Special Planning and Economic Development Committee  
REPORT 05-022  
October 24, 2005  
6:00 p.m.  
Dundas Town Hall  
Main Street, Dundas

Present: Chair T. Whitehead  
1st Vice-Chair M. Pearson,  
Councillors: B. Bratina, M. Ferguson, B. Kelly, D. Mitchell,  
B. McHattie S. Merulla

Also Present: Councillor A. Samson,

Staff Present: T. McCabe, J. Morgante, R. Walters, P. Mallard,  
T. Horzelenberg - Planning and Development  
E. Switenky, Traffic  
A. Rawlings, I. Sturgeon – City Clerk’s Office

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) Changes to the Agenda

None

(b) Declarations of Interest

None

(c) Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Planning & Development Committee dated October 18th,  
2005, were approved as presented.

Council – October 26, 2005
Chair

During the course of the meeting, Chair Whitehead relinquished the Chair on several occasions to First Vice Chair Pearson in order to join in the debate and to request additional information from staff and the public.

Applications for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment by 998153 Ontario Inc. (G. Schuit) for Lands Located at 114 Pleasant Avenue (Dundas) (PED05144) (Ward 13) (Item 6.1)

Chair Whitehead welcomed everyone to the Special Meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee, regarding the Public Meeting for the proposed residential development at 114 Pleasant Avenue.

He explained that the Public Meeting was intended to hear input from the public on the proposed development and that following the public presentations, Committee would discuss the matter and make a Recommendation, for consideration by the Council meeting on October 26, 2005.

Chair Whitehead continued that in view of the large number of people who wished to speak, he was requesting that speakers keep their presentations as brief as possible, in line with the 5 minute rule in the Procedural By-law, and not to repeat points already made by other speakers.

However, he noted that due to the importance of the subject matter, some speakers might need longer than usual and that he would therefore ask each speaker, before they start, how long they would need to fairly explain their views.

Chair Whitehead added that any written presentation material should be given to the Clerk.

Chair Whitehead advised that 4 written submissions had been distributed tonight, as follows:

- Julianne Burgess and Hugh Tye, on behalf of the Pleasant Valley Community
- Darce Connell, 72 Pleasant Avenue
- Julianne Burgess and Hugh Tye, on behalf of the Pleasant Valley Neighbourhood Committee
- David and Valerie DiSalvo, 9 KingsGate Drive

Chair Whitehead advised that as per the Planning Act, the Ontario Municipal Board has the authority to dismiss any appeal of a person not presenting an oral statement or written statement at the Public Meeting.
Trevor Horzelenberg outlined the report to Committee.

The following members of the public addressed Committee on the matter:

1. **Julianne Burgess, 1 Autumn Leaf Road**

Ms. Burgess addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Noted the importance of public spaces
- Questioned if re-development comes to Pleasant Valley at the expense of community
- City set a precedent in trying to buy University Garden School and so should purchase Pleasant Valley School site
- Density is not compatible with surrounding neighbourhood, 2 storey homes are not in sympathy with the area
- Pedestrian paths are being wiped out
- Does not meet provisions of Official Plan
- Questioned the method of approval of condominiums
- Systemic & holistic approach is needed
- Plan is not acceptable and proposal should be sent back to revisit the issues of concern

Chair Whitehead thanked the presenter.

2. **Hugh Tye, 1 Autumn Leaf Road**

Mr. Tye addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Impact of bad planning in our community, need to preserve community
- Infill site – in the middle of an established neighbourhood, would like the Planning process to protect that
- Feel this may be a precedent
- Application is not good planning, doesn’t satisfy Official Plan, no parkland dedication, loss of greenspace
- Existing houses storey & half – proposed are two storey plus walk out basement will be too high and incompatible in the neighborhood and will block escarpment view
- Concern regarding huge increase in density
- Would like 2nd floor area for entire development be 50% of the ground floor
- Application fundamentally flawed – send report back to staff for concerns to be addressed
Councillor Whitehead noted the importance of good park space but noted that development can not be stopped. He asked staff if there was a park deficiency in the neighbourhood.

