this development to proceed.

I have no problem with the development of the property as long as it conforms and maintains the present character of the area.

My feelings are in agreement with the rest of the residents in this area that have sent you letters outlining all of the issues, e.g. High Density, Inconsistent Planning, Property Values, Drainage, Flooding, Congestion, Security, Privacy Preservation of existing trees and tree lines, Condo overflow parking on neighbourhood streets, design and curb appeal impressions impacting the existing neighbourhood.

This area has been well planned in the past, so why spoil it now.

I would very much appreciate it, if you would keep me informed about all aspects of this request to Amend existing City Plan and Zoning and I trust in your wisdom to find good reason to "REJECT" this proposed development.
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Thanking you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joan Tonellotto  
33 Bellstone Lane  
Glanbrook, Ontario  
L0R 1W0
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29 Bellstone Lane  
Mount Hope, Ontario  
LOR 1W0  
March 31, 2010

City of Hamilton  
Hamilton City Hall  
77 James Street North  
Suite 400  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3

Attention: Jennifer Haan, City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Section  
77 James Street North, Suite 400, Hamilton Ontario, L8R 2K3  
Quoting File No. OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002

Copies to:  
Peter J. De Iuliis, BES, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager Development Planning - East Section  
Councillor David Mitchell, Ward 11  
P. Maillard, Director, Planning Division  
S. Robichaud, Planning Division

Dear Sir/Madam,

As suggested in your letter dated March 19, 2010; following are our comments.

To be clear, we are in total opposition to this type of proposed development planned for this location. We are not opposed to this type of development in an area that is suitable and accommodating. The property at 345 Glancaster Road (Glancaster and Kopperfield) does not meet this criteria.

Our objections to the proposed zoning changes are as follows but not limited to:

A substantial negative impact on the value of the neighbouring homes.  
The homes in this area are single dwellings, meticulously maintained and are selling in the $450,000 plus range.  
The proposed high density development adjacent to the existing homes would without a doubt considerably lower their value.

A negative impact on the current homeowners.  
We purchased our home based on the location and based on the fact that the surrounding land was zoned for similar residential dwellings that would complement our home.  
We trusted that the City approved zoning would remain intact and consistent with single home development.
The proposed high density development undermines Hamilton's original planning and now suggests that a hodgepodge plan would be acceptable; which makes no sense to us and should not make sense to anyone associated with planning.

An irreplaceable tree line currently borders the proposed site. These huge trees, estimated to be approximately 50 years old, are on the property of the existing homeowners. The very real and valid concern is directed to the root system of these trees. The root system and its integrity is crucial to the survival of these awe-inspiring trees. There is no doubt that the root system over 50 plus years has travelled a considerable distance onto the adjacent property. Unrestricted earth removal and/or disruption will stress the root system which could lead to the demise of the trees. This would be unconscionable.

The existing properties are subject to poor drainage resulting in extremely wet yards and sump pumps that consistently operate. This condition has been acknowledged by city officials who have reviewed the drainage issue with the homeowners. The existing homes are lower than the grade of the proposed condo site and there is a natural creek on this property that is subject to a high run off. This combination without a doubt, would create a monumental problem for existing homeowners. The existing homes are in the range of 1700 to 3300 sq. ft. and sit on properties that average 50ft. X 100ft.

The number of proposed condo/townhouses squeezed into blocks 1, 2, 3 & 4 totally 1.12ha. is incomprehensible for this area. As this location is the gateway to our community, similar dwellings complementing the existing homes should be the only choice that the city of Hamilton should be considering.

We expect our tax money to be wisely spent on intelligent decisions made by employees who use logic and common sense when it comes to the future development of the city of Hamilton. It is our expectation that this will be executed when the decision is made on the outcome of this proposed condo/townhouse development.

Again, we want to be clear; we do not oppose this type of development as long as it is complementary to an existing development or consistent with future development.

Your letter of March 19, 2010, Re: Applications for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc. for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glenbrook, is vague and lacks detail pertaining to building height, location, design, construction, tenant parking, visitor parking and accessibility from Glancaster and/or Kopperfield.

We respectfully request that the “application received by Hamilton's Planning and Economic Development Department for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glenbrook” not be approved.

This location should only be considered for development that is consistent and compatible with existing homes and designed to meet the safety of traffic flow, parking and pedestrians.

We thank you for the opportunity to be able to express our opinions. We hope that they will be considered, taken seriously and acted upon in the best interest of ourselves, our neighbours and the future development in this area.
As very concerned residents who would be adversely affected if this project proceeds, please ensure that we are kept informed of all details, decisions, meetings etc., that relate to this property.

