SUBJECT: Applications for an Official Plan Amendment to the Town of Ancaster Official Plan, Draft Plan of Subdivision Known as “Westvit Estates”, and for a Change in Zoning, for Lands Located at 280 Valridge Drive, Ancaster (PED07189) (Ward 12)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That approval be given to Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-07-07, Westvit Estates Inc., Owner, to amend policies and to redesignate lands in the Ancaster Official Plan, including the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, to delete the requirement for a separate elementary school site, relocate and reduce the size of a neighbourhood park, delete the requirement for a walkway along Highway 403, reduce the right-of-way width of local roads and realign the road pattern, delete the requirement for a 1.8 metre high berm within a walkway, and to identify lands for a stormwater management pond, for lands located at 280 Valridge Drive, as shown on Schedules “A” and “B” to Appendix “B” of Report PED07189, on the following basis:

(i) That the Ancaster Official Plan, including the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, be amended as shown in Appendix “B” to Report PED07189.

(ii) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED07189, be adopted by City Council.

(iii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.
(b) That approval be given to **Subdivision Application 25T200704 "Westvit Estates Inc.", Owner**, to establish a draft plan of subdivision comprising one hundred and three lots for single detached dwellings, one block for storm water management, one block for a park, and three blocks for public open space, on lands known municipally as 280 Valridge Drive (Ancaster), as shown on Appendix “E” to Report PED07189, subject to the following conditions:

(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T200704 prepared by L.J. Kuelling, O.L.S., Guido Papa Surveying Ltd., as certified on May 14, 2007, showing one hundred and three lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1-103), one block for storm water management (Block 107), one block for a neighbourhood park (Block 108), and three blocks (Blocks 104, 105 and 106) for public open space, subject to the Owner entering into a Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, as approved by City Council and with the Special Conditions attached as Appendix “G”.

(ii) Acknowledgment by the City of Hamilton of its responsibility for cost sharing with respect to this development for the following items:

(1) That the City will pay half the cost of the chain link fence being installed between the residential lots and the lands being transferred to the City as parkland from the City Parks Trust Fund Reserve in accordance with the current financial policy.

(2) That the City will pay half the cost of the aboveground and underground works adjacent to the lands to be dedicated to the City as parkland from the City’s Development Charge Reserve. For above ground works, the City’s share shall be based on the “New Roads Servicing Rate.” All in accordance with the City’s Financial Policies for Development.

(iii) That the City agrees to purchase an additional 1.31 hectares (3.24 acres) of land for parkland purposes, at market value, at the time of registration of that portion of the plan containing the parklands; with funding provided through the City’s Park Trust Fund Reserve.

(c) That approval be given to **Zoning Application ZAC-07-27, Westvit Estates Inc., Owner**, for changes in zoning from the Agricultural “A” Zone to a modified Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone (Block “1”) to permit a new neighbourhood park, to the Conservation/Hazard Land “P5” Zone (Block “2”) to permit a stormwater management facility, to the Open Space “P4” Zone (Blocks “3”, “4” and “5”) to permit a public trail, and to the Residential “R4-558” Zone (Block “6”) to permit one hundred and three single detached dwellings on individual lots, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07189, on the following basis:
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(i) That Block “1” be added to By-law 05-200 as a Modified Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone, as Special Exception No. 9.

(ii) That Block “2” be added to By-law 05-200 as Conservation/Hazard Land “P5” Zone.

(iii) That Blocks “3”, “4” and “5” be added to By-law 05-200 as Open Space “P4” Zone.

(iv) That Block “6” be rezoned from Agricultural “A” Zone to Residential “R4-558” Zone.

(v) That the draft By-laws, attached as Appendix “C” and Appendix “D” to Report PED07189, which have 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 Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, and will be in conformity with the Town of Ancaster Official Plan upon finalization of Official Plan Amendment No. ____.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The applicant has submitted applications for amendments to the Ancaster Official Plan and the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, for changes in zoning, and for draft plan of subdivision approval to permit the creation of one hundred and three lots for single detached dwellings, one block for storm water management, one block for a neighbourhood park, and three blocks for public open space walkways (Appendix “E”).

This proposal has merit and can be supported since the proposed amendments and draft plan of subdivision are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and comply with the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

BACKGROUND:

The applications were originally circulated under files OPA-06-07, ZAC-06-28 and 25T200606. However, as additional lands were acquired by the applicant, the applications have been revised accordingly with new file numbers and recirculated. The
previous applications have been closed; however, as the revisions to the applications are considered minor, the comments received from the public through the initial pre-circulation have been included in Appendix “F” and are addressed in the Analysis/Rationale Section of the report.

The applications are for amendments to the Ancaster Official Plan and the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, for approval of a draft plan of subdivision, and for changes in zoning, for lands located 280 Valridge Drive (Ancaster), as shown on Appendix “A”.

Amendments to the Ancaster Official Plan and the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan are required to implement the proposed plan of subdivision, which remove the requirement for a separate elementary school site, relocate and reduce the size of a neighbourhood park, remove the requirement for a walkway along Highway 403, reduce the right-of-way width of local roads and realign their location, remove the requirement for a 1.8 metre high berm within a walkway, and identify lands for a stormwater management pond.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendments (Appendix “C” and “D”) allow the lands to be developed in accordance with the proposed draft plan of subdivision “Westvit Estates”. As shown on Appendix “A”, the proposal would rezone Block “1” to allow for a Neighbourhood Park, Block “2” to allow for a stormwater management facility, Blocks “3”, “4” and “5” to allow for public trails, and Block “6” to allow for one hundred and three single detached dwellings on individual lots.

The proposed lots conform to the minimum 12.0 metre lot frontage of the Residential “R4” Zone and range from 12.2 metres to 18.6 metres in width. The proposed lot areas range in size from 390m² to 1,002.76m². The minimum lot area required in the Residential “R4” Zone is 400m² for non-corner lots. As a result, the applicant has proposed a site specific modification to the Residential “R4” Zone for a reduced minimum lot area of 385 m² for non-corner lots.

By-law 06-166, an amendment to By-law 05-200 was passed by Council on June 14, 2006 which established new Open Space and Park Zones for the City of Hamilton, but excluded the subject lands. This By-law is now in full force and effect. As the proposed subdivision is required to provide a neighbourhood park and an open space walkway system as per the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, staff has implemented the new Open Space and Park Zones set out in By-law 06-166 for the subject lands to ensure consistency through the City’s approved planning documents. The proposed amending by-law (Appendix “D”), appropriately implements the approved Parks and Open Space Zones by amending the Schedules to By-law 05-200 to include
Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as shown on Schedule “A”. One minor modification is proposed to the Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone standards at the request of the Ministry of Transportation to include a setback of 14 metres for permanent buildings and structures both above and below ground, utilities, frontage roads/fire routes, essential parking spaces, storm water management ponds and associated berms, and noise walls, from the limits of Highway 403.

Details of Submitted Application

Applicant/Owner: Westvit Estates Inc.

Agent: Rosemarie Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc.

Location: 280 Valridge Drive, Ancaster

Description: Total Area: 9.52 hectares (23.52 acres)
Width: 288.55 metres (Northern boundary)
Depth: 356.03 metres (parallel to Galley Road)

Existing Land Use and Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Lands:</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Agricultural &quot;A&quot; Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Lands:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single Detached Residential and Townhouse Condominium</td>
<td>Residential &quot;R4-437&quot; Zone, Residential &quot;R4-439&quot; Zone, Institutional “I” Zone, and Public Open Space “O2” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single Detached Residential</td>
<td>Residential &quot;R3-207” Zone and Residential “R3-312” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Provincial Highway 403</td>
<td>Agricultural “A” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Environmentally Significant Area</td>
<td>Agricultural “A” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

Circulation of the proposed applications to various City Departments and outside agencies resulted in no significant issues with respect to the proposed Official Plan and zone changes, although a number of requests to impose specific conditions of draft approval for the proposed plan of subdivision were received. Planning staff’s evaluation of the proposed applications is set out below.

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

   (i) The proposed Official Plan Amendment, draft plan of subdivision and changes in zoning are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conform to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan;

   (ii) It implements the “Low Density Residential 1”, “Neighbourhood Park” and “Open Space Linkage” designations of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan of the Ancaster Official Plan;

   (iii) The proposal is compatible with the existing and planned development in the immediate area; and,

   (iv) The proposal is an appropriate infill development that will make efficient use of existing services on site.

2. The proposed amendments to the Ancaster Official Plan and Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan include:

   **Relocation of Neighbourhood Park**

   Policy 6.1.5.5(f) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan outlines that the Neighbourhood Park should be centrally located and adjacent to the public and separate elementary school sites. As neither elementary school is to be constructed in the Secondary Plan area, an amendment is proposed to relocate the Neighbourhood Park to the south of the property. The revised park location is preferable to the City of Hamilton as the new location is adjacent to Highway 403 and will allow for an area of open space linkage as originally envisioned by Policy 6.1.5.5(e) which called for a 6 metre wide walking trail along Highway 403. As well, there is municipal cost sharing involved in the construction of the above ground and underground works adjacent to the lands to be transferred to the City as parkland, and the revised location will allow for appropriate public access to the park with a lesser amount of road frontage, to be paid for by the City.
Reduced Neighbourhood Park Area

On June 14th, 2006, City Council approved the new Open Space and Parks Official Plan policies and new Zoning By-law for Open Space and Parks Zones. The proposed Neighbourhood Park has been reduced in area from approximately 2.5 hectares (6.1 acres) to 1.82 hectares (4.5 acres) and is in keeping with the Council approved policy. As well, the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section has no objections to the size of the Park.

