SUBJECT: Applications for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision and Change in Zoning by Sulphur Springs Development Corp. (D. Carnicelli) for Lands Located at Ryckman’s Corners - 80 Springside Drive (Hamilton) (PED06131) (Ward 7)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That approval be given to Amended Subdivision Application 25T200515, “Ryckman’s Corners”, Sulphur Springs Development Corp. (D. Carnicelli), owner, to establish a draft plan of subdivision, comprising eighteen lots for single-detached dwellings and a new cul-de-sac, as shown on Appendix “C” to Report PED06131, subject to the execution of a City standard form Subdivision Agreement, including the conditions contained in Appendix “D” to Report PED06131 and the following:

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

(ii) That payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required, pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act, prior to the issuance of each building permit for the lots within the draft plan. The payment will be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of issuance of the building permit;

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

(b) That approval be given to Amended Zoning Application ZAC-05-70, Sulphur Springs Development Corp. (D. Carnicelli), owner, to change the zoning from the “B” (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified, to permit the development of eighteen single detached dwellings on separate lots, on lands located at 80
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Springside Drive (Hamilton), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED06131, on the following basis:

(i) That the subject lands be rezoned from the “B” (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified.

(ii) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED06131, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(iii) That the proposed change in zoning is in conformity with the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and the Hamilton Official Plan.

(iv) That upon finalization of the implementing By-law, the Allison Neighbourhood Plan be amended by re-designating the subject lands from “Civic and Institutional” to “Single and Double Residential”.

Lee Ann Coveyduck
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of the applications is for approval of a draft plan of subdivision and a change in zoning to permit the development of the subject lands for eighteen lots for single detached dwellings.

The proposal has merit and can be supported since the draft plan of subdivision and change in zoning are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and implement the intent of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and the Hamilton Official Plan. The proposal is compatible with surrounding residential uses, and is an appropriate infill development that will make efficient use of existing services.

BACKGROUND:

Proposal

The purpose of the applications is for approval of a draft plan of subdivision and a change in zoning to permit the development of the lands located at 80 Springside Drive, for eighteen lots for single detached dwellings and a new cul-de-sac (Appendices “A”)
and “C”). The proposed arrangement of the lots would create a cul-de-sac of eleven lots accessed from Springside Drive fronting a new cul-de-sac, while the remaining seven lots would front onto Seneca Avenue. The frontages of the lots situated within Court A range from 12.00 to 16.33 metres, and have lot areas ranging from 400 sq.m. to 695 sq.m. The lots fronting Seneca Avenue have lot frontages ranging from 13.82 to 14.19 metres, and lot areas ranging from 442 sq.m. to 553 sq.m.

The amended subdivision includes modifications suggested by staff in order to establish varied setbacks to those properties fronting Seneca Avenue (by increasing lot depths), and to increase the required side yard setbacks for those units flanking Springside Drive by widening those lots (Lots 1 and 11).

In order to implement the proposed draft plan of subdivision, the applicant has applied to change the zoning of the subject lands from the “B” (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District to “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified.

The standard “C” District requires a minimum 6.0 metre front yard setback. The proposed staggered setbacks along Seneca Avenue require a modification to this minimum setback distance. To create the varied setbacks the modification would consist of applying a minimum setback of 6 metres for Lots 14, 15 and 16, a minimum setback of 8 metres for Lots 13 and 17, and a minimum setback of 11.5 metres for Lots 12 and 18, respectively (see Appendix “C”). A modification has also been applied to Lots 1 and 11 flanking Springside Drive by increasing the minimum side yard setback from 1.2 metres to 4.2 metres in order to increase compatibility with the “B” zoned adjacent lots. The placement of any buildings or accessory structures, including fencing, within 4.2m of Springside Drive, would be prohibited.

Staff has evaluated these modifications, which are discussed in the Analysis/Rationale Section of this report.