We remain,

[Signature]

Margaret McKay
Syd and Margaret McKay
29 Bellstone Lane,
Mount Hope, Ontario
LOR 1W0
March 29th, 2010.

Attention of: Jennifer Haan, Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Division

. Copies to: - Peter J. Delulio, BES, MCIP, RPP,
Senior Project Manager, Development Planning - East Division
- Co-ordinator, Economic Development and Planning Committee, City of Hamilton.
- Councillor David Mitchell, Ward 11
- P. Mallard, Director, Planning Division, City of Hamilton
- S. Robichaud, Manager, Planning Division, City of Hamilton

Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for an Official Plan Amendment,
Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc.,
for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing to place on record our opposition to the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment
and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., to permit building of Forty Eight (48)
Condominium Townhouses on property located at 345 Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane, Glanbrook, as
represented in your letter dated March 19, 2010, which we received on March 24th, 2010.

We respectfully request City Hall Staff and City Council to NOT agree to Amend existing Plan/Zoning By-laws etc. that
will allow construction of a High-Density Condominium Project with Intensification Footprint and associated issues at this
location because of potential adverse impacts on existing property values and family lifestyles.

Opposition to the proposed Amendments and Draft Plan are based, in part, on the following issues:
* High Density project adversely Impacts existing Residents
* Inconsistent with plan/zoning for existing Neighborhood
* Affects existing Property Values unfairly and hurts Marketability
* Increases Drainage issues and Flooding concerns
* Population and other Intensification issues creates Congestion
* Security and Privacy Issues
* Preservation of existing Trees and Tree lines
* Condo Overflow Parking on Neighborhood Streets
* Design and Curb Appeal impressions impacts existing Neighborhood

As there was no site or building design/layout detail in your letter of March 19th, it is expected that additional concerns
and issues will surface when more information is made available.

The proposed High-Density Condominium Project would bring an intensification footprint and associated impact
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on existing homes and residents, and will be the first at this Prime Residential Community, "Lanes of Glancaster". Amending Plan/Zoning to permit this project would be grossly unfair to existing home owners who purchased single-family, stand-alone homes built on individual residential Lots in good faith, trusting and expecting that City-approved Plan and Zoning By-laws and Regulations would remain consistant.

This Project is not consistent with City Hall's approved detached single-family single-dwelling template for this neighborhood with a target buying audience of single-family, working professionals and empty-nesters. It is unclear why City Hall would consider approving this location for High Density Condominium Development that will create associated population and other intensification issues, instead of maintaining the City's existing Plan/Zoning By-laws for consistency and continuity, and protecting values and marketability of Homes already in this Development.

The current Plan/Zoning for our "Lanes of Glancaster" Residential Development was approved by the City and does not permit the levels of high-density intensification being proposed by the Developer to build 48 Condominiums/Townhouses on a relatively small parcel of land. The project will bring to our neighborhood high-density construction and population, infrastructure and other issues including paved areas, water, sewer, drainage, vehicles and pedestrian traffic, etc. This project will be virtually surrounded by existing single-family, stand-alone detached Homes on larger lots and with higher values that can be adversely affected by their proximity to Condoa/Townhouses. This is not fair to existing Home-owners who purchased homes expecting consistency of planning and zoning by City Hall.

The Projects High-Density/Intensification and paved ground surfaces are likely to result in Condo ground water-runoff that could become hazardous. We are particularly concerned about water run-off from the Condo Site into existing property's that already experience flooding in heavy rains, storms, snow-melt run-offs, etc. In addition, some existing Homes are at a lower grade than the proposed Condo's which is cause for additional concern. Importing 48 Townhouses/Condo's into this existing Development creates a major Intensification Footprint that includes additional population, cars, paved areas, water run-off, drainage, sewage, vehicles, pedestrian traffic, and other related issues, that are likely to impact in a negative way existing neighborhood property's. All of these are of concern to neighbors, and should be to City Hall.

There is an existing natural Creek that flows through the property for the proposed Condo Project, as well as other natural water run-offs in our development, which emphasizes concerns about water run-off and potential flooding.