Staff confirmed that following a review of parkland in the area, they concluded that there was no deficiency and explained that it is not appropriate to take Parkland Dedication in this sub-division, since it would work out to the size of one lot. Funds from Parkland Dedication in this development would be more appropriately used towards a larger park elsewhere.

3. Edward Porter, 19 King`s Gate

Mr. Porter addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- The site was initially intended for a school
- Sanctuary Park is too far for children to go to unaccompanied and would not send his kids there
- Suggested a land swap between Sanctuary Park and the Pleasant Valley School Site.

4. Kathleen Lyne, 29 Turnbull Road

Ms Lyne addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Concern with the loss of wild life as Pleasant Valley was developed over the years
- Supports the comments made by J. Burgess & H. Tye and asked Committee to consider the issues raised regarding density and access to a public pathway owned by the City.
- Concern that Sanctuary Park is too far and unsafe for young children
- Feels the neighbourhood would benefit from a parkette in the area
- Noted the site is not currently secure or safe and would like the City to address these issues

Staff advised that there is no by-law to require fencing, developer has done this on his own.

5. Jim Campbell, 33 Pleasant Avenue

Mr. Campbell addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,
Currently, 10,000 gallons of raw sewage is going into the creek
Sewers are overloaded – 2 tanks at Pleasant Avenue & Sunrise Crescent - during heavy rains the tanks overflow raw sewage.
Flooding currently occurs every few months
Tanks were supposed to be a temporary measure and it is not acceptable that the City wants to add new housing to the area, while the problem remains.

John Morgante advised that there is no CSO tank in the area, that issue is storm sewer not sanitary sewer, and explained that proposed development will be result in no increase of the flow in the area.

6. Audrey Henson, 48 Autumn Leaf Road

Ms. Henson addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,
- Encouraged Committee to do a site inspection
- Need to preserve parkland
- Current storm surge capacity does flood their basement
- Will there be reimbursement should it continue with the new development
- Density/Compatibility concerns

7. Elaine Geurter, 38 Long Lane, Paris

Ms. Geurter addressed Committee and expressed her desire for the proposed residential development to proceed. Her comments included, but were not limited to,
- Used to live in Dundas, driven out by McMaster University Students
- Wants to move back to Dundas but there are no places to build
- Condominiums are desirable to many people
- Builder builds good quality homes and development will bring more tax income to the community
- Many hiking trails already exist in the neighbourhood
- Urged residents to try and accept change

8. Eric Canton, 9 Princess Court

Mr. Canton addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,
Does not agree with the modified R2 Zoning, and said future development should be at par with existing zoning
Does not want to see 2 storey homes – are the future grades being measured from existing grades
Has concerns with the Site Plan control stage - an administrative process
Concern with the back of the properties with respect to grade and height – will there be limits to the height of decks
Concern regarding the number of parking Spaces

9. **Bruce Evendon, 41 Turnbull Road**

Mr. Evendon addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- In 1970, they had to pay $13,000.00 for a sanitary sewer and questioned the size of the current sewers.
- Still have problems with sewers
- Raised concern regarding increased traffic capacity

10. **David DiSalvo, 9 King’s Gate Drive**

Mr. DiSalvo addressed Committee and expressed his support for the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Lives beside the site and finds the plan acceptable
- Finds density acceptable
- Finds the plan for Condominium acceptable
- Do not want any pathways through the site – these will create security issues, garbage etc.
- Submitted a map highlighting their survey which shows the existing parks and the streets with and the streets without walkways

11. **Laura Robertson, 38 Pleasant Avenue**

Ms. Robertson addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Have experienced two floods in their basement due to heavy rains
- Made claim with their insurance company and were told that they could not make any more claims
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Chair Whitehead questioned flooding frequency in the area.

John Morgante advised that the subdivision approval drawings will look at a sewer management plan. This new proposal will not have any impact on the existing sewers.

Councillor Kelly asked to see a copy of the insurance report and noted this was information that should be shared with Committee and staff.