Elimination of Separate Elementary School Site

Policy 6.1.5.2(a) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan outlines that one separate elementary school site shall be located within the Plan area. Policy 6.1.5.2(j) states that in the event an elementary school site is not required by the applicable school board and is not acquired by the Town for parkland, it may be developed for single detached dwellings. The Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board has indicated they do not require a school site and the City of Hamilton has not identified the need for these lands as parkland. As a result, the lands are to be redesignated from “Institutional” to “Residential” in the Ancaster Official Plan and from “Separate Elementary School” to “Low Density Residential 1” in the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

Elimination of 1.8 metre high berm

Policy 6.1.5.5(d) requires a 1.8 metre high berm along the east side of the 15 metre wide walkway to screen the existing homes that front onto Galley Road. As the original Secondary Plan policy called for a school and park to be located along the westerly side of the walkway, there was a need for a berm. However, as the separate elementary school site is not needed and the park will be relocated within the neighbourhood, residences will be adjacent to both sides of the walkway and a berm is not required but screening will be required.

Furthermore, through discussions with the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, it is not possible to design a berm with moderate slopes for maintenance purposes to a height of 1.8 metres that would not consume a significant amount of area within the walkway. The Open Space Development and Park Planning Section are supportive of the removal of the 1.8 metre high berm requirement and the revised Secondary Plan policy.

With respect to a berm, there are public concerns with respect to existing vegetation that may have to be removed and privacy. Since a berm is no longer required, an alternative form of screening such as a fence or landscaping is proposed along both sides of the walkway which will address these concerns (Special Condition 17).
Elimination of 6 metre wide trail along the Highway 403 corridor

Policy 6.1.5.5(e) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan requires a 6 metre wide walkway to be established along Highway 403 which will connect the north/south 15 metre wide walkway to the Big Creek wooded ravine/valley lands. As the Neighbourhood Park is being relocated to the south, the establishment of a formal trail is not required as the entire park will be accessible to the public. A public trail system has been incorporated along the rear and sides of Lots 18 to 38 and 80 to 103 as envisioned in the Secondary Plan (Appendix “E”). As a result, the Secondary Plan has been amended to remove this requirement, and the appropriate changes to Map 1 on Appendix “B” have been drafted.

Reduction of Right of Way for Local Roads

Policy 6.1.8.4(c) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan states that local roads shall generally be 20 metres (66 feet) in width. Street “A” of the plan of subdivision is shown as a 20 metre right-of-way, while Street “B” is shown as an 18 metre wide right-of-way. The slight reduction in the right-of-way still allows for proper two-way vehicular traffic movements, parking, snow storage, and utilities, and is supportive of more compact development. The Traffic Engineering and Operations Section and Development Engineering Division staff have no concerns with the proposed reduction in road width.

Introduction of Storm Water Management Pond

Policy 6.1.9.4 of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan outlines the storm drainage policies for the Secondary Plan area. A Stormwater Management Study has been prepared for the subdivision which calls for the creation of a stormwater management facility. Therefore, an appropriate land use designation is proposed for the storm water management facility to recognize its location within the Secondary Plan area.

3. The proposed draft plan is comprised of one hundred and three lots for single-detached dwellings, as shown on Appendix “E”. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendments (Appendix “C” and “D”) allows the lands to be developed in accordance with the proposed draft plan of subdivision “Westvit Estates”.

Residential R4-558 Zone (By-law 87-57)

The proposed lots meet the minimum lot frontage (12 metres) of the Residential “R4” Zone. The Residential “R4” Zone requires a minimum lot area of 400m², except on a corner lot the minimum lot area shall be 500m². The proposed draft plan as shown on Appendix “E” shows one hundred and three single detached residential lots. The number of lots was reduced from the previous application (123 to 103) to address local concerns with respect to density and potential
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As a result of the revised configuration, certain lots are slightly below the minimum standard of 400m$^2$. The revised draft plan shows a total of nineteen lots within the range of 390m$^2$ and 399m$^2$. To address this, staff is recommending a site-specific modification to the Residential “R4” Zone that would allow for a reduced minimum lot area of 385m$^2$ for non-corner lots. The reduced lot area will still allow for a suitable building envelope that will meet the yard requirements of the Residential “R4” Zone, and allow for proper grading and drainage. All lots within the proposed subdivision have a minimum lot depth of 30 metres. Where appropriate, Policy 6.1.5.1(h) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan encourages more innovative housing types, zoning standards and subdivision designs. Staff considers the reduced lot area as minor, and the proposal supports this policy.

Open Space “P4” Zone (By-law 05-200)

Blocks 104, 105 and 106 on Appendix “E” will be developed as open space walkways as per Policy 6.1.5.5(d) and (e) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan. Blocks 104 and 105 will be used as a public walkway and linkage through the neighbourhood, and will be a minimum 15 metres in width with screening along the rear of the residential lots. Block 106 will be used as an open space linkage abutting the lands designated “Open Space and Conservation” to the west.

Conservation/Hazard Land “P5” Zone (By-law 05-200)

Block 107 on Appendix “E” is to be developed as a stormwater management facility and will be zoned under the new Conservation/Hazard Land “P5” Zone provisions set out in By-law 06-166 (New Open Space and Parks Zoning).

Modified Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone (By-law 05-200)

Block 108 on Appendix “E” is to be developed as a Neighbourhood Park. The proposed zoning is consistent with the Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone provisions set out in By-law 06-166 (New Open Space and Parks Zoning). However, as the proposed park abuts the right-of-way of Highway 403, the Ministry of Transportation requires a minimum 14 metre setback for permanent buildings and structures both above and below ground, utilities, frontage roads/fire routes, essential parking spaces, storm water management ponds and associated berms, and noise walls, from the limits of their property. Therefore, a specific zone provision has been included in the implementing By-law (Appendix “D”).

4. There are existing watermains of sufficient size and capacity on Valridge Drive and Speers Road available to service the development directly.
5. In response to the precirculation process and the proponent sponsored Open House, eighteen letters and e-mails were received from neighbouring property owners (Appendix “F”). The issues raised in the correspondence are addressed below:

**Traffic**

A majority of respondents raised concerns with respect to traffic impacts on the neighbourhood. Issues such as volume, congestion, on-street parking, and the need for a secondary access through the subdivision were raised. Comments from the Traffic Engineering and Operations Section did not request a traffic study. The subdivision application has been redesigned and is proposing two full access points at the south limit of Valridge Drive and through the westerly extension of Speers Road to service the subdivision (Appendix “E”).

**ESA Boundary**

The Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) boundary abutting the westerly limit of the subdivision was staked on October 12, 2006 with staff from the City of Hamilton, Grand River Conservation Area, and the applicant’s environmental consultant. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared and presented to the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) on January 18, 2007. A majority of the ESA features are located on the property to the west now owned by the City of Hamilton and designated as “Open Space and Conservation” in the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan. The proposed draft plan includes a 4.0 metre wide block to act as a buffer from the ESA (Block 106 on Appendix “E”), which will include an open space walkway as well.

**Density**

Concerns were raised with respect to the density of development and the sizes of the proposed lots. It should be noted that the applicant has not applied for an amendment to the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan to either increase the maximum density or to reduce the minimum lot frontage.

Policy 6.1.5.1(l)(i) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan outlines that the minimum lot frontage for single detached units located within the “Low Density Residential 1” designation is 12.2 metres (40 feet). The applicant is proposing a range of lot sizes from 12.2 metres to 18.6 metres which conforms to the Secondary Plan policy.

With respect to density, Policy 6.1.5.1(l)(i) requires the “Low Density Residential 1” designation not to exceed 15 units per “gross/net residential hectare” (a defined term). Based on the revised proposal of one hundred and three
residential units, the density of the site is 15 units per “gross/net residential hectare”.

As well, to address density concerns the applicant has reduced the number of lots from one hundred and twenty-three to one hundred and three with a wider range of lot frontages and areas.

15 metre wide Walkway Block

Policy 6.1.5.5(d) of The Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan requires that a walkway be included where it abuts the existing residential uses along Galley Road. The walkway is to be 15 metres in width and is to include a 1.8m high berm along the east side to screen the Galley Road residences. Concerns were raised with respect to privacy and the ultimate design and construction of the berm as there are mature trees on the applicant’s and abutting property that may have to be removed to construct the walkway. As a result, the proposed text amendments to the Secondary Plan call for the removal of the 1.8 metre high berm, to be replaced with fencing or landscaping (Special Condition 17).

Impact on Property Values

Concerns were raised with respect to impacts on property values and taxation of existing properties. Staff is unaware of any information or data to support this concern.

