SUBJECT: Applications for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision "Thornbrae Estates" and Change in Zoning for Lands Located at 256 Thorner Drive (Hamilton) (PED06139) (Ward 7)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That approval be given to Amended Subdivision Application 25T200520, A. DeSantis Developments Ltd., owner, to establish a draft plan of subdivision comprising fifty lots for single detached dwellings, one walkway block and one cul-de-sac street, as shown on Appendix “B” to Report PED06139, on lands located at 256 Thorner Drive (Hamilton), subject to the execution of a City standard form Subdivision Agreement, including the conditions contained in Appendix “C” to Report PED06139 and the following:

(i) Acknowledgement that there will be no City share for any municipal works related to this development; and,

(ii) That payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required for the development prior to the issuance of each building permit for the lots within the plan. The calculation of the Cash-in-Lieu payment shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of issuance of the 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 Amended Zoning Application ZAC-05-93, A. DeSantis Developments Ltd., owner, for a change in zoning from the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified (Block 1), from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified (Block 2), from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District,
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Modified (Block 3), and for a modification to the established “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District (Block 4), to permit the development of fifty single detached dwellings, for lands located at 256 Thorner Drive (Hamilton), as shown on Appendix "A" to Report PED06139, on the following basis:

(i) That Block 1 be rezoned from the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified.

(ii) That Block 2 be rezoned from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified.

(iii) That Block 3 be rezoned from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified.

(iv) That Block 4 be rezoned from the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified.

(v) That the Draft By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED06139, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(vi) That the proposed changes in zoning are in conformity with the Official Plan for the Hamilton Planning Area.

(c) That upon finalization of the implementing By-law, the Thorner Neighbourhood Plan be amended to reflect the change in designation from “Civic & Institutional” to “Single and Double Residential”, and to revise the plan to add a public walkway shown as Block 51 and a cul-de-sac street shown as Court ‘A’ on Appendix “B” to Report PED06139.

________________________
Lee Ann Coveyduck  
General Manager  
Planning and Economic Development Department

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The applicant has submitted applications for a draft plan of subdivision and change in zoning to facilitate the development of fifty lots for single detached dwellings on a proposed cul-de-sac street, and one block for a public walkway connection to Thorner Park. An amendment to the Thorner Neighbourhood Plan is required to accommodate the proposal.
This proposal has merit and can be supported since the changes in zoning and draft plan of subdivision are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and comply with the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Official Plan. The proposal is compatible with existing and planned development in the immediate area. In addition, the proposal is an appropriate infill development that will make use of an already serviced site.

BACKGROUND:

Proposal

The proposed development applications are for a change in zoning and approval of a draft plan of subdivision, for lands located at 256 Thorner Drive, as shown on Appendix “A”. The plan of subdivision (Appendix “B”) is comprised of fifty lots for single detached dwellings fronting onto a proposed cul-de-sac street (Court A), which would connect to Thorner Drive. The plan also includes a block for a public walkway (Block 51), which will connect the proposed cul-de-sac street to adjacent Thorner Park. The draft plan attached as Appendix “B” is a revised plan from an originally submitted plan which did not include the public walkway. As a result of the walkway addition, Lots 1 to 7 have been reduced in size, and are, therefore, proposed to be rezoned to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, which permits smaller lot sizes than the previously proposed “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (Appendix “D”) would rezone the lands to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified (Blocks 1 and 2) and the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified (Blocks 3 and 4) to permit a total of fifty single detached dwellings. Modifications to both zones would permit a reduced front yard of a minimum 4.5 metres, with a minimum 6.0 metres to the main wall of the garage (whereas the standard “R-4” and “C” Districts would require a minimum front yard of 6.0 metres to the main wall of the dwelling and the garage), and a maximum encroachment into the front yard of 1.5 metres for an unenclosed one-storey porch at the first storey (whereas the Zoning By-law standard permits a 3.0 metre encroachment). The applicant had originally requested a minimum front yard of 3.0 metres to the main wall of the dwelling. Staff was not supportive of this modification as the reduced front yard depth would not complement the existing streetscape. After meeting with staff, the applicant revised their application to request the minimum 4.5 metre setback to the main wall of the dwelling, with a maximum encroachment of 1.5 metres for an unenclosed porch.

A Neighbourhood Plan amendment is required to redesignate the subject lands from “Civic & Institutional” to “Single & Double Residential” on the Thorner Neighbourhood Plan and to revise the street pattern to include Court “A”.

Details of Submitted Application

Owner/Applicant: A. DeSantis Developments Ltd.
Agent: Urbex Engineering Limited (Angelo Cameracci)
Location: 256 Thorner Drive

Description: Frontage on Thorner Drive: approximately 194 metres
Frontage on Deerborn Drive: approximately 125 metres
Area: 2.495 ha

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>North</td>
<td>Single-Detached</td>
<td>“C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District; “AA” (Agricultural) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>“AA” (Agricultural) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-Detached</td>
<td>“C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Hydro Corridor,</td>
<td>“AA” (Agricultural) District; “G-2” (Regional Shopping Centres) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