12. Heather Oliver, 20 Turnbull Road

Ms. Oliver addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Would like to keep the existing space left as is
- Community used the property extensively and would like City to give them special consideration with respect to continued use of this property
- Feels environment is important and should be protected
- Property on hill and feels there will be sewage problems
- Asked Committee to view the property and area

13. Joe Campanella, 27 Sunrise Crescent

Mr. Campanella addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Feels parts of Pleasant Valley were inadequately built, including hydro lines, road
- Concern regarding high taxes
- Current residents were promised a secondary access and this has not been installed
- 2 Sanitary Sewers were initially installed for 200 homes – not adequate – current residents are having problems. Tax payers are paying for mistakes made in the past and people will not be able to afford to continue to live in their homes, Hamilton’s mill rate highest anywhere.
- Feels Committee representatives should represent tax payers and not developers.
14. Mary Tye, 1 Autumn Leaf

Ms. Tye addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Has always enjoyed the neighbourhood space
- Does not approve of adding more development and feels that land would better be preserved as green space. Does not want to see a gated community in the neighborhood

Mr. Horzelenberg confirmed that this would not be a gated community and that the decorative gate posts would include a commemorative plaque.

15. Julianne Gruneberg, 37 Turnbull Road

Ms. Gruneberg addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- More housing will take over the heart of the community
- Has no problem with a condominium grouping just the density
- Questioned why the development is a court
- The development should fit into the current space and heart of the community
- Wrong decisions could mean the loss of green space and skyline for ever
- Low level condominiums would fit better in the area
- Has pictures of 4 communities in Dundas where they have walkways and feels it works in these areas
- Two parkettes in the area but not large enough for recreational activities
- Provided example/pictures of parkettes in Burlington which had benches, sand boxes and swings and felt that these tied in well into the community
- Traffic safety concerns regarding increased traffic and wants the City to review this area

16. Judith Stevenson, 9 Pleasant Avenue

Ms. Stevenson addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,

- Water problems on the former Catholic School Board site which was residentially developed
- Concerns regarding retaining walls
- Ancaster Road can not take any more traffic
- Increased school bus traffic – children used to walk to school
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Sanctuary Park is not safe – children play on the road
- Proposed survey has no green space
- Feels driveways are not wide enough and that there will be snow removal issues
- Added development will overload sewage system

17. Harold Guy, 15 Green Meadow

Mr. Guy addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,
- Concern regarding density, loss of views and snow clearing issues

18. Renald Poudrier, 14 Princess Court

Mr. Poudrier addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to
- Density – Concern how this was measured
- Empty Nesters – people without children do not need 2 storey homes
- Tax concerns – values go higher – so will their taxes

19. Jim Campanella, 45 Turnbull Road

Mr. Campanella addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to
- Density and streetscape,
- Traffic safety with cars backing out of their driveways and increased traffic

20. Andrew Campbell, 16 Sunrise Road

Mr. Campbell addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to,
- On street parking issues need to be addressed properly
- Green space should be kept in Pleasant Valley, money should not go to other parts of the City, Sanctuary Park not an alternative for the neighbourhood
- Increased traffic and traffic safety concerns.
- No police support on traffic issues
Councillor Ferguson explained that a community-police consultation meeting would take place on November 15, 2005 at 7:00 pm in Dundas Town Hall, and that everyone was invited to attend. He confirmed that he would talk to Mr. Campbell about his individual concerns.

21. Sophie Gorski, 14 Monarch Court

Ms. Gorski addressed Committee and expressed her concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to:

- Policing issues
- Concern with flooding and backed up sewers
- Back yards are continually wet because of drainage problems
- Effects on storm sewers because of the new development
- Traffic concerns regarding arrangements at Old Ancaster Road, and two-way stop.

Ed Switenky explained that this junction is a two-way and not a three-way stop, since there is heavier traffic on Old Ancaster Road.

Councillor Kelly explained that while a drainage plan was done as part of the approval of a new subdivision, and the residents move in, they often make changes which affect the grading and drainage. After subdivision is assumed, any problems become a civil matter, between the residents.

22. Steve Austin, 3 King's Gate

Mr. Austin addressed Committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposed residential proposal. These included, but were not limited to:

- Concern with the width of the properties – Only 40 feet, while existing lots on opposite side of Turnbull are at least 50 feet wide.