Construction Impacts

Concerns with respect to noise, dust and mud as the result of construction were raised. Through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, erosion and sediment control fencing are engineering standards that apply to all developments. The proposed development will be subject to these standards and any additional requirements imposed through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement. The Standard Form Subdivision Agreement also requires the Owner to prevent earth and debris from being tracked onto streets outside the property, and to clean any debris as a result of construction activities. Securities are held by the City of Hamilton to ensure the work, if required, is completed under the agreement. Lastly, if required, the City’s Noise Control By-law can be used to enforce potential noise impacts from construction.

Future Development Block

The previous application (25T200606) had proposed a future development block, however, as this block has been acquired by the applicant at the south east corner, the new applications do not include any lands for future development.
Removal of the Park Block

The original draft plan submitted under the previous file 25T200606 proposed 123 single detached lots and did not include a park as per the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan. Based on comments from the Open Space Development and Park Planning section, the applicant has revised the plan of subdivision to show the required park block in a new location within the plan of subdivision (Appendix “E” – Block 108).

6. As per the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan the applicant is required to dedicate a 1.82 hectare (4.5 acre) Neighbourhood Park. However, in accordance with the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, the applicant is required to only dedicate 5% of the total site for park purposes which is equivalent to 0.463 hectares (1.14 acres). Consequently, the City will be required to purchase 1.13 hectares (3.24 acres) of parkland over dedication from the Owner. (Recommendation (b) (iii)).

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

If the applications are denied, the applicant has the option of using the property for the current range of Agricultural “A” Zone uses.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

**Financial:** The City of Hamilton will be required to purchase the balance of lands required for the 1.82 hectare (4.5 acre) Neighbourhood Park, after the applicant’s 5% land dedication of 0.463 ha (1.14 acres). The City of Hamilton will be required to purchase 1.31 hectares (3.24 acres) to create the 1.82 hectare (4.5 acre) Neighbourhood Park at a market rate at the time of acquisition. The applicant and the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section have agreed that due to the configuration of the applicant’s parcel, some areas will not be purchased as they cannot be utilized for active park purposes which are reflected in the calculated area to be dedicated.

The development is subject to cost sharing, and as a result, the City will pay half the cost of the chain link fence being installed between the residential lots and the lands being transferred to the City as parkland from the City Parks Trust Fund account in accordance with the current financial policy.

As well, the City will pay half the cost of the above ground and underground works adjacent to the lands to be transferred to the City as parkland, as per the current financial policy. For above ground works, the City’s share shall be based on the “New Roads Servicing Rate.”
Policies Affecting Proposal:

Provincial Policy Statement

The applications are consistent with Policy 1.1.3.1 of the PPS, which focuses growth in settlement areas. However, 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, only development and site alteration which maintains the heritage integrity of the site will be permitted. The applicant submitted an archaeological assessment prepared by Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc. to the Ministry of Culture. A letter dated May 8th, 2006 states that Provincial concerns for cultural heritage have been fully met for the subject lands which responded to the previous applications (OPA-06-07, 25T200606, and ZAC-06-28). However, as additional lands were added in the current applications, an archaeological assessment will be required for these lands as per the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

In addition, Policy 1.1.1 (c) outlines that healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by avoiding developments and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns. Furthermore, 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, and aggregate activities) and sensitive land uses are appropriately designed, buffered and separated from each other to prevent adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, and to minimize risk to public health and safety. An initial noise assessment was prepared for the subdivision application; however, as the design has changed significantly, an addendum to the noise assessment will be required and will be implemented through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan

The subject lands are designated as “Urban Area” within the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. Policy 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. Urban Areas are intended to accommodate approximately 96% of new residential housing units in the Region to the year 2020. As well, the subject land is adjacent to the Jerseyville Road Woodlot Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). As per Policy 1.2.2 of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, the applicant prepared an Environmental Impact Statement and presented the study to ESAIEG on the 18th of
January, 2007. The Environmental Impact Statement concluded that a buffer from the limit of the feature would be appropriate to minimize intrusion into and protect the function of the ESA. ESAIEG recommended that:

1. The applicant conducts a spring/summer botanical survey.
2. That a water balance be prepared.
3. That the applicant provides a detailed design of the storm water management facility.
4. That the applicant provides fencing.
5. That a tree protection plan be prepared for the storm water management pond outlet.

ESAIEG Recommendation 1 has been addressed through Special Condition 3. Recommendations 2 and 3 have been addressed through Special Condition 2 imposed by the Grand River Conservation Authority who regulates the lands within which the Environmentally Significant Area and wetland are located. ESAIEG Recommendation 4 has been addressed in Special Condition 8 which states that the Owner shall provide fencing, and ESAIEG Recommendation 5 has been addressed in Special Condition 2.

As the nature of the applications is for the development of a residential plan of subdivision on full municipal services, and the applicant has prepared the necessary supporting studies, the applications conform with the policies of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

**Ancaster Official Plan**

The subject lands are designated as “Residential”, “Institutional” and “Open Space and Conservation” on Schedule “B” – Land Use – Urban Area of the Ancaster Official Plan.

Policy 5.11.3 outlines that the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan shall ensure a broad range and mix of residential units are provided in terms of lot and unit size, and type of tenure. The draft plan of subdivision, as shown on Appendix “E”, proposes a range of lot frontages from 12.2 metres to 18.6 metres.

Policy 5.11.5 of the Ancaster Official Plan requires that the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan shall provide a neighbourhood park approximately 2.5 hectares (6.1 acres) and a separate elementary school site. Amendments to this policy are required as the park size has been reduced to 1.82 hectares (4.5 acres) and the separate elementary school site is no longer required by the Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School Board. The separate elementary school lands are to be developed for residential purposes as per the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan policies.
Revisions to Schedule “B” – Land Use – Urban Area are necessary to implement the redesignation of the lands from “Open Space and Conservation” to “Residential”, from “Institutional” to “Residential” and from “Residential” to “Open Space and Conservation” as per Schedule “A” of Appendix “B”.

Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

The subject lands are designated as “Low Density Residential 1”, “Neighbourhood Park” and “Separate Elementary School” on Map 1 – Land Use of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan. The proposed one hundred and three lot residential plan of subdivision complies with the “Low Density Residential 1” density provision which allows a maximum gross/net density of 15 units per residential hectare. The plan of subdivision is also consistent with the minimum lot frontage of 12.2 metres by providing a range of lot frontages from a minimum of 12.2 metres to 18.6 metres.

Policy 6.1.5.1(m) states that detailed plans of subdivision shall further refine the location, size and shape of sites for community facilities such as public and separate elementary schools, neighbourhood parks and open space walkways. The proposed plan of subdivision (Appendix “E”) calls for the removal of a portion of the open space walkway along the Highway 403 corridor, the removal of the Separate Elementary School site in favour of residential development, and the reduction and the relocation of the Neighbourhood Park from the centre to the south, and the appropriate revisions to Map 1 – Land Use of the Secondary Plan.

Policy 6.1.5.2(j) states that in the event that an elementary school site is not required for the applicable school board and is not required by the Town for parkland, it may be developed for single detached dwellings. Technically, an amendment is not required to this policy for the removal of the school site, however Map 1 – Land Use will be revised accordingly. Staff received documentation from the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board in a letter dated February 21, 2007 stating the site is no longer required for their purposes. The City of Hamilton, Open Space Development and Park Planning Section has stated that the site is not required for additional park purposes.

Policy 6.1.5.5(d) calls for a 1.8 metre high berm along the east side of the 15 metre wide walkway to screen the existing homes that front onto Galley Road. As the original Secondary Plan policy called for a school and park to be located along the westerly side of the walkway, there was a need for a berm. However, as the separate elementary school site is not needed and the park will be relocated within the neighbourhood, residences will be adjacent to both sides of the walkway and a berm is not required but screening will be required.
Furthermore, through discussions with the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, it is not possible to design a berm with moderate slopes for maintenance purposes to a height of 1.8 metres that would not consume a significant amount of area within the walkway. The Open Space Development and Park Planning Section are supportive of the removal of the 1.8 metre high berm and the revised Secondary Plan policy.

Policy 6.1.8.4(c) of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan states that local roads shall generally be 20 metres (66 feet) in width. Street “A” of the plan of subdivision is shown as a 20 metre right-of-way, while Street “B” is shown as an 18 metre wide right-of-way. The slight reduction in the right-of-way still allows for proper two-way vehicular traffic movements, parking, snow storage, and utilities, and is supportive of more compact development. The Traffic Engineering and Operations Section and Development Engineering Division staff have no concerns with the proposal to reduce the width to 18 metres.

Policy 6.1.9.4 outlines the storm drainage polices for the Secondary Plan area. A Stormwater Management Study has been prepared for the subdivision which calls for the creation of a storm water management facility (Appendix “E” – Block 107). As a result, an appropriate land use designation is proposed for Map 1 to recognize its location within the Secondary Plan area.