1. The proposal has merit and can be supported for the following reasons:
   (i) The proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Official Plan.
   (ii) It is compatible with existing and planned development in the surrounding area.
   (iii) It represents an appropriate infill development which will make efficient use of an already serviced site.
2. The proposed draft plan is comprised of fifty lots for single detached dwellings, as shown on Appendix “B”. The proposed draft plan has been amended from the original submission to add a public walkway, which will link Court “A” to Thorner Park, between Lots 14 and 15, shown as Block 51 on Appendix “B”. The walkway was requested by area residents at a Public Meeting held by the Ward Councillor and applicant and the location was chosen due to the necessity of a required sewer easement between Lots 14 and 15. As a result of the addition of the public walkway, the applicant has amended their zoning application to request that Lots 1 to 7 be rezoned to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified, instead of the originally proposed “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District. Lots 1 to 7 will, therefore, be narrower than Lots 8 to 50. These seven lots meet the minimum required lot width (9 metres) and lot area (278m$^2$) of the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, and also have an average lot width of not less than 10 metres and an average lot area of not less than 306m$^2$, as required by the “R-4” District. Lots 8 to 50 are proposed to be zoned “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified. The proposed lots meet the minimum lot width (12 metres) and lot area (360m$^2$) requirements of the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District. Staff is supportive of the amendment to the application as the addition of the public walkway will be beneficial to existing and future residents in the neighbourhood, and because the proposed “R-4” lots (1 to 7) are internal to the development and will, therefore, not impact the existing streetscape. It is noted that Lot 1, which is proposed to be rezoned to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified, requires a minimum flankage side yard of 1.2 metres (as per the standard “R-4” District regulations), which is consistent with the side yards required for the existing lots across Thorner Drive which are zoned “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District.

3. The applicant has requested a modification to the zoning for all of the lots to permit a reduced front yard. Both the “R-4” and “C” Districts require a minimum 6.0 metre front yard under the Zoning By-law. In addition, the Zoning By-law permits a maximum encroachment into the required front yard of 3.0 metres for a roofed-over or screened but otherwise unenclosed, one-storey porch. The applicant had requested a reduced front yard of a minimum 3.0 metres to the main wall of the dwelling, and 6.0 metres to the face of an attached garage. Staff was not supportive of this modification, as the reduced front yard depth would not complement the existing streetscape. After meeting with staff, the applicant amended their proposal to request a reduced front yard of a minimum 4.5 metres to the main wall of the dwelling and a minimum 6.0 metres to the face of an attached garage, with a maximum permitted encroachment of 1.5 metres for a roofed-over or screened but otherwise unenclosed one-storey porch. This modification will allow the applicant the flexibility in design that they are seeking, while also having the benefit of facilitating housing of a type that has an increased street presence over typical single family dwellings, with the option of a garage setback from the main wall of the dwelling. Staff also notes that, as of right under the “C” District, a 3 metre encroachment into the front yard is
permitted for a roofed over and unscreened porch. Therefore, the requested modification is not out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood and can be supported.

4. In accordance with the Public Participation Policy that was approved by Council on May 29, 2003, this application was circulated to 111 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. In addition, the agent for the application held a Public Meeting in the neighbourhood on November 28, 2005, which was attended by the Ward Councillor, staff, and several residents. Eight letters were received in response to the preliminary circulation, attached as Appendix “E”. The following issues were raised which are discussed below: loss of greenspace; increase in traffic; parking impacts; density and neighbourhood character; servicing concerns; and construction issues.

**Parkland**

A number of residents expressed a preference to see the subject lands developed as City parkland. They also expressed concern that they were not notified of the land sale between the Hamilton Wentworth District School Board and the purchaser. The subject property is located immediately north of Thorner Park, and is not designated in the Official Plan or Neighbourhood Plan as a future park. The northern portion of the property is already zoned to permit single detached dwellings. When the Hamilton Wentworth District School Board determined that the property was surplus to their needs, the property was first offered for sale to the Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School Board, the City of Hamilton and other public agencies. School Boards are not required to consult with the public on the sale of surplus properties. The City of Hamilton reviewed the opportunity to purchase the subject lands and determined that the City did not require the lands as the Thorner Neighbourhood currently has sufficient parkland to meet the needs of the neighbourhood. Thorner Neighbourhood has 1.8 hectares of parkland (Thorner Park). With a population of 2,470, the Thorner Neighbourhood requires 1.73 hectares of parkland (based on a calculation for neighbourhood parks of 0.7 hectares of parkland per 1000 population from the City of Hamilton Official Plan). Therefore, comments from the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section indicate a preference for a cash contribution in-lieu of parkland, in accordance with the City of Hamilton’s Parkland Dedication By-law. Staff also notes that the existing playground equipment in Thorner Park will remain, as it is located on the City owned parkland and not on the subject lands.

**Traffic and Parking Concerns**

Several residents raised concerns over the potential for an increase in traffic in the neighbourhood as a result of the proposed development. Staff from the Traffic Engineering and Operations Section has reviewed the application and has no concerns. Staff notes that the traffic generated from the proposed fifty single
detached dwellings would be less than the traffic generated by the former elementary school on the site in the morning peak hours, and comparable to the traffic generated by the school in the afternoon peak hours. Using data from the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generations, Traffic staff has estimated that approximately fifty-two vehicles would have entered and exited the school site during the morning and afternoon school entry/exit times. Conversely, the proposed fifty single detached dwellings would generate, on average, 39 trips during the AM peak hour and 52 trips during the PM peak hour. This includes trips both entering and leaving the neighbourhood. Residents also raised the issue of the need for new traffic signals at Bishopsgate Avenue and Mohawk Road East. Traffic Engineering and Operations staff will monitor this intersection for traffic volumes and delay to motorists to determine if new traffic signals are warranted in the future. Finally, one resident raised concerns over the impact of this proposal on the availability of on-street parking on Thorner Drive. It is noted that this proposal meets the requirements for on-site parking under the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law at a minimum 2 parking spaces per unit. Therefore, staff is satisfied that sufficient on-site parking is being provided for the proposed development.