High-Density Condominiums are clearly not appropriate for existing, approved, residentially Zoned Property's for stand-alone single-family detached homes on lot sizes approximating 50 feet by 100 feet. Not only are Condos inconsistent with current Zoning, but their proposed location increases potential safety risks with Road and Traffic expansions planned for Glancaster Road and other area roads to facilitate growth of Commercial and other Vehicle Traffic for the talked-about AEGD Airport Expansion. Substantial increases in vehicle and human Traffic created from the proposed High-Density Condo Project will also congest existing Street access for our Neighborhood Residences, increasing probability of accidents, especially for Families and Children using Glancaster Road, Kopperfield Lane, and other neighborhood Streets for social/exercise walking, cycling, skateboarding, street hockey, wheelskating, etc., along with currently minimal local auto traffic.

Security and Privacy are likely to become issues if this Project with associated Population Intensification is allowed. As we have said, High-Density population on small property are not consistent with residential planning that previously approved single-family, single-level, detached Bungalows and two-story residential homes on 50X100 foot lots, which have been sold, we understand, at prices in the $450,000 range. Notwithstanding all the Neighborhood Opposition, if City Hall were to agree to amend Zoning By-laws, etc. and permit this Condo Project, the Developer should be required to comply with Building Height Restrictions appropriate to existing neighborhood single-story Bungalow homes that adjoin the proposed Condo site.

In addition the Developer should be required to construct at their expense suitable Privacy Fencing that separates Condo property from adjoining Residences. We also propose that consideration be given to a Buffer Zone on Condo property to help to protect existing residents trees and tree lines from damage, etc.

This existing residential neighborhood and its lawns and gardens are cared for and appreciated by Homeowners, and there is concern that such a high-density Condo project with obvious associated Intensification issues, will adversely impact the appearance and tone of this Neighborhood, and possibly destroy some of the very tall 40+ year old tall trees growing on residential property's that borders the Condo Site. Many of these mature trees have shallow root systems. Disturbances such as are typical with construction, removing top-soil, digging, etc, can affect roots causing stress to Trees, and possibly even kill them. Developers should be required to employ at their expense, in consultation with affected homeowners, the services of an Arborist to advise on best practices to minimise construction and other Condo-related damages to plants and trees on bordering neighbors property's. Interfering with or disturbing roots of these large trees increases chances of them falling over due to wind, rain, etc., possible onto existing homes, proposed condos, or people, with serious consequences.

The very general preliminary Plan contained in your letter does not indicate in any detail locations of buildings, vehicle
pamphlet capability, garages, paved areas, driveways, Garden, Recreational areas, etc., within the High-Density
Condo/Townhouse property.
It also does not provide visual impressions of completed Buildings, Street appearance, Exterior Layouts, Road
Access, etc., to enable an evaluation of Curb Appeal and Overall Impression, and the image it will present to the public,
and the rest of the Neighborhood.
This is important because located at the Entrance to our Community, this High-Density Townhouse/Condo Project will by
its design and appearance create and transmit impressions about the rest of the neighborhood, and residents.
Prospective Buyers are likely to be influenced about desirability of buying and living in this Community based on opinions
they form of the adjoining Townhouse/Condo project located by the entrance to the community, and which they will pass
on the way in/out. Appearance, Curb Appeal, and Overall Impressions about the completed Project are Critical because of
its location on primary streets that provides access to the rest of the neighborhood.
How this very visible Project will be envisaged, planned, designed, developed, occupied, and maintained, will reflect on
everyone living here, and create impressions about existing homes. The completed Project can either help to maintain
and possibly even enhance the neighborhood, or, it can destroy Values and Marketability if it’s Development is
not consistent with existing plan/zoning, and neighborhood architectures, values, and lifestyles.

At this stage, with the limited information so far provided, we do not know the full impact this High-Density Project located
at the Entrance to our Community will transmit about itself, and about the rest of the adjoining neighborhood, and
the impact on current home values and lifestyles.
But, should you decide to allow this sort of high-density intensification into this location, we request City Hall, as a
condition of that approval, to require that Condo Buildings Plan/Design to be Architecturally Pleasing and with appropriate
Positive Curb Appeal to blend into and enhance the appearance of the neighborhood. It should be properly landscaped
and maintained and contribute a good overall impression of this neighborhood.

It is also unclear where/how Condo Vehicle Traffic will access Public Roads, and which ones, and
we are naturally concerned about the proposed Site Intensification adversely affecting traffic flows, and increasing Street
and other hazards in this residential family neighborhood.
Your letter also did not indicate how Developers, City Planners, and/or Condo residents propose to address
issues surrounding overflows of Condo Vehicles Parking on Public Roads. It is expected that limited land area and
parking space within the Condo property will encourage vehicles to park on Glancaeter Road, and more likely along
Koppertield Lane, causing Congestion on main access streets for this neighborhood. This will impact Residents,
possibly also hindering Emergency Vehicles such as Fire, Ambulances, Police, and the like.