Policy 6.1.5.5(f) states that the Neighbourhood Park shall be centrally located, 2.5 hectares (6 acres) in size, and adjacent to the public and separate elementary school sites. Neither the public and separate elementary school sites are proposed to be developed. As a result, based on consultation with the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, a revised location has been agreed upon and the reduction in the Neighbourhood Park to a size of 1.82 hectares (4.5 acres).

Revisions to Map 1 – Land Use are necessary to implement the redesignation of lands from “Neighbourhood Park” to “Low Density Residential 1”, from “Separate Elementary School” to “Low Density Residential 1”, from “Separate Elementary School” to “Storm Water Management Pond Area”, from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Storm Water Management Pond Area”, from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Neighbourhood Park”, to delete a portion of the “Open Space Linkage” along Highway 403, and to delete and add a “Local Road”, as shown on “Map 1” of Appendix “B”.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION:**

**Agencies/Departments Having No Comment or Objections**

- Public Works Department, Capital Planning and Implementation.
- Public Health Services Department – Health Protection Branch.
- Parking and By-law Services.
- Corporate Services Department – Budgets and Finance Division.
- Hamilton Street Railway.
APPLICATIONS FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE TOWN OF ANCASTER
OFFICIAL PLAN, DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION KNOWN AS “WESTVIT ESTATES”,
AND FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING, FOR LANDS LOCATED AT 280 VALRIDGE DRIVE,
ANCASTER (PED07189) (WARD 12) - PAGE 17 OF 20

- Hamilton Emergency Services.
- Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.
- Source Cable & Wireless.
- Ontario Power Generation.
- Hamilton Hydro Inc.
- Canada Post.

Union Gas

The “Dominion Line” will be located within the 15 metre wide walkway blocks (Blocks 104 and 105 on Appendix “E”). Union Gas has advised that all relocation costs are to be borne by the Owner subject to agreement with Union Gas. As well, Union Gas has requested that they will require a 15 metre easement pre and post construction as well as easy and unobstructed access to the “Dominion Line” at all times for repair or maintenance purposes. As well, there are limitations to the timing of this project as the relocation of the Dominion Line must take place within the June 1st to September 30th timeframe. The establishment of all required easements is addressed through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Ministry of Transportation

The Ministry of Transportation has requested that as a condition of draft plan approval, a copy of the storm water management report and grading and drainage plans for their review and approval. These issues are addressed in Special Condition 1. The Owner is also advised that Ministry building/land use permits for all buildings within 46 meters (150 feet) of the Highway 403 property lines and 396 metres from the intersection of Highway 403 and Wilson Street will be required prior to any grading and construction of this site. Separate building/land use permits will be required for each storm water management pond serving this subdivision. Sign permits will be required as well. Lastly, a 14 metre setback for all permanent buildings and structures both above and below ground, utilities, frontage roads/fire routes, essential parking spaces, storm water management ponds and associated berms, and noise walls, is required from the limits of the MTO right-of-way. This requirement has been included as a modification to the Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone as shown in Appendix “D”.

Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board

A letter from the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board was received on February 21, 2007 stating that the separate elementary school site identified in the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan was no longer required. As a result, the site may be developed for residential purposes in accordance with the Secondary Plan policies.
Public Works Department – Operations and Maintenance Division, Forestry Section

The Forestry Section has reviewed the application and advised that there are no municipal trees on the subject lands. A Landscape Plan will be required as per the Street Tree Planting Policy as a condition of draft plan approval which will be addressed through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Public Works Department – Capital Planning and Implementation Division, Open Space Development and Park Planning Section

The need for a public park as per the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan has been identified. The Open Space Development and Park Planning Section has confirmed that a 1.82 hectare park is an appropriate size versus the 2.5 hectares as per the Secondary Plan.

They have also advised that 5% of the total land area is required for parkland dedication. Additional land will be required to form an appropriately sized park. The Capital Planning and Implementation Division, Open Space Development and Park Planning Section will bring forward an agreement to purchase 1.31 hectares (3.25 acres) of the subject land to make up the difference in area.

With respect to the location of the park, the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan states that the park should be located adjacent to the school site, however as the school site is no longer required, an alternative location has been agreed upon with the applicant.

Lastly, comments from the Open Space Development and Park Planning Section call for a 50mm water line, 200mm sanitary sewer, and 250mm storm sewer services to be extended to the property line of the park (Special Condition 14). As well, grading, streetscape and street tree planting and preservation plans must be prepared along with a Record of Site Condition (RSC) for all lands to be conveyed to the City of Hamilton for parks and open space purposes. These issues are addressed through Special Condition 15 and the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)

Comments from the Grand River Conservation Authority have requested a detailed stormwater management report and addendum to a previous report prepared by the applicant’s engineer. The Grand River Conservation Authority has also requested standard erosion and siltation control measures to be in place and follow-up of hydrogeological and groundwater studies as agreed to in the applicants’ letter to the GRCA dated January 22, 2007. These issues have been addressed in Special Condition 2. The GRCA has also recommended fencing be installed between all the rear lot lines and the ESA which has been addressed in Special Condition 8.
Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG)

As aforementioned through the policies affecting the proposal, specifically the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, all recommendations from ESAIEG have been addressed as discussed on Page 16 of the Report.

Bell Canada

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. This item has been addressed through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Public Consultation

In accordance with the Public Participation Policy that was approved by Council on May 29, 2003, the previous applications (OPA-06-07, ZAC-06-28, & 25T200606) were pre-circulated to 178 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands and a sign was posted on the site. A total of eighteen letters and e-mails were received (Appendix “F”). Concerns were raised with respect to traffic, the environmentally significant area, density, the 15 metre wide walkway, property values and construction impacts. These issues have been discussed in more detail in the Analysis/Rationale section of this report.

As well, the applicant hosted an open house on the 17th of January, 2007, for area residents to view the proposed plan of subdivision. Over 400 households were mailed notice of the open house. Also, City of Hamilton staff was in attendance.

As previously mentioned, additional land was acquired by the applicant and as a result, the 2006 applications were closed and recirculated under the current file numbers. As the revisions to the applications were considered minor and previous pre-consultation had taken place, it is the opinion of the Manager of Development Planning in consultation with the Ward Councillor, that an additional preliminary circulation of the application would have minimal purpose or benefit.

Notice of the Public Meeting will be given in accordance with the regulations 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
The public are involved in the definition and development of local solutions. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage are supported and enhanced.
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Environmental Well-Being is enhanced.  ☑ Yes  ☐ No  
Human health and safety are protected.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced.  ☑ Yes  ☐ No  
Investment in Hamilton is enhanced and supported.

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

:SD
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PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: ZAC-07-27/CPL-07-27/257200704
Date: June 7, 2007

Appendix “A”

Scale: N.T.S.
Planner/Technician: SD/LMM

Subject Property
260 Valbridge Drive

- Block 1 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A" Zone to Modified Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone.
- Block 2 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A" Zone to Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone.
- Blocks 3, 4 & 5 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A" Zone to Open Space (P4) Zone.
- Block 6 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A" Zone to Residential "R4-558" Exception Zone.

Ward 12 Key Map N.T.S.
Draft Amendment No. [redacted] to the
Official Plan of the Former Town of Ancaster

The following text together with Schedule “B” – Land Use – Urban Area and Map 1 – Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment No. [redacted].

Purpose:

The purpose of this Amendment is to redesignate and realign the subject lands from “Institutional (Separate Elementary School), Open Space and Conservation (Neighbourhood Park) and Residential (Low Density Residential 1) to Stormwater Management (SWM) Pond Area, Open Space and Conservation (Neighbourhood Park) and Residential (Low Density Residential 1) to permit 103 single detached residential dwellings. In addition, the Amendment removes a portion of walkway (open space linkage) adjacent to the Highway 403 corridor, reduces the right-of-way width for a local road, realigns the road pattern, and deletes the requirement for a 1.8 metre high berm.

Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are located at 280 Valridge Drive, at the northern intersection of Highway 403 and Wilson Street West, in Ancaster.

Basis:

The basis for permitting the proposed redesignation is as follows:

- The proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
- The proposed development is consistent with the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and the general intent of the Town of Ancaster Official Plan; and,
- The proposed development is compatible with the surrounding uses.

Actual Changes:

Text Changes:

1. Subsection 5.11.5 is hereby amended by deleting the words “2.5 hectares,” and replacing with the words “1.8 hectares and” and deleting the words “and a separate elementary school having a minimum lot area of 3.2 hectares,” so the policy reads:
“Within the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood a neighbourhood park of approximately 1.8 hectares and a public elementary school having a minimum lot area of 2.5 hectares shall be provided.”

2. Subsection 6.1.5.2 is hereby amended as follows:

a) amending clause (a) by deleting the words “and one separate elementary school have” and replacing with the word “has”;

b) deleting clause (d); and,

c) amending clause (g) by deleting the words “be adjacent to the park/open space system” and, so the policy reads:

“The elementary school shall have access to the pedestrian walkway system.”