Density and Streetscape Character

Several residents raised a concern over the number of lots that are proposed on the subject lands, and the compatibility of these lots with existing lots in the neighbourhood. The proposed lots that will front onto Thorner Drive and Deeborn Drive have a minimum lot width of 12 metres and a minimum lot area of 360m$^2$. Two of the lots are larger and have minimum lot areas in excess of 400m$^2$. All of these lots meet the minimum lot width and area requirements under the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, which requires a minimum lot width of 12 metres and a minimum lot area of 360m$^2$. The existing lots on the north side of Thorner Drive have lot widths of approximately 13 metres and lot areas of approximately 445m$^2$. Existing lots to the east of the proposed subdivision on Deeborn Drive, Jasmine Street and Southampton Drive have lot widths ranging from 12 metres to 14 metres and lot areas ranging from approximately 400m$^2$ to 500m$^2$. Therefore, the proposed lots fronting onto Thorner Drive and Deeborn Drive are consistent and compatible with the existing lots in the surrounding area. Staff notes that the applicant is proposing seven smaller lots (Lots 1 to 7) with minimum lot widths of 10.6 metres and minimum lot areas of 329m$^2$. These lots were reduced in size to accommodate the proposed public walkway between Lots 14 and 15. These lots will front onto the proposed Court “A” and will, therefore, not have any visual impact on the existing streetscape. Based on the above, staff is satisfied that the proposed density is appropriate for the subject lands and that the proposed lots are compatible with surrounding development.
With regard to streetscape character, as previously stated in Comment 3, a modification has been proposed in the amending By-law to permit a reduced front yard of a minimum 4.5 metres to the main wall of the dwelling and a minimum 6.0 metres to the face of an attached garage, with a maximum permitted encroachment of 1.5 metres for a roofed-over but unenclosed one-storey porch. The “R-4” and “C” Districts require a minimum front yard of 6.0 metres, with a maximum allowable encroachment of 3.0 metres into the front yard for a roofed-over, unenclosed porch. Therefore, the effect of the modification is to allow the main wall of the proposed new dwellings to be located 1.5 metres closer to the street line than is permitted under the standard regulations. The porch encroachments will be permitted a minimum 3.0 metres from the street line, which is consistent with the standard regulations of the Zoning By-law. Therefore, staff is satisfied that the requested modification is not out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Servicing Concerns

A concern was raised over how this proposed development will be serviced, and the potential impact from the new development on sewer capacity in the area. A preliminary design brief has been submitted to the City of Hamilton for review. As a condition of approval for this subdivision, the applicant will be required to submit to the City of Hamilton a detailed engineering design submission which will include servicing drawings. In addition, the applicant is required to submit a detailed stormwater management report to address both quality and quantity, and demonstrate how the existing municipal system can be enhanced to reduce surcharging and potential flooding (Development Engineering Condition No. 12). The applicant is responsible for providing services to each of the proposed lots and to upgrade all City services and infrastructure surrounding the subject lands which would be impacted as a result of their development. The engineering drawings and stormwater management report will be reviewed to ensure that existing property owners will not be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

Construction Issues

Residents noted that they were concerned with the negative impacts associated with future construction such as dust, noise and traffic (heavy vehicles). Both noise and dust are regulated by City By-laws and performance by contractors is monitored by the City. In addition, it is a standard clause in the City’s Subdivision Agreement to require the owner to provide a plan or written procedure for approval to address issues concerning dust control and street cleaning on roads internal and external to the plan throughout construction.
5. There are external municipal watermains and separate storm and sanitary sewers available to service the subject lands. As a condition of draft plan approval, the applicant will be required to extend full municipal sewer services along Deerborn Drive from their existing limit at Jasmine Street to the southern limit of the draft plan, and to reconstruct and resurface this portion of Deerborn Drive (Development Engineering Condition No. 8). The applicant will be required to reconstruct and resurface, including all curbing and sidewalks impacted by the development, all of Thorner Drive along the frontage of the subject lands and 50% of Deerborn Drive from Thorner Drive to Jasmine Street (Development Engineering Condition No. 9). All costs associated with upgrades to City infrastructure are the responsibility of the applicant (Development Engineering Condition No. 10).

6. In accordance with the City of Hamilton’s Parkland Dedication By-law, the application is subject to a Cash-in-Lieu of parkland dedication payment. Given that the subject lands are not designated for a future park, the City does not require the inclusion of parkland dedication into the draft plan of subdivision. Therefore, in accordance with City By-laws, a cash payment to the City of Hamilton, equivalent to the value of 5% of the value of each lot in-lieu of the dedication of land, will be required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

In addition, the City’s Transition Policies would allow for the following phase-in for Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland:

(a) 4% of land value on the day before building permit issuance between January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006.

(b) 5% of land value on the day before building permit issuance as of January 1, 2007.