We join with others in our neighborhood in respectfully requesting the City’s Planning and Economic Development
Department to REJECT this Developers application to Amend existing Plans and Zoning by-laws to permit construction of
a High-Density Condominium Project in this Existing Single-Family, Single-Dwelling, Residential Community. We
believe that overall negative impacts from a High-Density Condo Proposal are likely to hurt existing Lifestyles, Values, and
Marketability of Homes, which were constructed and purchased in accordance with the City’s then, and still existing, Plan
and Zoning Regulations.

We appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention, and wish to be kept informed about all aspects of this request to
Amend existing City Plan and Zoning, which, we repeat, we are opposed to because of it’s potential adverse effects
on existing real estate values and residents life-styles.

Thank you for considering our comments,
Sincerely,
Paul & Marian Scott

3/30/2010
From: palloway [redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 26, 2010 10:01 AM
To: Haan, Jennifer
Subject: Draft plan for Koppercreek development

Jennifer—would you please forward a copy to Peter J Delulio, P. Mallard and S. Robichaud. Thanking you in advance
Tom & Sharon Palloway

City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Hall
77 James Street North
Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3


Attention of: Jennifer Haan, Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division - Development Planning - East Division
and,
Peter J. De Iulio, BES, MCIP, RPP,
Senior Project Manager, Development Planning - East Division.

Councilor David Mitchell, Ward 11
P. Mallard, Director, Planning Division, City of Hamilton
S. Robichaud, Manager, Planning Division, City of Hamilton

RE: Your letter dated March 19, 2020
File No. OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 25T-201002
Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., for lands located at 345 Glancaster Road, Glanbrook.

Dear Sir/Madam,

On behalf of ourselves at 31 Bellstone Lane (Tom & Sharon Palloway) with our residence adjoining the proposed development, we are writing to place on record our objection to the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Approval, of a Draft Plan of Subdivision by Koppercreek Developments Inc., for the building of Forty Eight (48) Condominium Townhouses on Lands located at 345 Glancaster Road and Kopperfield Lane, Glanbrook, as represented in your letter dated March 19, 2010, which we received on March 24th, 2010.

We respectfully urge and request City Hall Staff and City Council that these proposed Amendments NOT be approved in view of the substantial adverse effects that it will obviously cause to existing area Home-owners and their Families Life-styles who will be affected by this First High-Density Housing Project proposed to be built in this prime residential area, and the resulting negative impacts on existing property values in the area if you approve Zoning changes that enable this intensification.

We wish to point out that the High-Density Housing Project as proposed, the First in this residential neighborhood, is not

3/29/2010
consistent with City Hall’s already approved single-family dwelling template for this area, with target buying audience (single-family, working professionals, etc.). It is unclear why City Hall would even consider approving this location for High Density Condominium Development, instead of following their existing plans/zonings with consistency and continuity. Other options exist, for example by putting single family houses as been already zone for (ZAC-07-075 and draft plan 251-200713) at Glanclaster road and Grassy Plains to continue the continuity of the area.

This residential area is a mini-greenbelt enjoyed, cared for, and appreciated by existing homeowners, and there is major concern that this high density project could destroy much of the very tall 40 to 50 year old spruce trees that are within our property line and 2 other residences for approx. 200 feet. We wish to point out that these trees abutting the proposed high density project are over 40 years old with shallow root systems. Disturbance such as is typical with new construction that removes top-soil and excavations will disturb roots and cause trees stress, and possible dying. If project should be finally approved, the Developers should be required to employ, at their expense, the services of an impartial Arborist approved by existing home-owners to assess any and all potential damage to existing tree lines. If this proposed high-density project developer interferes with the existing root base of our trees there will be greatly increased chances of these trees dying or falling due to wind, rain, or otherwise - on existing homes or possibly onto proposed condominiums and/or its tenants.

The plan by the builder is not showing any thought to the already approved and developed residential area that such a massive intensification of condominium homes would bring to the area especially since it is virtually surrounded by already existing single family homes that are now value at well over $400,000.