3. Subsection 6.1.5.5 is hereby amended as follows:

a) amending clause (d) by deleting the third and fourth sentences of the policy, the words “A 1.8 m berm shall be established along the east side of the walkway to screen the Galley Road residences. Adjacent to the elementary school/neighbourhood park complex, fencing shall be installed on the east lot line of the walkway only.” and replacing with the words “A visual buffer in the form of a planting screen or fence shall be established along both sides of the walkway to screen adjacent residences.” so the policy reads:

“Adjacent to the east boundary of the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood where it abuts the existing residential uses along Galley Road, a 15 m open space walkway shall be provided. The walkway shall not be considered part of the 5% parkland dedication under the Planning Act. A visual buffer in the form of a planting screen or fence shall be established along both sides of the walkway to screen adjacent residences.”;

b) deleting clause (e) and;

c) amending clause (f) by deleting the words “centrally located,” and “and located adjacent to the public and separate elementary schools”, and replacing the words “2.5 hectares (6 acres)” with the words “1.8 hectares (4.5 acres)” so the policy reads:

“The neighbourhood park shall be 1.8 hectares (4.5 acres) in size.”; and,

d) deleting clause (g).
4. Subsection 6.1.8.4, Principal Local Roads and Local Roads Policies, is hereby amended by adding a new clause “(f)” as follows:

“(f) Notwithstanding the road right-of-way detailed in 6.1.8.4 (c), for lands located at 280 Valridge Drive, the rights-of-way for Local Roads shall generally be 18 metres (59 feet).”

Schedule Changes:

5. Schedule "B" – Land Use – Urban Area – is hereby amended by redesignating the subject lands from “Open Space and Conservation” to “Residential”, from “Institutional” to “Residential”, and from “Residential” to “Open Space and Conservation” as shown on the attached Schedule “A” of this Amendment.

6. Map "1" – Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – is hereby amended by redesignating lands from “Neighbourhood Park” to “Low Density Residential 1”, from “Separate Elementary School” to “Low Density Residential 1”, from “Separate Elementary School” to “Storm Water Management Pond Area”, from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Storm Water Management Pond Area”, from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Neighbourhood Park”, to delete a portion of the “Open Space Linkage” along Highway 403, and to delete and add a “Local Road”, as shown on the attached Schedule “B” of this Amendment.

Implementation:

A Zoning By-law amendment and Plan of Subdivision will give effect to the intended use on the subject lands.

This is Schedule "1" to By-law No., passed on the ___th day of____, 2007.

The City of Hamilton

____________________________________   ____________________________________
Clerk                                              Mayor
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW No. 87-57

To Amend Zoning By-law 87-57

Respecting the Property Located at 280 Valridge Drive (Ancaster)

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap.14, Sch. C. did incorporate, as of January 1st, 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 Town of Ancaster” and is the successor of 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 Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster) was enacted on the 22nd day of June 1987 and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on the 23rd day of January 1989;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section of Report of the Economic Development and Planning Committee at its meeting held on the day of , 2007, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Official Plan of the City of Hamilton (formerly the Official Plan for the Town of Ancaster) upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. proposed by the City of Hamilton, but not yet approved in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:
1. That Map 1 to Schedule “B” of Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing from the Agricultural “A” Zone to the Residential “R4-558” Exception Zone, for the lands comprised of Block “1”, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

2. Section 34: Exceptions of Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection:

“R4-558” That notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection 12.2 – Regulations of Section 12: Residential “R4” Zone of Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), the following special provision shall apply to the lands zoned “R4-558”:

Regulations:

Minimum Lot Area: 385m$^2$, except on a corner lot, the minimum lot area shall be 500m$^2$.

3. 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 ____, 2007.

__________________________________________  _________________________________
Fred Eisenberger                           Kevin C. Christenson
Mayor                                      City Clerk
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This is Schedule "A" to By-Law No. 07-
Passed the .............. day of ...................., 2007

Clerk

Mayor

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of By-Law No. 07-____

to Amend By-law No. 87-57

Subject Property
280 Valridge Drive

Block 1 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A" Zone to Residential "R4-558" Zone

Refer to By-Law No. 05-200
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW No. [Blank]

To Amend Zoning By-law 05-200,

280 Valridge Drive (Ancaster)

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton has in force several Zoning By-laws which apply to the different areas incorporated into the City by virtue of the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, S.O. 1999, Chap. 14;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the lawful successor to the former Municipalities identified in Section 1.7 of By-law 05-200;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to enact a new Zoning By-law to comprehensively deal with zoning throughout the City;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item 5 of Report 07- [Blank] (PED07189) of the Economic Development and Planning Committee at its meeting held on the [Blank] day of [Blank], 2007, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law is in conformity with:

- The Official Plan of the Town of Ancaster, as amended by Official Plan Amendment No. [Blank];

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

1. That Map 1332 of Schedule “A” to Zoning By-law 05-200, is amended by incorporating additional zone boundaries for the applicable lands, and that Map 1384 of Schedule “A” to Zoning By-law 05-200, is amended by incorporating additional zone boundaries for the applicable lands, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A” as follows:

   Block 1 – Lands to be zoned Neighbourhood Park "P1" Zone – Special Exception No. 9.
Block 2 – Lands to be zoned Conservation / Hazard Land "P5" Zone.

Block 3 – Lands to be zoned Open Space "P4" Zone.

Block 4 – Lands to be zoned Open Space "P4" Zone.

Block 5 – Lands to be zoned Open Space "P4" Zone.

2. That Schedule “C”, of By-law 05-200, be amended by adding an additional exception as follows:

   “9. Notwithstanding Section 7.1 of the By-law, within the lands zoned Neighbourhood Park “P1” Zone, identified on Maps 1332 and 1384 of Schedule “A”, and as described as the Neighbourhood Park within the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, a minimum yard of 14 metres abutting the Highway 403 right-of-way shall be required for buildings and structures both above and below ground, and within the required yard no utilities, roads, driveways, parking areas, storm water management facilities, berms, or noise walls shall be permitted.”

3. 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.

4. This By-law No. shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with subsection 34(21) of the Planning Act, either upon the date of passage of this By-law or as otherwise provided by the said subsection.

PASSED and ENACTED this day of 2007.

Fred Eisenberger
Mayor

Kevin C. Christenson
City Clerk

ZAC-07-27
This is Schedule "A" to By-Law No. 07-
Passed the .......... day of ...................., 2007

Clerk

Mayor

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of
By-Law No. 07-_____

to Amend By-law No. 05-200
(Maps 1332 & 1384)

Subject Property
280 Valridge Drive

Block 1 - Lands to be zoned Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone - Special Exception No. 9.

Block 2 - Lands to be zoned Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone.

Blocks 3, 4 & 5 - Lands to be zoned Open Space (P4) Zone.

Refer to By-Law No. 87-57
Good Morning Simon,

A bit of a horns nest you folks walked into last night. I still feel that it was a constructive gathering. As I inquired last night, I would like a printable version of the initial plan and the current plan from Humphries.

I would also like clarification about the 15m easement behind Galley Rd. You mentioned a 1.8m berm which Rosemarie explained would be located on the east side of the easement. This is a point of concern for myself and several of my neighbours as we have mature trees (20-30' spruce) which are approx. 1 m form the property line. Will these trees be accommodated in the planning and construction of the walkway? They will afford us a great deal of privacy from the proposed walkway.

After receiving and perusing the plans and your response to my question I will be submitting a second letter to add to your report to Planning and Economic Development Committee.

Regards David Alliston

Hello Simon:

My husband and I attended the recent open house held at the Ancaster Old Town Hall on January 17, 2007, regarding the new proposed subdivision off of Valridge Drive in Ancaster (just East of Tranquility Avenue).

We reside at 67 Tranquility Avenue. We would like to be formally recognized as being among those with significant concerns with regards to the proposal in question as it now stands.

We have always understood that this section of land would almost certainly be developed at some point, and have never had an inherent problem with the likelihood that development would occur. However, our concerns with respect to this specific proposal are similar to those expressed by others at the meeting.

Specifically, these are as follows:

1) The density of housing proposed is greater than necessary, and would be out of synch with development already existing in the surrounding neighbourhood. We see no reason why the development could not be scaled back somewhat so as to build fewer homes of a more high end nature on larger lots. This would minimize the impact of the increased traffic flows which must inevitably occur even in a best case scenario.

Ancaster as a whole is already experiencing significant difficulties with traffic, so it would only make sense that any further development only be allowed to proceed in a fashion that will not substantially exacerbate the problems that already exist.

2) Even more importantly, we don't feel that any development should be allowed to proceed unless and until both potential street accesses to the subdivision can be opened
up for full traffic. The negative impact on our street (Tranquility) and Valridge Drive would otherwise be very large. With no other exit but the one on Valridge, a substantial increase to traffic down our streets (particularly during rush hours) must certainly occur (especially given the density of housing as currently proposed).

Should these issues be addressed to a satisfactory extent in some amended proposal, it is unlikely that we would any longer have any material objections to this development per se.

Many thanks for your attention,

Marie Andrews
Ian Andrews

Hi Simon Can you please pass this on to Planning

In regards to the Valridge/Tranquility Ancaster proposed development I have the following comments.