During the staff and public presentations, Committee asked questions and had additional information supplied by the speakers.

John Ariens, Planning and Engineering Initiatives Limited, the agent for the applicant, made a power point presentation regarding the proposed development. He supported the staff recommendation and noted that two information meetings had been held in the neighbourhood. He continued that the builder, Mr. Schuit, lives in Dundas and has won many awards for his developments.

Committee asked a number of questions regarding the proposal.
Mr. Ariens advised that 45 foot lots are very efficient and do not have adverse effects on existing neighbourhoods. He noted that 50 foot lots would result in one less lot but that the developer could still make a profit with some reduced density. Mr. Ariens confirmed that this proposal was not a gated community.

Councillor McHattie noted the concerns regarding the use of Sanctuary Park. He said that intensification is important but respect for the surrounding area is important as well. Councillor McHattie suggested that we need to look at lower density and that parkland dedication should stay in the area versus taking cash-in-lieu.

He suggested that more discussion take place on the matter with the developer and hoped to see the proposed homes in the area reduced as a gesture of good will.

Councillor Bratina noted the changes that have occurred in the area over the years. He is not against development but suggested that it has to be kept in line with the surrounding area.

Councillor Pearson reminded the residents that the School Board sold the property and the City has to deal with the proposal that has come before them and work within the guidelines.

Councillor Kelly acknowledged the concerns noted this evening and reiterated that he would like to see the report by the insurance adjuster. He suggested that Committee should listen to the residents and apply the appropriate planning principles. Councillor Kelly added that he would like to see a solution come forward between the residents and the developer. Councillor Kelly explained that he does not want to see this proposal rushed through if more time is needed to make the development a better fit.

Councillor Whitehead noted that Council needs to be responsible for the decisions they make regarding growth and development. He noted concern with respect to the accessibility issues of Sanctuary Park. In addition, he raised concerns with respect to emergency vehicles accessing the proposed development and suggested that to build a proper neighbourhood, you need to provide green space. Chair Whitehead cautioned against adding development to areas that were already experiencing problems in sewer capacity.

Tim McCabe advised Committee that it was staff’s recommendation that cash-in-lieu be accepted for this development and that the servicing of this proposed subdivision will not produce any negative impacts.

Councillor Samson addressed the meeting and explained that in Dundas, four green spaces are going to be lost where school sites are being re-developed. He explained that cash-in-lieu doesn’t go into a fund for Dundas, but a general City fund, and that he is going to fight in order to retain parkland. With respect to this particular development, Councillor Samson noted that several neighbourhood meetings have been held in the past few months.
In summary, Councillor Samson noted that he would like 8 lots instead of the 9 proposed, and that he would like to see green space in place of Lot 9, since that is where the community park is currently located. He requested that staff look at placing it at the entrance to the condominium development. Councillor Samson asked staff to check and report back on whether the City still has an outflow on Glen Court. Councillor Samson explained that he does not support a walkway through the site and suggested a sidewalk be put in on the west side of King’s Gate, to be paid for by the developer.

Committee then discussed the matter in detail and had additional information supplied by staff.

On a Motion by Councillor Ferguson, seconded by Councillor Kelly, Committee approved the following;

That the applications by G. Shuit for development of 114 Pleasant Avenue be referred back to staff, for consideration of the matters raised at the Public Meeting on October 24, 2005, including, but not limited to:

- density of the proposal and the surrounding area
- lot widths proposed on Turnbull
- drainage and sanitary sewers
- local greenspace including Sanctuary Park
- walkways

And that the staff report back to Committee on November 15, 2005.

And that this time period will provide Committee members with the opportunity to visit or revisit the site

Chair Whitehead requested that the record show that the vote was unanimous.

(e) Motions (Item 9)

None

(f) Notices of Motion (Item 10)

None
(g) General Information
None

(h) Private and Confidential
None

(i) Adjournment
The Planning and Economic Development Committee adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Whitehead, Chair
Planning & Economic Development Committee

Alexandra Rawlings, Co-ordinator
Planning and Economic Development Committee
October 24, 2005