The additional impacts of this proposals intensification on existing homes in this neighborhood that experiences existing water drainage and sewage issues is of considerable concern. We are especially concerned about drainage at our home and to existing neighborhood homes and gardens/lawns areas, already subject to flooding in rains, storms, snow melt run-off etc. due to fact that we sit on a clay base and in our case we are close to 8 ft lower in grade than the site in question. Many other existing residential homes are lower in grade than the levels of the proposed condominium site that brings major additional intensification of people, water, sewage, traffic, paved areas, etc. There should also be more concern about the existing natural Creek currently flowing through the property for this proposed high density Condo project, as well as other underground water run-offs that flow through already areas.

High-Density Condominiums are not appropriate on single family residentially zoned property. This is also inconsistent and dangerous for everyone in the area in view of the proposed road expansion planned for Glanclaster Road and other close-by area roads to accommodate commercial truck and other vehicles for the talked about Airport (AEGD) Developments. Additional resulting traffic and access to existing and potential residential streets and buildings can become extremely dangerous, especially for families (many RETIRED and SENIORS are residents of this area) and children who now use Glanclaster Road and other neighborhood streets for social walking, cycling, etc.

Privacy and security issues will become of increasing concern if this project is approved. In the event that the requests to Amend existing City Plans and existing Zoning By-laws are approved by your Department there is concern that since the existing area consists mostly of single family single-level bungalows with some two story residential homes, that this condominium proposal should be required to comply with appropriate (for the area) height restrictions to preserve everyone’s privacy - theirs, and existing family homes. In addition, it should be mandatory for Developers of this high-density project, if Zone changes etc are approved, to construct and pay for suitable privacy fencing. With approval of homeowners abutting the Developers proposed condominium project, and that there be at least a 10 meter-buffer zone on Developers property to protect existing residents trees and tree lines from potential damages.

Finally the Plan as presented in your letter, does not show locations of buildings, vehicle parking capability, or paved driveways within the proposed development, nor does it show where/how the development will access the public roads. Nor does it show how it is planned to deal with anticipated overflow parking for condo vehicles and visitors. It is anticipated that such vehicles may have to be parked on Glanclaster Road and Kopperfield Lane, which can lead to congestion on a main access for an already developed neighborhood, affecting existing residents and possibly emergency vehicles for Fire, Ambulances, Police, etc.

We respectfully request that the City’s Planning and Economic Development Department reject this Developers application to Amend existing Plans and to Amend existing Zoning by-laws because of the serious negative impact it is likely to have on existing area property’s in close proximity which were purchased and constructed under the City’s existing Plans and Zoning regulations.

We invite the developers of this project to instead consider alternative development plans for this site that will have less negative impact on existing homeowners and residents.

We wish to be kept informed and advised of all aspects of this request to Amend existing City Plans and Zoning, which we strongly object to, in view of the applications potential disastrous impact on exiting real estate values and residents safety in this area.

3/29/2010
Thank you,
Sincerely,

Tom and Sharon Palloway
31 Bellstone Lane Lot 22 and part of 46
Glenbrook

3/29/2010
March 25, 2010

City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Hall
77 James Street North
Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3

To: Jennifer Haan, Development Planning - East Division
   Peter J. Deluio, BES, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager, - East Division.

cc: Co-ordinator, Economic Development and planning Committee, City of Hamilton.
    Councillor David Mitchell, Ward 11
    P. Mallard, Director, Planning Division, City of Hamilton
    S. Robichaud, Manager, Planning Division, City of Hamilton

Subject: Development at Glencaster and Kopperfield Road—Glanbrook
   (File # OPA-10-004, ZAC-10-010 and 2ST-201002-March 19th letter)

The purpose of this letter is to submit our personal objections to the proposed zoning bylaw changes and type of development, planned for this package of land. The framework of this objection, focuses on impacts to the adjacent homes, located on Kopperfield Lane (to Idlewilde), Kellogg Ave, and Bellstone and Blackburn Lanes, referred to as the “target area”.

Let me first express my frustration with the vagueness, generalizations, and expressions contained within the March 19th letter, which makes it very difficult to understand and respond to. There is no dimensioning of differences between what a “street townhome” vs. “condominium townhome” is, no perspective on whether the 30-home package is a single stacked building or connected-homes, and no indication of traffic impacts and flows (streets and parking), amongst other issues. What is clear to us, is that the plan clearly reflects higher density housing than what currently exists. The template and makeup of this target area will change substantially, as a result of this plan, and will negatively impact existing property values, and the lifestyles of the existing residents. This and other issues are detailed below:

Type of Development
This plan is not consistent with existing zoning and with the single family home matrix in this area. It adds 48 residences in a space roughly equivalent to 22 existing homes, which is completely unacceptable. In addition, there is no similar existing development of this nature in this quadrant between Rymal and Twenty Road. Perhaps more damning, is its location at the entrance to Kopperfield Lane, which will cheapen the view of prospective resale buyers of existing properties.