1) Access, 1 entrance will just not work. In the summer time Tranquility is often down to 1 lane. Adding another 200 cars to this street will create gridlock. This is also a safety concern when it comes to access for emergency vehicles. Adding a second entrance would help greatly. I don't think that Galley Homes should hold our neighborhood hostage by blocking access from Seers Road. The City should expropriate this small section of land to allow 2 access's to the proposed subdivision. Galley needs Speers road as well to develop his property.

2) Power, We are at 218 Valridge Drive and we often have power outages. More than normal. Can Hydro One supply this new subdivision properly, when they seem to have problems looking after the area now.

3) Water, the water pressure in the area is very low. Are new water mains going to be installed or how will the City handle this?

Thanks

Simon:

I would appreciate a copy of the report and possibly information pertaining to the area specific to the easement labeled O2 that runs behind what is called Galley Rd.

This parcel is currently open to the field and is unmaintained and very overgrown. I am not 100% positive, but my recollection of some plans developed some time ago that were proposed in order to have certain other parcels approved showed this as being a continuous walkway connecting these communities. This plan as shown indicates this parcel as being a "dead-end".

Its current condition, as disheveled as it is, has been tolerated only because the final plans for the area have not been completed, however, if it were to remain a dead end as indicated this area will become an unmaintained, unkempt piece of land that will become an eyesore.
Please confirm for me that this easement/walkway was in fact part of an earlier proposal and that it has not fallen through the cracks of progress and that our city retains the level of scrutiny to maintain continuity through the ongoing development of plans through this process. Otherwise, please advise as to what will be done with this dead-end to keep it properly managed and maintained, given its otherwise predetermined, predictable future.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated, thank-you.

Regards,

Barry Kent

---

Dear Simon,

In reply to your letter, received yesterday, outlining the proposed changes to the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood. We are very alarmed at the proposal both from the safety issue of 123 homes feeding through this already busy survey and the elimination of family services i.e. school and park in a community made up largely of young families.

Valridge and Tranquility are heavily travelled at present. Both are curving streets, with vehicles parking on them, necessitating drivers being extremely vigilant in order to weave through the area. It has just been necessary to eliminate some of the soccer night parking at the Meadowbrook/Tranquility intersection, as it is an accident waiting to happen there as people attempt to enter and leave the survey. 123 new homes will add incredible stress to the infrastructure as neither Valridge or Tranquility are wide roads hence not meant to carry this increased volume of traffic. It is dangerous to have that number of homes with only one exit when the Speers/Galley Road access would give these homes easier access to Wilson and easier for emergency vehicles to enter the survey.

Yours truly,

Bob & Andrea Wolgemuth

---

Mr. Simon M. Deiaco:

Further to your notice of July 21, 2006, regarding comments on the official plan amendment for the above noted property, and our telephone message requesting additional information (which was not returned and/or information was not provided) we have the following comments:

Although we did not receive the detailed plan, as requested, we note that it appears that the storm water management facility is not being placed in the location as per the official plan. The current official plan notes that the storm water management facility should be located in the area immediately to the west centre of the subject property in the adjacent property. Does changing this location require an official plan amendment since the severed lands may not be ESA?
According to the severance application, the land to the west was to be surveyed to determine if the line for the ESA lands was properly determined. Although the OMB appeal did not discuss this, the severance was to stand as per the Committee recommendations and therefore, our understanding was that it was to contain the condition as set out by the committee that the city resurvey the land and determine the proper line for the ESA lands. We note that the property immediately to the south west of the property is NOT ESA lands and is simply a pile of fill left behind during the 403 construction. Any plan of subdivision should take into account that the property severed off as ESA lands could be resurveyed and redesigned as usable lands and (approximately 3 acres of land) may be made available for future development. The city should insure that the piece is not landlocked by the development and/or not allow the removal of the walkway adjacent to the 403 as this provides access to the potential usable land. Also the MTO will not allow the sound wall banking on their property, therefore allowances should be made for the banking of the sound wall along the 403 as well as the walkway along the 403 which will require additional land along the south side of the property.

The official plan also allows the City first right of refusal to turn the school block into a park (Section 6.1.5.2(ii)). Has the City determined its course of actions with respect to the school block? If the school block is removed the next step is for the city to determine if they are going to purchase the land.

It should be noted that Union Gas will require a 5 meter easement (by about 30 meters) along the north part of the property near the nursing home. They had requested the easement previously but were turned down by the MTO due to negotiations with our company over the entrance on Speers Road. This easement is on the land proposed for the park.

The official plan (section 6.1.8.4) requires that Valridge be joined to Speers (Principal road). Therefore, we do not feel that the road width should be reduced to 18M from 20M as it is considered a principal road and required for access at full width. The reduced road size would also reduce on street parking and with the proposed houses being only 40 feet wide they will likely have some single car garages they may require on street parking which would be limited by the narrow road.

With respect to the removal of the park, we feel that a park (possibly slightly smaller) should be included in the survey since no park was included in the adjacent surveys - Meadowbrook Manors or Foxwood. The nearest community parks are the small park on Meadowbrook Drive at Speers (which is at capacity for the existing survey Meadowbrook Manors) and the community centre at Jerseyville Road (which services the Ancaster community as well as the Meadowbrook Manors and Foxwood subdivisions). The Ancaster High grounds are not a park but private school property. Regardless, the design of the roads in the subdivision will make the closest and most convenient park, for this subdivision, the Speers at Meadowbrook Park, which as indicated is already at capacity for the area (the road system as proposed will leave an exit at Valridge and Speers and therefore, the nearest park will be Speers and Meadowbrook which is not sized for the new subdivision). The Valridge exit will leave residents a long walk to any park while the Speers exit will leave them only a few hundred feet from this relatively small park.
Finally, servicing of the property will likely require access through the property owned by
Imperial Belgal (south east side). As indicated above the official plan requires that
Valridge be joined to Speers (Principal road). To date no agreement is in place or
proposed for access over this land (our company owns this land and is not in a position
to sell it). Although the sewers are already through the property they will require access
for water, electrical, bell ,cable etc. There is also an amount owing to Fracarsan
Corporation (another of our companies) once the connection is made to the sewers in
the property (this amount has not been calculated by the City to date).

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the writer.

CARL GALLI

Dear Mr. Deiaco,

Thank you for your letter informing of us the proposed changes for the neighbourhood of
the Valridge/Meadowbrook corridor.

I would like to inform you and council of my lack of support and concern to the
amendment as quoted in OPA-06-28, ZAC-06-28 and 25T200606.

My greatest concerns are as follows:

1. Density of the proposed development set at 123 homes.

2. Traffic flow along Tranquility Ave to Meadowbrook Drive, and exit onto Wilson.

3. Further congestion onto Valridge Drive spilling over to Tranquility & Mowat Drive.

In purchasing my home on Valridge Drive 3 years ago, I had checked out this location
based on access to the highway.

(Previously I lived at Upper Paradise and Mohawk, and would take the link to the
highway exit). Upon the expressway being added, traffic flow at the Mohawk
exit....declined and would cause significant delays to my morning commute.

Initially moving out to Valridge Drive, these problems ceased, I could leave at a
reasonable time and get to work fairly quickly.

Once the Town Villas, went in at the top of Tranquility and Weslyan Crt, traffic along
Tranquility/Meadowbrook began to slow down and cause bottlenecking from the stop
signs along Meadowbrook all the way to the Traffic Circle at Wilson.

With a proposed additional 123 homes in this area, the only traffic exits for these homes
will either come from Valridge/Tranquility area or along Speers Drive of which all spill
onto Meadowbrook.

With an average of 2 cars per household, that is an additional 246 Cars, trying to exit
this area down Meadowbrook for highway access or to get on Wilson.
Further housing developments along Wilson, Westveiw, and Shaver, will only add to further congestion along Wilson. This is already showing up, and these above mentioned developments are yet to be completed in full.

I do not wish for this area to turn into "the Meadowlands"...of which is far too dense and has problems with traffic all along Golf Links.

The "village" of Ancaster is also beginning to clog with congestion in the areas of Wilson and Fiddlers Green.

So while, I am all for development, this is not the right area for such a large project when traffic/congestion problems are already showing up.

My support as a resident, goes to this area either being designated to Park land, for the kids in the neighbourhood and the seniors at (Tranquility Place) OR at worst case, a smaller development of which consists of 80 or less single detached homes on lot sizes no smaller than 45ft to 50ft with an additional traffic circle placed at Tranquility Ave and Valridge Dr.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely
DAVID WALLIS

Hello,

We are NOT in agreement to proposed changes to the "Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan".

We have been maintaining the property directly behind our home since we moved in July 1989. (17 years)
We have cut the lawn added trees (at considerable expense) etc.