7. Approval of this Draft Plan of Subdivision will be subject to the conditions included in Appendix “C”, including the applicable City’s standard conditions of approval. Several special conditions will also apply, many of which have already been referenced in this report. In addition, conditions relating to payment for survey monumentation, the requirement for a geotechnical report, sidewalks, dedication of Court “A” and Block 51 to the City of Hamilton, the requirement for a pre-blast survey, removal of existing services to the former school building, and the requirement to video the sewers on Thorner Drive and Deerborn Drive have also been included. In accordance with Development Engineering Special Condition No. 13, sidewalks will be required on the west and south sides of Court “A” from Thorner Drive to Block 51, as per the Development Engineering Guidelines. (Development Engineering Special Condition Nos. 3, 5, and 13 to 17).
FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial: N/A.

Staffing: N/A.

Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider applications for approval of a draft plan of subdivision and change in zoning.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

Provincial Policy Statement

The applications have been reviewed with respect to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Staff recognizes that the applications have shown proper regard towards focusing growth in urban areas (1.1.1(a)). However, Policy 1.1.1(c) outlines that healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns. Policy 3.2.2 states that contaminated sites shall be remediated, as necessary, prior to any activity on the site associated with the proposed use such that there will be no adverse effects. Therefore, due to the previous use of the site and age of the building, the submission of a signed Record of Site Condition (RSC) will be required as a condition of draft plan approval. The RSC must be to the satisfaction of the City of Hamilton, including an acknowledgement of receipt of the RSC by the MOE. This condition has been addressed through Development Planning Standard Condition No. 6, as contained in Appendix “C”, Conditions 2(b).

Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan

The subject property is designated “Urban Area” in the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. Policy 3.1 states 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. As well, the Urban Areas are intended to accommodate approximately 96% of new residential housing units in the Region to the year 2020. Therefore, as the nature of the applications are for the development of a residential plan of subdivision where full
municipal services are available, the proposal conforms to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

City Of Hamilton Official Plan

The subject property is designated “Major Institutional” on Schedule “A” – Land Use Concept to the City of Hamilton Official Plan. The following policies of the City of Hamilton Official Plan, among others, are applicable to the subject lands:

“A.2.1.13” Plans for redevelopment will, to the satisfaction of Council, ensure that the RESIDENTIAL character of the area will be maintained or enhanced and that the redevelopment will not burden existing facilities and services.

“A.2.6.5” Notwithstanding the policies set out above, in areas designated MAJOR INSTITUTIONAL, Residential uses may be permitted provided they are compatible with the surrounding area and are in keeping with the Residential policies set out in Subsections A.2.1 and C.7 of this Plan.

“C.7.3” Council will encourage a RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT of an adequate physical condition that contains a variety of housing forms that will meet the needs of present and future residents. Accordingly, Council will:

iii) Support RESIDENTIAL development such as infilling, redevelopment and the conversion of non-residential structures that makes more efficient use of the existing building stock and/or physical infrastructure that recognize and enhance the scale and character of the existing residential area by having regard to natural vegetation, lot frontages and areas, building height, coverage, mass, setbacks, privacy and overview.

The City of Hamilton Official Plan permits residential development in areas designated “Major Institutional”, provided that the proposed development is compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed fifty single family dwelling lots are compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood, and the proposal represents an appropriate example of infill development that will make efficient use of existing services, while ensuring that the existing character of the neighbourhood will be maintained. Based on the above, the proposal conforms to the City of Hamilton Official Plan.

Thorner Neighbourhood Plan

The subject property is designated as "Civic and Institutional" in the approved Thorner Neighbourhood Plan. If approved, the proposal will require an amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan to re-designate the lands as "Single and Double Residential" and to reflect the revised road pattern and public walkway.
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relevant consultation:

Agencies/Departments Having No Comment or Objections

- Public Works Department (Strategic and Environmental Planning Section).
- Corporate Services Department (Budget & Fiscal Policy Services).
- Corporate Services Department (Revenues Division).
- Hamilton Wentworth District School Board.
- Union Gas.

Traffic Engineering and Operations Section, Public Works Department has commented that, as a condition of approval, the driveway locations on Lots 8 – 10 and 17 – 24 must be located to the satisfaction of the Supervisor of Traffic Planning. The driveway locations to these lots must not encroach onto adjacent properties between the road allowance and curb line. The access to Lot 24 does encroach onto Lot 25 and must be revised. The applicant must submit engineering drawings that illustrate the accesses for approval. This condition has been addressed through Development Engineering Special Condition No. 4, as contained in Appendix “C”.

Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, Public Works Department approves of the location of the proposed public walkway located between Lots 14 and 15 to provide access from the subdivision to the park. The walkway must be a minimum 4.5 metres in width, fenced on both sides, with bollards on either end and hard surfaced, to the satisfaction of the Director of Capital Planning and Implementation. The boundary of the subdivision with Thorner Park, along the property line of Lots 10 through 18 and Lot 50 must be fenced with a minimum 1.5 metre high galvanized steel 9 mm gauge, 40 mm mesh, chain link fence. These conditions have been addressed through Open Space Development and Park Planning Section Condition No. 19 and Development Engineering Special Conditions No. 6 and 7, as contained in Appendix “C”.

This Section has indicated a preference for a cash contribution in-lieu of parkland dedication, in accordance with the City of Hamilton’s Parkland Dedication By-law. The Thorner Neighbourhood has sufficient parkland for its population, as discussed in Comment 4 on Page 6 and, therefore, a parkland dedication is not recommended.