Impact on Property Values
Existing homes in the target areas are valued between $450,000-$475,000, are generally between 1700-3000 sq foot, are single standalone dwellings, and generally on 50x100 foot lots. The public perception of this development/plan, will be that it dominates and sets the tone, for the entire target area. Double the homes in half the space. Not smart planning, or consistency with what this area was designed to be.

Current Homeowner Expectations
When we purchased our home, based on existing zoning, we clearly expected similar development of the undeveloped and adjoining lands. Why would we not when it was zoned that way? There is a surgical mix of retired, professional, and upscale homeowners in the target area, which appears directly, opposed to what this plan suggests. The clear message in your March 19th letter is that the City has given no consideration to this, and is moving forward in a completely contrary way.
Traffic Flow and Connection
This plan will add up to 200 residents & 100 vehicles in a "postage stamp" sized area. Traffic control, parking, and safety is already an issue with the existing homes, and further high-density homes will only magnify this problem. In addition, there is absolutely no perspective in the plan indicating the flow of traffic within the development and no dimensioning of parking areas, specifically as they may impact adjoining properties.

Drainage Issues
The City has already acknowledged that drainage is not sufficient for existing homes in this area, primarily due to the roof area of existing homes, out of proportion with runoff areas, and has forced residents to adopt alternative drainage methods. As you are aware, the land in question is wrought with water issues because of its unique "land pitch" and a creek, which results in a high runoff area. Our homes sump pump runs consistently in periods of rain. We shudder to think what will happen to water disposal, given impacts of the current plan.

Existing Tree Line and Buffer Area
Ultimately, this land will be developed in some form and we accept that, as long as it confirms to the mosaic of the area. Amongst the considerations, must be protection of the existing 40-year old tree line, including a buffer zone, to ensure root systems are permitted to thrive, and that privacy is still afforded to the founding residents. Some form of additional protection and "green" privacy barrier will be required.

In summary, this is the wrong type of development for this area and we strongly object to the plan in its current form. Please ensure we are kept advised of ongoing events and changes, as this plan moves forward, specifically the first public meeting, where you can be assured, strong representation from existing residents will be voiced.

Yours truly,

David and Carolyn Goddard
27 Belstone Lane, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0

Koppercreek:
Attention: Jennifer Haan

cc: David L. Mitchell

Mon Apr 12, 2010

Re: 345 Gloucester Rd
(Hopper Creek Development)

Please find enclosed signed petitions from residents of the affected areas shown above (as per our phone conversation on Thurs. Apr 8, 2010 allowing us more time to compile).

Also please note there will be more letters and a petition of names opposing the above.

Please advise of receipt of this letter and petition enclosed.

Thank You,
Tom Polloway
31 Bellstone Lane
1st Hope 20812
polloway@quicksilver.net
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENTS
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 medium density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glansacker Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

1---NOT compatible with existing homes and lot sizes
2--Condo/townhouses overflow parking congests area streets
3--Devalues existing properties
4--Potential drainage problems as north side of property is subject
   to flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Leanne Haron</td>
<td>Athen</td>
<td>6 Blackburn Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Ken Vis</td>
<td>Ken Vis</td>
<td>2 Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jeilah Mate</td>
<td>Mello</td>
<td>3 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernandez</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>7 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Daniel LeForce</td>
<td>OZ</td>
<td>5 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Matt Olinski</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>9 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Tawna Olinski</td>
<td>T. Olinski</td>
<td>9 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Bernice Macked</td>
<td>B. Macked</td>
<td>11 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>W. Macked</td>
<td>W. Macked</td>
<td>15 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M. Olsen</td>
<td>M. Olsen</td>
<td>15 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>B. Olsen</td>
<td>B. Olsen</td>
<td>17 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>R. Dam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>J. Faulkner</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td>19 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 medium density condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

1—NOT compatible with existing homes and lot sizes
2—Condo/townhouses overflow parking congests area streets
3—Devalues existing properties
4—Potential drainage problems as north side of property is subject to flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>BRETT ROBERTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Bellstone Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>Annmarie Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Bellstone Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>FRANK SHACKLETON</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Bellstone Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>MARILYN SHACKLETON</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Bellstone Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>THOMAS MILLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 Bellstone Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>Marc Amorosi</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 Bellstone Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>Pam O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>DOREN DOREN</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>RICHARD DAMON</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>KATHY WEILAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>JOE GOLIATH</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>B.J. THOMSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Nancy Fleming</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>MARIE FLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>PHI CERNEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 medium density condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