**Owner/Applicant:** Sulphur Springs Development Corp. (D. Carnicelli)

**Agent:** Urbex Engineering Limited, c/o Angelo Cameracci

**Location:** Lands located on the east side of Seneca Avenue, west of Springside Drive and South of Rymal Road West

**Description:**
- Frontage: 94.4 metres (Springside Drive)
- Depth: 106.70 metres
- Area: 1.023 ha
EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Lands</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School (to be demolished)</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>Single Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot; (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

1. The proposal has merit and can be supported for the following reasons:
   
   i) The proposed draft plan of subdivision and change in zoning is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and the Hamilton Official Plan.

   ii) The proposal is generally consistent with the type and form of residential development in the surrounding neighbourhood.

   iii) The proposal is an appropriate infill development that will make use of existing and adequate services presently available to the site.

2. The recommended zoning permits only single detached dwellings and accessory uses. Eighteen single detached dwellings and a new cul-de-sac are proposed. The built form is the same as permitted by the surrounding "B" District and the resulting density, although higher, is considered compatible with the surrounding area and conforms with the existing land-use polices in effect (see Page 6 - Density & Streetscape Character for further analysis). Modifications to the "C"
District would be required in order to achieve the proposed staggered setbacks, suggested by staff, to those units fronting Seneca Avenue. Modifications will also be required to ensure increased side yard setback requirements are incorporated for those lots flanking Springside Drive. These modifications are detailed in the amending By-law (see Appendix “B”) and are evaluated in greater detail in the following section relating to Density & Streetscape Character (Page 6).

3. The Development Engineering Section reviewed the servicing report submitted by the developer and note that there are external municipal watermains and separate storm and sanitary sewers available to service the subject lands. There will be no City share for the cost of installation of any municipal services. The owner will be required to demolish the existing structure on site and provide engineered fill within the future road allowance.

While staff is in general agreement with the conclusions of the servicing report, a detailed report is required prior to final subdivision approval to confirm the adequacy of the proposed storm outlet for the minor and major system, and to demonstrate that the resulting runoff will not negatively impact the downstream properties. This matter has been recommended as Special Draft Plan Condition (xiv) of Appendix “D”. In addition, the owner must agree that the subdivision is subject to capacity being available in the City of Hamilton Storm Water Management Facility to which the subject lands drain. Should capacity not be available at the engineering approval stage of the development, the owner, at its cost, will provide storm water control and will be responsible for maintaining this, as recommended in Special Draft Plan Condition (xi) of Appendix “D”.

4. The application was reviewed by the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority (HRCA) who noted that development will require an increase in the amount of impervious area currently on the site. As such, the Authority will require storm water quality and quantity controls to be implemented, as per Ministry of Environment guidelines. These requirements have been recommended as HRCA Standard Conditions (1) and (2), and Special Draft Plan Condition (xvii) of Appendix “D”.

5. A community meeting was held on November 1, 2005, by the Ward Councillor, with the applicant and staff in attendance.

Twenty-nine letters and two petitions of 96 and 121 signatures, respectively, were received in response to the preliminary notice of circulation letter (attached as Appendix “E”). Numerous concerns were raised in the letters and at the meeting, including the following: compatibility with existing neighbourhood; traffic/safety; noise; drainage, and loss of trees/open space/greenspace. An analysis of these issues is provided in the following section of this report.
Density & Streetscape Character

The main concern raised by residents, is that the rezoning of the subject lands to the “C” District would establish an unsuitable precedent for the area, one that would result in a pattern and density of development that would be incongruous with the present neighbourhood and would serve to erode the existing character of the area.

The subject lands are currently located within a “B” District, and are surrounded by residential properties. The rezoning of the subject lands to a “C” District would, in terms of zoning regulations for single detached dwellings, permit the minimum front yard setback of 12 metres (under the existing “B” District) to be reduced to 6 metres (under the proposed “C” District), reduce the minimum side yard setback from 3 metres to 1.2 metres, and the minimum rear yard setback from 9 metres to 7.5 metres.

With regard to the intensity of development, each lot would be required to have a width of at least 12 metres instead of the 20 metres required under the existing zoning, and an area of at least 360 square metres instead of the existing 1,100 square metres minimum.

The different zoning regulations between the “B” and “C” Districts (as summarized in Table 1.1) has resulted in local residents raising concerns over the potential impacts of new development upon both the character and density of the surrounding area.