In addition, as a condition of draft plan approval, the following warning clause should be included in all Offers of Purchase and Sale for the lots adjacent to the park lands: “Purchasers of lots adjacent to Thorner Park are advised that the existing children’s play equipment shall remain in its present location.” This condition has been addressed through Open Space and Park Planning Section Condition No. 18, as contained in Appendix “C”.

This page requires a fix for proper formatting.
Forestry Section (Public Works Department) has advised that there are six 80 mm trees located on the Deerborn Drive road allowance. In addition, there are four 100 mm trees that have been planted by the City around the playground in Thorner Park, which should be protected during construction. The Section requests that a Tree Preservation Plan be required as a condition of approval. This condition has been addressed through Development Planning Standard Condition No. 12, as contained in Appendix “C”, Condition 2(b).

The Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) has advised that HSR currently operates Route #24 Upper Sherman buses close to the site with no planned changes in service. Direct short walking distances between dwellings and transit service are preferable. HSR supports the inclusion of high quality pedestrian amenities such as sidewalks and lighting. These comments have been addressed by Development Planning Standard Condition No. 16 and Development Engineering Special Condition No. 13.

The Hamilton Conservation Authority has advised that the subject property is within the Greenhill subwatershed of Red Hill Creek. The lands are in the watershed of Hamilton Harbour, which has a Remedial Action Plan to restore the health of the harbour. The recommendations of the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan indicate that development should provide stormwater quality control as well as control erosion and sediment during and after construction. The site is not within an area of combined sewers. Therefore, it should be demonstrated that water quantity and quality control has been or will be provided for this development. Being within the Greenhill subwatershed, water quality control for this development may be provided by the Central Mountain stormwater facility at Mountain Brow Boulevard. It should be confirmed that this site is included within the area allocation for this facility; otherwise development of this site will be premature until additional stormwater management facilities are constructed to serve the Greenhill area. Erosion and sediment control must be provided during construction to limit the off-site movement of sediment that can affect downstream fish habitat. To address these comments, it is recommended that Hamilton Conservation Authority Standard Condition Nos. 1 and 2 (Appendix “C”, Condition 2(d)), Hamilton Conservation Authority Special Condition No. 20, and Development Engineering Special Condition Nos. 11 and 12 be included in the draft plan of subdivision approval.

Hydro One has advised that they have no objection, in principle, to the proposed draft plan of subdivision provided that several standard conditions of approval are included in the draft plan approval. The conditions relate to Hydro One approval of a grading and drainage plan, fencing, and usage of the adjacent Hydro corridor lands. In addition, Hydro One has requested that a Note be added to the Conditions of Draft Plan Approval for this subdivision. The Note warns the applicant of the high voltage transmission lines abutting the subject lands, and states that it is the applicant's responsibility to maintain a safe distance from these lines during construction. These comments have been addressed through the inclusion of Hydro One Standard Conditions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 (Appendix “C”, Condition 2(e)) in the draft plan of subdivision approval.
Bell Canada has determined that there are adequate telecommunication facilities existing within the area and, therefore, Bell Canada does not require any easement or lease. Bell Canada has requested that a condition requiring the developer to enter into a Letter of Understanding for underground servicing be imposed on the draft plan of subdivision. In this regard, Bell Canada Standard Condition No. 1 (Appendix “C”, Condition 2(c)) has been included in the draft plan of subdivision approval.

Public Consultation

In accordance with the Public Participation Policy that was approved by Council on May 29, 2003, this application was circulated to 111 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. In addition, the agent for the application held a Public Meeting in the neighbourhood which was attended by the Ward Councillor, staff, and several residents. Eight letters were received in response to the preliminary circulation, attached as Appendix “E”. The following issues were raised: loss of parkland; increase in traffic; parking impacts; density and neighbourhood character; servicing concerns; and construction issues. These concerns have been addressed in the Analysis/Rationale Section of this report. In addition, a Public Notice sign has been posted on the property and Notice of the Public Meeting will be given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Shelter, care and satisfying employment are accessible to all Hamiltonians.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Ecological function and the natural heritage system are protected.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Infrastructure and compact, mixed use development minimize land consumption and servicing costs.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? ☐ Yes ☑ No
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Subject Property
256 Thorner Drive, Hamilton

- **Block 1** - Change in Zoning from “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified
- **Block 2** - Change in Zoning from “AA” (Agricultural) District to “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified
- **Block 3** - Change in Zoning from “AA” (Agricultural) District to “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified
- **Block 4** - Modification to established “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District

Ward 7 Keymap

N.T.S
“Thornbrae Estates” (25T200520) – Conditions of Draft Approval

1. That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision entitled “Thornbrae Estates”, for Part of Lot 9, Concession 6, Geographic Township of Barton, City of Hamilton, dated September 1, 2005, prepared by Urbex Engineering Limited, as shown on Appendix “B” to Report PED06139, showing fifty (50) lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 to 50), one (1) block for a public walkway (Block 51), and one (1) cul-de-sac street (Court A).

2. That the following standard conditions of draft plan approval from Appendix “A” of Report PD01184 (Streamlining and Harmonization of Subdivision, Condominium and Part Lot Control Approvals and Administration Processes) shall apply;

   (a) Development Engineering
       Standard Conditions Nos. 1, 2, 7, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29;

   (b) Development Planning
       Standard Conditions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 16, 17, 20, and 21;

   (c) Bell Canada
       Standard Condition No. 1;

   (d) Hamilton Conservation Authority
       Standard Conditions Nos. 1 and 2;

   (e) Hydro One
       Standard Conditions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5;

Development Engineering

3. That the Owner agree in writing to make a cash payment to the City in-lieu of providing Horizontal and Vertical Control Survey Monumentation, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

4. That as part of the detailed engineering design, the grading plan shall indicate all proposed driveway locations for all lots within the subdivision, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering and the Supervisor of Traffic Planning.