1—NOT compatible with existing homes and lot sizes
2—Condo/townhouses overflow parking congests area streets
3—Devalues existing properties
4—Potential drainage problems as north side of property is subject to flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Sharon Pachoway</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Thomas Pachoway</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Marian Pachoway</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Sean Pachoway</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Paul Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>David E. Goddard</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Carolyn Goddard</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Margaret R. McKay</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Sydney C. McKay</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Joseph Neugebaur</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Grace D. Pierson</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Richard L. Pierson</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Bellstone Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>K. Seine</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>Ryan Chown</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>John Sivir</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 251-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 medium density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glanceaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

1—NOT compatible with existing homes and lot sizes
2—Condo/townhouses overflow parking congests area streets
3—Devalues existing properties
4—Potential drainage problems as north side of property is subject to flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 10/10</td>
<td>Seraphine Pavone</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Bullstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diukle Pavone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10/10</td>
<td>Maria Pavone</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 BELLSTONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Pavone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11th</td>
<td>G. S. D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16th</td>
<td>A. W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10/10</td>
<td>A. Bickham</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10/10</td>
<td>K. Bickham</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/10</td>
<td>L. Kreuzer</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 10, 2010</td>
<td>Andrew Grabstos</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 10/10</td>
<td>Steve White</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10/20</td>
<td>Lisa Simeonidis</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10/20</td>
<td>Paul Trevisan</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>The A. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>59 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Bert Blokker</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Jean Blokker</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Louise Simeonidis</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 Bellstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 medium density condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancester Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

1---NOT compatible with existing homes and lot sizes
2--Condo/townhouses overflow parking congests area streets
3--Devalues existing properties
4--Potential drainage problems as north side of property is subject to flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Jane Landrini</td>
<td>Joan Townsend</td>
<td>33 Benson Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Lucy Bozelli</td>
<td>Lucy Bozelli</td>
<td>7 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Nacha Bozelli</td>
<td>Nacha Bozelli</td>
<td>7 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>C. Pouliau</td>
<td>Carm Pouliau</td>
<td>9 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>P. Mamo</td>
<td>R. Phillips</td>
<td>11 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Row O'Brient</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>13 Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>The Tremblays</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>14 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Betty Petro</td>
<td>Betty Petro</td>
<td>14 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Jim Petro</td>
<td>Jim Petro</td>
<td>14 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Tony Mamo</td>
<td>Tony Mamo</td>
<td>11 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Virginia O'Neal</td>
<td>Virginia O'Neal</td>
<td>10 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Brian O'Neill</td>
<td>Brian O'Neill</td>
<td>11 Blackburn Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Tom Hopt</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Eric Feaver</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1</td>
<td>Rob Brocc</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Cathy Petruca</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11/10</td>
<td>Lisa Ringelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1</td>
<td>Lisa Ringelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11/10</td>
<td>Kevin Han</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11/10</td>
<td>Chris R. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11/10</td>
<td>Kevin Han</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11/10</td>
<td>Ron Sobczak</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1</td>
<td>Modjan See</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11/10</td>
<td>James See</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Renata Frumusa</td>
<td>Renata Frumusa</td>
<td>6 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Maria Frumusa</td>
<td>Maria Frumusa</td>
<td>6 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Carmelo Frumusa</td>
<td>Carmelo Frumusa</td>
<td>6 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Kelly Noble</td>
<td>AMOLO</td>
<td>5 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Kelly Noble</td>
<td>Kelly House</td>
<td>5 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Tracy Fowler</td>
<td>Tracy Fowler</td>
<td>7 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Amber Ruttan</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Stan Lantzs</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Shellie Mackhan</td>
<td>Shellie Mackhan</td>
<td>11 Brookheath Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Carlos DaCherese</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 8/10</td>
<td>Richard <em>Isabella Daysdale  Flidaysdale</em></td>
<td>7 - Bellmore Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>DOROTHY MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>79 Brookheathe</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Ann Scoble</td>
<td>73 Brookheathe</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Shannon Maddin</td>
<td>67 Brookheathe Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Daniel Carbamaan</td>
<td>57 Brookheathe Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Tony &amp; Trish Kitz</td>
<td>53 Brookheathe Lane</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Steve &amp; Marlena Falcon</td>
<td>47 Brookheathe Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Tina Manna</td>
<td>7 Brookheathe Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>Joan Norris</td>
<td>80 Brookheathe Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/10</td>
<td>William Norris</td>
<td>80 Brookheathe Ln</td>
<td><img src="redacted" alt="Redacted" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENTS
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density condominiums/townhouses proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-05</td>
<td>Pat Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Blackburn Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-05</td>
<td>Carlos + Sonia Almeida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almeida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-09-06</td>
<td>Guenther + Dana Haas</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Idlewild Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-06</td>
<td>Guenther Haas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Idlewild Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana Haas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-06</td>
<td>Gerson Frank Gennaco</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Idlewild Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-06</td>
<td>Kisten Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Idlewild Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-06</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Idlewild Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-09-06</td>
<td>James Stover</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Idlewild Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-08</td>
<td>Angeli</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Idlewild Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vincenza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-08</td>
<td>M. Leem</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Idlewild Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-08</td>
<td>W. Wiebenga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-08</td>
<td>J. Capretta</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Bellmore Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-04-08</td>
<td>T. Capretta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCESTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glancester Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Iain Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 Brookheath Lane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton, ON L0R 1L0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Marco DiMarino</td>
<td></td>
<td>98 Brookheath Lane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Hope, ON L0R 1L0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Jay Dolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Brookheath House,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Hope, ON L0R 1L0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Erin Banko</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 Brookheath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Amon Tackett</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Brookheath Lane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11 2010</td>
<td>Kyu Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>91060 Wild Lane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENTS
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glanca ter Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 6/10</td>
<td>Dianne Aizin</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Kyle Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Catherine Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Diana Alampi</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Claudia Bizzarro</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Eugenio Bizzarro</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>John Paul Jococo</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>Kerry Colcindt</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>Larry Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>Tony Leerne</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Kellpg Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>Paul Artiere</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>A Belisario</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6/10</td>
<td>Lara St Clair</td>
<td></td>
<td>71 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENTS
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002)