File # OPA-06-07, ZAC-06-28 25T200606

Attention: Simon M. Deiaco

Dear Sir

We are responding to your recent letter regarding the proposed changes to the subdivision plan at 280 Valridge Drive, Ancaster. We purchased our property on Valridge Drive 1 year ago, after searching for a quiet, residential neighbourhood. We invested a lot of time & energy in investigating & reviewing the zoning and future plans for the lots at the end of our street with the City of Hamilton. As such, we are now extremely distressed to receive your correspondence in the above noted matter which is now requesting significant amendments to the plans that we based on decision on. We absolutely object to the elimination of the walkway adjacent to the Highway 403 corridor and to the reduced roadway size, and to the number of lots that are proposed for the
area. Adding to our considerable distress over this issue is the fact that, unbelievably, it would appear that this new sub-division proposes to use Valridge Drive as the **ONLY** access in and out of this new site. The ensuing traffic that this would bring onto our quiet street would turn Valridge Drive into an extremely busy throughway. Valridge Drive was not intended to be a major access for some 492 additional vehicle travels per day at minimum! Furthermore, we cannot understand how the school site and park, which are essential to our children and our community, can simply be eliminated from the plans in order to accommodate a builder who has only their own interests at heart and who simply wants to create as many lots as possible so they can increase their profits. We would like to be informed of any upcoming meetings regarding this matter and to be provided with information on how we may proceed to object or appeal these proposed changes.

Regards
Elio and Heather Di Sabatino

---

Dear Sir:

We are currently residents at 14 Galley Rd, Ancaster, ON, which is directly adjacent to the proposed subdivision. We have just recently purchased this home in the past year on the assumption the neighborhood would remain undisturbed.

This email is to voice our concerns with the proposed development of a subdivision. Our primary concerns are noise pollution, dust and debris from the construction site, increased traffic on residential roads, loss of privacy and a decrease in our property value.

We appreciate the opportunity to voice our concerns and are prepared to be involved in future meetings and processes.

Sincerely,
Grace Kim and Brian Yu

---

Mr. Simon M. Deiaco

**Subject: File Nos. OPA-06-07, ZAC–06-28, and 25T200606**

Dear Mr. Deiaco,

I am writing to you in response to a letter I received from your department regarding the above file Nos. I appreciate the opportunity to express my opinions in this matter.

It is not my intentions to oppose the redevelopment of the property in this matter, but rather my question falls with the fact that there appears to be only one entrance (off of Valridge Drive) to this new subdivision. With a neighborhood that is mainly comprised of families with young children, it gives me great concern to think of what the impact might be of the increased traffic volume entering into a 123 home survey via one access. It
only seems logical to me that there should be a secondary access via Speers Road to help spread the traffic flow out.

I would welcome any of your comments or further information regarding this issue.

Regards,

Mark Cunningham

August 9, 2006

Simon M. Deiaco
City Of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Department, Development & Real Estate Division
City Hall, 71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5
File #OPA-06-07, ZAC-06-28 and 25T200606

I am opposed to this plan of Development because of the lack of vehicular access and high traffic congestion it will cause on already congested streets. The high density of the project and the loss of a park site, school site and walkway for people are also a concern to us. Safety and Environment should be addressed before Urban Sprawl engulfs us all.

Dwight & Elizabeth Rose

This memo is to inform the Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department that both my wife and I do not support the application for amendment to the Meadowbrook West Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

We do not support any reduction of roadway for the local road, the elimination of a park site nor the elimination of a school site. We also do not support any elimination of the walkway adjacent to the Highway 403 corridor.

While we support future development plans it should not be to the detriment of the existing and future children and residents in the neighbourhood. The proposal would create a situation of increasing the residential population without balancing the need for park lands for the children. This proposal further contributes to existing pressures of over crowding in schools.

This amendment requires both the future residents of the subdivision in addition to existing residents in the surrounding neighbourhood to cope with the resulting issues caused by fewer parks and over crowding of schools. We see this proposal having a detrimental impact to our quality of life. Given the significant taxes paid to the City by residents within this neighbourhood we do not support any proposal to lower the quality of life currently enjoyed in our area.

RICHARD AND KIM MORRISON
Hi, Simon M. Deiaco

As you can see I am a real estate sales person at Coldwell, but also the sales person for Galli Homes in Ancaster. I along with my partner sold all the single family homes in phase 3 for Galli Homes. These homes abut and lead into the said proposed subject property for re-zoning.

If history serves me correct, the current agreed upon zoning was determined in the past at an O.M.B. hearing. One that specifically does not permit townhomes on subject property. That is why we see from phase 2 all the townhomes that were build there. Now is the time to disclose in your preliminary circulation a true understanding of what is meant by (1) block for future development.

Since, many people know me from purchasing there homes from me they have knocked at my door or have phoned me to discuss their concerns and fears about this re-zoning proposal. These are some of the main concerns.

1. The lost of more parkland, a park that was a part of the original plan for this site.

2. The number of proposed homes creating to high a density for the amount of land, therefore the (1) block for stormwater management purposes is going to be too small to meet requirements. The more density the less amount of exposed land to absorb rain water leading to a higher potential for flooding in the surrounding neighbourhood.

3. To reduce local roadway to 18 metres will increase a risk to local children who play games on the road since you want to eliminate the park. Also this phase must follow parameters set out for "ALL" previous phases so road sizes don't vary, side walks must be provided on at least one side of the road. (This to meet previous requirements ie. lot coverage for home to be build)

4. The elimination of the walkway to the 403 corridor, is simple, don't do it. If you are ever in the area you will see people using this corridor for jogging, walking etc. Health Canada is encouraging all of us to get fit, so please look at this corridor and just don't dismiss it's need to the community at large.

5. Most disturbing issue to all home owners in the area is access to this land and the lack of it. The smartest entrance to this land is Speers Road. This entrance issue must be addressed before any re-zoning is considered.

Fears are trucks traveling down Meadowbrook Dr. onto Tranquility Ave. To Valridge Dr. thus creating the greatest amount of disturbance to a much greater number of families then otherwise need be.

There would be a need for a road maintenance schedule, a time restriction for heavy trucks pending on seasonal factors.

This issue is very, very disturbing, more so than the current situation with Landmart Homes in The Meadowlands. A secondary access is of the highest concern and fear. With out this issue being addressed prior, nothing should proceed. How can anyone move on without knowing the consequences these proceedings will have on our community.
Thank You! I will be waiting for your response to forward to all concerned.

Roman Radojewski

-------------------

Simon

Thanks for your prompt reply. Just to fill you in on some background; when the neighbourhood was built between 16 and 18 years ago, many of the earlier occupants were led to believe that the area behind would not be developed because of the gas line in the field. When I moved in, I checked with the City and was told that it was years away (they were correct) and that it would most likely be developed into a survey of houses that would be of similar size to those on Galley Rd. The existing plan (school, park and walkway) was accepted by a minority (those at one end of the street with the park behind them) and opposed by the people at my end of the street (with the school). At the time, I canvassed the street in order to find this out. The results were presented to the Town and completely ignored. The Consultant actually stated in the public meeting that only one person objected to the new plan. When I confronted him in the Meeting with the fact that my petition contained the names of over half the homeowners, he admitted that this was true. Since then, about 20 to 25% of the homeowners of that era have moved away. Thus there is no way of knowing the existing consensus – obviously that is what the open house is for.

While this is still in the early planning phases, I would suggest that the current homeowners would still be happy to accept the altered plan if the homes backing on our properties were of similar lot sizes. At this point, I can't speak for anybody but myself, but most of the people at my end of the street are still here from the time that I last canvassed. I am not familiar with Westvit Estates, but it appears that they will receive a substantial benefit by changing the plan. More power to them however I would suggest that they get Galley involvement sooner that later.

Regards,

Ron

-------------------

To Rosemarie and Simon:

I attended the Open House in Ancaster on Wednesday, Jan. 17th which dealt with the proposed subdivision off Valridge Dr. I share many of the concerns that were expressed at that meeting.

One full access is not enough to safely service 96 homes. In addition, the increased traffic will cause problems on Tranquility which is especially congested in the summer when there is soccer practice. Ideally, Speers Rd. should be opened up to become another full access.
I am also disappointed with the small size of the lots. Many of the adjoining streets have significantly larger lots, so why should the lots in the new subdivision be so much smaller?

As one gentleman suggested, instead of using the minimum measurement of 12m for Low Density housing couldn't you use the maximum measurement? This would increase lot size, decrease the number of houses and reduce the traffic flow.

Finally, I hope that you are following up with a request for a traffic study in this neighbourhood and that someone is looking into the low water pressure problem.

I trust that my concerns will go into Simon's report for the city as he promised at the Open House.

Thanks,
Petra Douma

Below are my comments in regards to the proposed development.

1. Road allowance of 18 metres

Unsure what this is talking about. If it refers to the width of the entry road (Speers Road), it should be kept the width it is now. From the map, it looks like it is going to get reduced, does not look appropriate. It would be a main entrance roadway into the proposed subdivision. The width of this road and how it affects the homes right beside them must be considered.

2. Lots

Lots should be a similar size as to neighbouring subdivisions. Lot allowances should be normal and not reduced to a zero lot line. On Galley Road, homes built on the lots had to have a 5 foot allowance on each side.

3. Map does not show where the stormwater block and future development block would be.

Please forward a copy of the staff report to me at:

Vince Chiarelli

Hello Simon,

Thanks you for giving me this opportunity to state my concerns with the development proposal off of Valridge & Tranquility Ave. in Ancaster. I think you will find that most of my comments are echoed by others in the neighbourhood.