5. That the Owner provides a geotechnical report prepared by a qualified professional engineer prior to final engineering design, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.
6. That the Owner agree in writing to install 1.5 metre high galvanized steel 9 mm gauge, 40 mm mesh chain link fencing along the rear of Lots 1 through 18 and flankage of Lot 50, adjacent to the Park and Ontario Hydro lands, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

7. That the Owner agrees in writing to install 1.5 m high galvanized steel, 9 mm gauge, 40 mm mesh, chain link fencing along each side of the public walkway Block 51, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

8. That the Owner agree in writing to extend full municipal sewer services and install all services along Deerborn Drive from their existing limit at Jasmine Street to the southern limit of the draft plan, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering. The Owner also agrees in writing to reconstruct and resurface Deerborn Drive, including the replacement of all impacted curbing and sidewalks from Jasmine Street to the southern limit of the draft plan, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

9. That the Owner agree in writing to install all services and be responsible for the cost to reconstruct and resurface Thorner Drive, along the entire frontage/flankage of the draft plan, including all curbing and sidewalks impacted by the development, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering. In addition, the Owner agrees in writing to install all services and reconstruct a minimum of 50% of Deerborn Drive, as associated with the location of the municipal services, along the entire frontage/flankage of the draft plan, from Thorner Drive to Jasmine Street, including the replacement of all impacted curbing and sidewalks, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

10. That the Owner agree in writing that all costs associated with any and all upgrades to the City infrastructure as a result of the development will be their responsibility, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

11. That the Owner agree in writing that the Subdivision be allowed to proceed, as approved, subject to capacity being available in the City of Hamilton Storm Water Management Facility to which the subject lands drain. Should capacity not be available at the engineering approval stage of the development, the Owner at their cost will provide storm water quality control, and will be responsible for maintaining this system and its removal upon City capacity being re-allocated, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

12. That the Owner submit a detailed storm water management report to address quality and quantity and demonstrate how the existing municipal system shall be enhanced to reduce surcharging and potential flooding. Further, the Owner must demonstrate that resulting run-off from the proposed development for the 2 to 100 year storm will not negatively impact downstream properties in accordance
with the City of Hamilton Storm Water Policy, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

13. That the Owner agree in writing to construct sidewalks on the west and south sides of Future Court “A” from Thorner Drive, through Block 51, to the City of Hamilton Park, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

14. That the Owner include a certificate on the final Plan of Subdivision dedicating all lands required for public highway, namely Court “A”, and public walkways, namely Block 51, within the plan, to the City of Hamilton, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

15. That the Owner agrees that no blasting will take place without a pre-blast survey completed and adequate monitoring conducted by a qualified consultant, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

16. That the Owner agrees to video the sewers on Thorner Drive and Deerborn Drive prior to, and post construction of the subdivision, and where as a result of the development, make all necessary repairs to the sewers at their cost, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

17. That the Owner agrees to abandon and remove all existing services to the former school building and make the necessary repairs to the City infrastructure at their own cost, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering.

Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, Public Works Department

18. That the Owner agrees to include the following warning clause in all offers of sale and purchase for Lots 10 to 18 and Lot 50 or any other lot abutting Thorner Park:

“Purchasers of lots adjacent to Thorner Park are advised that the existing children’s play equipment shall remain in its present location”.

19. That the Owner agrees in writing to construct a pedestrian walkway on Block “51” a minimum 4.5 metres in width, fenced on both sides, with bollards at either end and hard surfaced, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Open Space Development (Public Works Department).

Hamilton Conservation Authority

20. That the applicant prepares and implements a lot grading plan to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.
Note to Conditions of Draft Plan Approval:

1. The transmission lines abutting this subdivision operate at 500,000, 230,000 or 115,000 volts. Section 186 – Proximity – of the Regulations for Construction Projects in the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, require that no object be brought closer than 6 metres (20 feet) to an energized 500 kV conductor. The distance for 230 kV conductors is 4.5 metres (15 feet), and for 115 kV conductors it is 3 metres (10 feet). It is the proponent’s responsibility to be aware, and to make all personnel on site aware, that all equipment and personnel must come no closer than the distance specified in the Act. They should also be aware that the conductors can raise and lower without warning, depending on the electrical demand placed on the line.
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. __________

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593,
Respecting Lands Located at 256 Thorner Drive, Hamilton

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 municipality known as the “The Corporation of the City of Hamilton” 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 and Official Plans of the former area municipalities and the Official Plan of the former regional municipality continue in force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the City of Hamilton passed Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) on the 25th day of July 1950, which by-law was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board by Order dated the 7th day of December 1951, (File No. P.F.C. 3821);

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section ______ of Report of the Planning and Economic Development Committee at its meeting held on the day of ______, 2006, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this by-law is in conformity with the Official Plan of the Hamilton Planning Area, approved by the Minister under the Planning Act on June 1, 1982.