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Mimmo Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>46 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Rochelle Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/10</td>
<td>Jan &amp; Fred Beltrano</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6/2010</td>
<td>Diane Palets</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6, 2010</td>
<td>Charlotte Dishke</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6, 2010</td>
<td>Roberto &amp; Zelina Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6, 2010</td>
<td>Jason &amp; Tammy Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6, 2010</td>
<td>Ina VanHolle</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6, 2010</td>
<td>J. Rudd</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6, 2010</td>
<td>S. Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345 Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Karen Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td>75 Brookheath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Andrew Woodard</td>
<td></td>
<td>71 Brookheath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Paul Woodard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Kimberly Hatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>61 Brookheath Lp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Jojo Melko</td>
<td></td>
<td>59 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Steve Vrooman</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Ellen Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>64 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Leo Filice</td>
<td></td>
<td>66 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>John Zabicans</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Tendy St John</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 Brookheath Lp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8/10</td>
<td>Kelly St John</td>
<td></td>
<td>76 Brookheath Ln</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
TO CITY OF HAMILTON FROM AREA RESIDENT
OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF CONDOMINIUMS AND TOWNHOUSES
AT KOPPERFIELD LANE AND GLANCASTER ROAD
(City File No OPA-10-004, ZAC-100010 and 25T-201002

We the undersigned area residents oppose the development of 48 high density
condominiums/townhouse proposed to be built on Kopperfield Lane and 345
Glancaster Road at the entrance of the subdivision that consists of single
family residences known as THE LANES OF GLANCASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Glenn Davis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>28 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Sharon Davis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>28 Kopperfield Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Maria Garito</td>
<td>M Garito</td>
<td>25 Idlewildoe Ln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Nancy Machado</td>
<td>M Machado</td>
<td>29 Idlewildoe Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Mike Konstantinov</td>
<td>M Konstantinov</td>
<td>35 Idlewildoe Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Mike Konstantinov</td>
<td>M Konstantinov</td>
<td>39 Idlewildoe Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Cheryl Muscato</td>
<td>M Muscato</td>
<td>2 Bellmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Jack Urban</td>
<td>77 Brookhannah Lane Mount Hope, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Jim Urban</td>
<td>77 Brookhannah Lane Mount Hope, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Tim Urban</td>
<td>77 Brookhannah Lane Mount Hope, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>Kitty Urban</td>
<td>77 Brookhannah Lane Mount Hope, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2010</td>
<td>John Urban</td>
<td>77 Brookhannah Lane Mount Hope, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>