My first and largest point of concern has to do with the development having only one entrance from Valridge. This will increase an already dangerous traffic situation down
the Meadowbrook and Tranquility arteries. In the winter time, this section of road is busy at the best of times with a large high school, community center and senior citizens home creating extra traffic. However, once you start to enter the spring and summer times, when all the activities in the area start (ie/soccer, baseball, road races etc...) these roads literally become a nightmare. My girlfriend and I have lived in this house for almost 2 years now and I am shocked that nobody has been injured during this time of year. Coming home from work during these months you have to deal with the higher traffic volume with cars of commuters and activities participants added together AND you have to deal with a ridiculous number of pedestrians as parents shuffle their kids across the street to get to the fields at and across from Ancaster High AND you used to also have to deal with a ton of parked cars on the streets for these activities. I'm sure that the city has already noticed this area of concern as no parking signs have recently been installed on our street to try and relieve some of the congestion. Now to compound the problem, the subdivision proposal plans to add almost 100 homes which have to travel down this very corridor, and only this corridor, to gain access to their homes. This will mean close to 200 cars added to these roads approximately twice a day!!

I understand that these lands will be developed eventually. I understand that homes will be built back there. However, I am just questioning the logic at work here when we discuss certain aspects of this development proposal. First and foremost, to conclude the debate about this one entrance situation; one can clearly see on the development map clearly shows a possible second entrance from Speers Rd. However, a part of this land is apparently owned by a disgruntled developer who will not sell the 8-10 feet required for the road because he lost the bid for this other parcel of land which he wanted to develop. Is the City of Hamilton seriously considering jeopardizing the safety of countless people simply because we are a few feet short or some developers ego is out of joint. Can't a compromise be worked out?? Now, if the answer to this question is "no," then lets look at another option.

The proposal clearly shows almost 100 lots the majority of which are all smaller than this existing Ancaster West neighbourhood. Another good adjustment to the proposal, whether or not a second entrance can be worked out, would be to make the lot sizes more appropriate for the neighbourhood. Most of the lots in this area of 50 and 50+ foot lots. If this proposal adjusted the lot sizes to tie in with the neighbourhood better, not only would it be better suited to the neighbourhood but it would also address some of the traffic concerns as there would be fewer homes, thus fewer added cars. Doesn't this make sense?? As stated earlier, I am not opposed to development on this parcel of land. I understand homes will be built there, but I am just looking for a more logical approach here.

I just wanted to finish by saying that some of the items in the site proposal are fantastic. Keeping a large area for a park and conservation land are terrific ideas and they further strengthen what is already a great attraction to living in the area. Also, the buffer zone between the homes on Galley Rd. and the new homes that are being proposed is also a great idea. I'm sure the city needs this strip of land for a gas line or some other utility, but the proposal to develop it slightly as park land with a nice walkway is terrific. I know some neighbours will be concerned that teenagers will congregate and cause trouble along the path but this should not be a reason to eliminate this area. A beautiful gravel or wood-chip path lined with trees and grass would be a great addition to the neighbourhood especially if it can connect and run through the other park and conservation lands which are being proposed.
Thank you for taking the time to look at my comments and concerns. Hopefully this development can go ahead with some of the above adjustments in order to make it a better fit and a smoother transition for the people already living in the neighbourhood.

Your's truly

Paul Felix & Lisa Beckerson

Hello Simon,

I apologize for not having sent this message sooner following the community meeting held at Ancaster Old Town Hall.

My comments concerning the planned development of 102 homes in the property between Valridge/Tranquility and Wilson St are as follows;

1. The lot sizes displayed are not consistent with the neighbourhood. Regardless of the minimums allowed under the various rules, minimums do not have to be observed. The neighbourhood should be kept consistent and this would indicate lot widths of 18 to 20 metres.
2. The proposal to use Valridge as the only access road to service 100+ homes is not acceptable. With most homes having at least 2 cars and some with up to 4 adding several hundred vehicle trips per day to these roads. This is simply too much traffic onto narrow winding residential streets. Tranquility is already difficult to drive down when the soccer fields are being used, (every evening Spring to Fall) even with the new restricted parking.
3. No consideration has been given to deal with the traffic volume already being carried on Meadowbrook. I have personally experienced up to 12 cars lined up behind multiple school buses on Meadowbrook. This is a busy street and while the Wilson St traffic circle works well, waiting periods from Meadowbrook are growing as the volume on Wilson increases. The Wilson St drivers do not give way to cars entering from Meadowbrook.
4. A full set engineering and traffic capacity study needs to be completed for these roads to determine the design capacity and actual capacity prior to any further development.
5. Water pressure continues to be a problem and more homes will only make this worse.

Thank you for recording my comments and please include me on the notification of any future public meetings relative to the development.

Phil Sherriff
Special Conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval for “Westvit Estates”

(1) That prior to final approval, the Owner shall submit to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Transportation for their review and approval a detailed storm water management report and grading and drainage plans indicating the intended treatment of the calculated runoff and its impacts on the Highway 403 right-of-way.

(2) That prior to any grading or construction on the site and prior to registration of the plan, the Owner or their agents submit the following to the satisfaction of the Grand River Conservation Authority.


   b) An updated hydrogeological investigations and groundwater studies as per the applicant’s letter dated January 22, 2007 (Weslake Inc.).

(3) That the Owner conducts a spring/early summer botanical inventory to be presented to the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) as per their January 18, 2007 recommendation.

(4) That the Owner shall operate and maintain, in an acceptable manner, the storm water management facility throughout the construction of all stages of draft plan registration or until a time as established by the Director of Development Engineering and monitor such operation and effects thereof; and submit an operation and maintenance manual at the time of assumption of the SWM facility by the City.

(5) That the Owner agrees to assume full responsibility for the cost to construct, operate and maintain the storm water management facility including any changes to conditions of the MOE’s Approval until such time that the Storm Water Management Facility is assumed by the City to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

(6) That the Owner agrees to submit a detailed Storm Water Management report. Sufficient back-up information will be required to verify that the area designated for the SWM facility will accommodate the proposed facility designed in accordance with current / applicable Storm Water Management Guidelines to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering and all other appropriate agencies.
(7) That the Owner agree in writing to install a minimum 1.5 metre high chain link fence along the side lot lines of Lots 38 and 80 which lot lines abut City parklands to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering, such fencing shall be installed prior to the issuance of building permits for sold lots.

(8) That the Owner agree in writing to install a minimum 1.5 metre high chain link fence along the rear and side lot lines of lots abutting a public walkway block, and bollard where a walkway intersects with a road. Notwithstanding, a privacy fence may be substituted as provided in Condition No. 17 to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

(9) That the Owner agree in writing to install a minimum 1.5 metre high chain link fence along the rear lot lines which rear lot lines abut the storm water management pond; and along the side lot line which abuts the storm water management pond to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

(10) That the final plan of subdivision not be registered until sanitary sewers, watermains and road access are available to service the lands of the draft plan or alternatively, the Owner acquire the necessary land or easements and pay the full cost, less over-sizing, to construct sanitary sewers, watermains and road access to service the lands of the draft plan City to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

(11) That Street “A” aligns centreline to centreline with Valridge Drive, and the Speers Road extension aligns centreline to centreline with Speers Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

(12) That the Owner removes the existing cul-de-sac, at the sole expense of the Owner, on Valridge Drive and re-instates the road and boulevards to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

(13) That the City of Hamilton lands located directly west of Block 108 shall be graded and seeded to the satisfaction of the Director of Capital Planning and Implementation, the Director of Operations and Maintenance, and the Director of Planning.

(14) That the Owner locates a 50mm water service, 200mm sanitary sewer service, and 250mm storm sewer service extended to the property line of the park to the satisfaction of the Director of Capital Planning and Implementation.
(15) That the Owner agrees to grade and seed the park block to the satisfaction of the Director of Capital Planning and Implementation, and the Director of Operations and Maintenance.

(16) That the Owner shall design and construct a recreational trail through Blocks 104 & 105 (15.0m wide walkway) for the length of the Owner's property and Block 106 to the satisfaction of the Director of Capital Planning and Implementation, Public Works. The design and tender drawings shall include a cost estimate for the works, and it shall be prepared by a full member with seal, in good standing, of the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects (OALA), and be approved by the Director of Capital Planning and Implementation, Public Works. Design drawings and estimates will include grading plans, layout and construction details as required. The trail through Blocks 104 and 105 shall be 4.0 metres wide and paved, as per Public Works standards, with a maximum slope of 8% located approximately in the middle of the corridor, where grades and slopes permit. The owner shall arrange, and negotiate, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Development Engineering, any required agreement with the pipeline companies, on behalf of the City of Hamilton. The trail through Block 106 shall be 2.0m wide on Granular 'D', as per Public Works standards, with a maximum slope of 8% located approximately in the middle of the corridor, where grades and slopes permit. These recreational trails shall be shown on the Land Use Plan of Subdivision.

(17) That the Owner installs a minimum 1.5 metre high privacy fence or landscaping in lieu, along the east and west sides of Blocks 104 and 105 to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.