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

1. That Sheet No. W-37c of the District maps, appended to and forming part of By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), is amended,
(a) by changing the zoning from “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified, the lands comprised of Block 1;

(b) by changing the zoning from “AA” (Agricultural) District to “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified, the lands comprised of Block 2;

(c) by changing the zoning from “AA” (Agricultural) District to “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified, the lands comprised of Block 3; and,

(d) by changing the zoning from “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified, the lands comprised of Block 4;

the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule ‘A’.

2. That the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District regulations as contained in Section 9A of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the lands shown as Blocks 1 and 2 on Schedule ‘A’, be modified to include the following special requirements:

(a) That notwithstanding Section 9A(2)(b)(1)(i) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a front yard having a depth of not less than 4.5 metres to the main wall of the dwelling and not less than 6.0 metres to an attached garage or carport shall be provided and maintained;

(b) That notwithstanding Section 18(3)(vi)(d) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a roofed-over or screened but otherwise unenclosed one-storey porch at the first storey level, including eaves and gutters, may project into a required front yard to a distance of not more than 1.5 metres.

3. That the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District regulations as contained in Section 9 of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the lands shown as Blocks 3 and 4 on Schedule ‘A’, be modified to include the following special requirements:

(a) That notwithstanding Section 9(3)(i) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a front yard having a depth of not less than 4.5 metres to the main wall of the dwelling and not less than 6.0 metres to an attached garage or carport shall be provided and maintained;
(b) That notwithstanding Section 18(3)(vi)(d) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a roofed-over or screened but otherwise unenclosed one-storey porch at the first storey level, including eaves and gutters, may project into a required front yard to a distance of not more than 1.5 metres.

4. 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 “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District and “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District regulations, subject to the special requirements referred to in Sections 2 and 3, applicable to the lands described in Sections 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), and 1(d).

5. By-law No. 6593 is amended by adding this by-law to Section 19B as Schedule S-1552.

6. Sheet No. W-37c of the District Maps is amended by marking the lands referred to in Sections 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), and 1(d) of this by-law as S-1552.

7. 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 day of , 2006.

__________________________________________  ______________________________
MAYOR                                               CLERK
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This is Schedule “A” to By-Law No. 06—

Passed the .......... day of .............., 2006

Clerk

Mayor

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Schedule “A”

Map Forming Part of By-law No. 06-____
to Amend By-law No. 6593

Subject Property
256 Thorner Drive, Hamilton

Block 1 - Change in Zoning from “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District to “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified

Block 2 - Change in Zoning from “AA” (Agricultural) District to “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, Modified

Block 3 - Change in Zoning from “AA” (Agricultural) District to “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified

Block 4 - Modification to established “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District

Scale: Not to Scale
File Name/Number: ZAC-05-93/25T200520
Date: April 2006
Planner/Technician: HT/LMM
October 19, 2005

To: Anita Fabac, Senior Planner  
City of Hamilton, Planning & Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
Development Planning Section

Re: File Nos. ZAC-05-93/25T200520

Ms Fabac,

I am writing to you in regards to the change in zoning application referenced above. My husband and I have three areas of concern with the planned changes. They are as follows:

1) We’ve lived on Thorne Drive for ten years. In that time, we’ve found that parking on the street can sometimes be challenging. Most houses on our street have single car driveways and it seems that a majority of homeowners have more than one vehicle. With the addition of twelve new houses on the south side of the street, we wonder if Thorne Drive will be widened to accommodate parking on both sides of the street? If not, will parking only be allowed on one side of the street?

2) It’s difficult to tell by the planned drawings we’ve received, so we’d like to know if the playground area would be remaining in the park that runs off of Southampton Drive?

3) The destruction of the school seems to have gone generally well in our opinion. Except for one day when the wind was blowing towards our home and we ended up with a layer of yellow dust over our vehicles, garden and window screens, the mess of the destruction has been contained on school grounds. Once the school is completely demolished and the rubble removed, will there be a snow fence or barrier around the proposed building lot? We ask this because in past winters with the open field on the west side of the school and the single storey construction of the school, we’ve had more than our share of snow, with winds drifting snow in over our doorways on a regular basis. As we’ll no longer be a priority for snow removal with the school gone, I fear that there will be even more days when we will be snowed under.

We look forward to the opportunity to attend the public meeting regarding the planned rezoning and trust that your office will be able to answer our questions and concerns at that time.

Mark and Heather Barlow  
249 Thorne Drive
Dear Anita Fabac,  

Senior Planner,

My name is Kasia Makara. I’m a 15 year old teenage girl who lives in the area that you are planning to build new houses (256 Thorner Drive). I really don’t mind the fact that they are going to be new houses in that area, my only problem is that I think that they are going to be too many houses. The park, that is located beside what used to be Thornbrae School, is a huge play place for those kids that live in the area. Most of the area beside the park is a place where older kids like to run around, play ball or just hang out. I have used this park many times and I still use it when my friends and I want to go somewhere other than the mall or someone’s house. Because let’s face it, most kids my age don’t like playing on monkey bars anymore. If older kids have no place at the park then where else will they play? The only place left are the streets or the mall parking lot and that isn’t safe at all. Just realize that the houses are going to be really close to the park, meaning that the kids playing there will be bothering the people that will be living in those houses. Also, the area by Bishopsgate Avenue, kids play soccer there because there are soccer goal posts already there. Why not just make half of the houses you suggested, this way kids still have the park and an area to play in and new houses will still be built.

Sincerely,

Kasia Makara

26 Jasmine Street
Hamilton, Ontario
L8V 2M9

Thursday, October 13th, 2005
I totally agree with my daughter. With more and more agricultural land disappearing in Hamilton under the concrete land of the new subdivisions, it would be a prudent decision to save as much of existing green spaces as possible. Let’s balance the need for new houses and need of having the park for the children and adult and build only 25 houses on Thorne Drive. After all, there will be more children in the area when families move to the new houses.

Yours Truly,

Buba Makara

26 Jasmine Street
Hamilton, Ontario
L8V 2M9
In response to your letter dated September 30, 2005:

I have been living on 82 Bishopsgate Ave. for almost two years now. One of the reasons I bought this house was because of the open space and the park close by and another reason was that my parents live in the area and grew up here. What I like most about this area is the fact that all the homes have double lots and also the fact that it is a nice quiet area.

I DO NOT want to see a new subdivision for 50 single residential lots that will be one on top of the other and ruin the area. I DO NOT want the park to be taken away.

The government is reporting that our children are becoming overweight and now you want to take the only park we have in this area. If anything they should be building somewhere that our children can get the exercise they need and not taking away the little they have.

The park is used for soccer practice in the summer. If the park is taken away where will they go to practice.

Your truly,

Clara Ruggiero
October 5, 2005

Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Attn: Anita Fabac, Senior Planner
Planning and Economic Development Department

Dear Ms. Fabac:

Re: Zoning By-Law and Subdivision Application – ZAC-05-93/25T200520

I am a resident of Lilacside Drive Hamilton, and I have been living in this area for approximately five (5) years. My parents lived in my current home for approximately thirteen (13) years prior. I purchased my parent’s home because I enjoy the fact that this area is quiet, and the neighborhood children have an area just up the road at 256 Thorner Drive to play soccer, catch or to play at the park.

I have received a notice that states DeSantis Development Ltd. is planning to build fifty (50) houses on the property where Thornbrea School was previously located.

I would like it known, and noted, that as a current resident of the proposed building area I am opposed the plan to build these homes in my area for the following reasons:

· The increase in traffic flow;
· The reduction of green space;
· The further reduction of park amenities for the children in our residential area. Especially in light of the fact that communities complain of the obesity of our children and our city proceeds to reduce their opportunity for outdoor physical exercise in exchange for an increase in property tax revenue.
· The increase in noise in the area and therefore affect the quality of life for the current neighborhood.

I look forward to receipt of written notification of the date and time of the public meeting.

I thank you for your time.

Yours truly,

Janet Miceli
137 Lilacside Drive
Hamilton, Ontario
L8V 2L8
Anita Fabac re Application # ZAC-05-93/25T200520.

In response to your letter dated September 30/05, I have several issue with said application, that I would like addressed.

1 Will the sewers in the immediate area take the extra load without backup or flooding to present residence? I would like a guarantee.

2 As it appears all Traffic is going to be funelled onto Bishopsgate Avenue, has any thought gone into putting a Traffic Light at Mohawk Road, as it is already a Bear to enter West Bound at present, particularly at peak times?

3 House Density does not Blend with existing buildings, re Lot Size, or spacing, particularly on Thorner or Deerborn Drives to which they abut.

4 Some thought should go into putting Traffic onto Deerborn Drive, through Lots#19-20-46-47-48, so that Traffic could get out of the Survey Via a Controlled intersection.

CC; to Bill Kelly, Ward 7.

Sincerely  
John Cassidy  
13 Ranchdale Drive  
Hamilton, Ontario.  
L8V 2L9
-----Original Message-----
From: Gwen Ripco
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 8:08 PM
To: Fabac, Anita
Subject: Regarding Subdivision Application ZAC-05-93/25T200520

October 18, 2005

Dear Ms. Fabac

I am responding to the zoning by-law and subdivision application for the above mentioned file. I am a resident at 19 Jasmine Street and I have concerns regarding the sale of Thornbrae School to DeSantis Development Ltd., the subsequent proposal for the use of land, and the shortsightedness of The Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.

Firstly, my neighbours and I were unaware of the purchase of Thornbrae School by DeSantis Development Ltd. until destruction of the school was about to begin. One of my neighbours had previously written to Councillor Bill Kelly regarding the future of Thornbrae School. He did not receive a response after writing two letters. Furthermore, not every household who is affected by the property sale and subsequent proposal received a letter from the Planning and Economic Development Department. It appears that the intent was to keep information regarding the future of Thornbrae School a secret.

Secondly, I cannot imagine 50 homes being built on the purchased property as outlined by the subdivision plan. Not only will the subdivision be overcrowded and unsightly, but there will be a significant increase in traffic in the existing neighbourhood.

It was the school and the open field that gave the neighbourhood its charm. The openness allowed one to view a big piece of sky, something that is rare to view in the city. In addition, residents enjoyed the open space for playing organized and recreational activities. The demolition of Thornbrae School will definitely have a negative impact on the neighbourhood.

To lessen the damage already done, DeSantis Development Ltd. must scale down its project to show consideration for the existing residents and the integrity of the neighbourhood.

Sincerely

Gwen Ripco
-----Original Message-----

From: jean wise  
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 5:16 PM  
To: Fabac, Anita  
Subject: File Nos. ZAC-05-93/25T200520

Could you tell me how the sewers will be connected in this new survey? As well, where will the construction traffic be accessing the site? Can you also confirm there will be no extension of Thorner Drive across the hydro property?