With regard to the character of the area, staff is aware that the rezoning would permit the creation of smaller residential lots in an area characterised by large, wide residential lots. However, it is the opinion of planning staff that the proposed layout of the subdivision is such that any potential impact upon the character of the area is sufficiently mitigated.
Firstly, those lots accessed from Springside Drive would be fronting a new cul-de-sac. Consequently, the reduced frontages on these lots would not be viewed in the context of the building streetscape along existing Springside Drive in particular or the surrounding area in general. Instead, it would be assessed on their individual merit as forming part of a new cul-de-sac. The main impact upon the character of Springside Drive would be from Lots 1 and 11 (see Appendix “C”) which are sited immediately adjacent to Springside Drive. Staff has therefore recommended that the “C” District be amended to increase the minimum side yard requirement for Lots 1 and 11 from the standard 1.2 metres (under the proposed “C” District) to 4.2 metres. This is considered adequate to mitigate the building line of the proposed units from appearing conspicuous with regard to the existing established building line of Springside Drive.

Furthermore, staff considers that with buildings and accessory structures (including fencing) being restricted from locating within 4.2 metres of Springside Drive, the relationship of these lots with Springside Drive and the area in general would be acceptable, and would not detrimentally affect the character of the neighbourhood. This restriction is recommended in the amending By-law (see Appendix “B”).

Secondly, the front yard setbacks of the lots fronting onto Seneca Avenue have, following staff advice, been staggered. It is considered that these modifications as detailed in Table 1.1 and the amending By-law (see Appendix “B”), would mitigate the perception of narrow, overdeveloped lots with dwellings too close to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Existing “B” District</th>
<th>Proposed “C” District, Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (Min.)</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>6, 8 and 11.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (Min.)</td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>1.2 and 4.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (Min.)</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>7.5m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width (Min.)</th>
<th>Lot Area (Min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20m</td>
<td>1,100 sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Hamilton Zoning By-law 6593 – Zoning Regulations
the street, and create a streetscape that successfully harmonizes with the surrounding area.

Several of the letters of objection also raised the concern that the proposed new zoning would permit two storey dwellings that would be out of character with the existing scale and massing of dwellings in the area. Staff notes that the zoning provisions regarding height of dwellings would remain the same under either zoning District.

On the issue of densities, staff notes that while the permitted density of the subject land would increase from the “B” District, it is considered that the entire proposal maintains a low residential density that is compatible with the adjacent neighbourhood. The proposal is reflective of the density policies of the Hamilton Official Plan, which states (Policy C.7.7.3):

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

(v) Encourage new RESIDENTIAL development that provides a range of dwelling types at densities and scales that recognize and enhance the scale and character of the existing residential area by having regard to natural vegetation, lot frontages and areas, building height, coverage, mass, setbacks, privacy and overview;”

The proposal also satisfies the provincial intensification policies. Policy 1.1.3.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement states:

“Planning authorities shall identify and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs.”

As such, the intent to provide higher density for the subject site conforms to the City’s overall growth objectives.

The above noted policies, along with the additional stated policies (Policies C.7.7.1 and C.7.7.2– see Pages 11 to 12) of the Hamilton Official Plan provide that Infill residential development is permitted in residential neighbourhoods, where it is compatible and complementary to the surrounding area through harmonious design and integration. It is staff’s opinion that this proposal conforms to all these planning policies. The proposal represents an appropriate example of infill development that will make efficient use of existing services, while ensuring that the existing low density, grade oriented character of the neighbourhood is maintained.
In conclusion, it is staff’s opinion that the streetscape character of the neighbourhood will be maintained as the recommended zoning requires a built form, maximum height, minimum setbacks and a scale of development that is largely consistent with that existing and permitted by the existing zoning in the surrounding area.

Traffic/Safety Issues

Residents are concerned that the proposed development will generate additional traffic in the neighbourhood, which will create traffic congestion and safety issues. In particular, residents raised the issue that the new lots would provide insufficient parking. Residents consider that this would place pedestrians’ safety at risk, especially as they are already vulnerable to vehicular traffic as there are no formalized sidewalks along the roads.

The Traffic Engineering and Operations Section has provided comments regarding this application and raise no objections to the zoning application and note that the driveway locations within the ‘Court A’ road allowance, as submitted with the draft plan, are satisfactory. The Traffic and Engineering and Operations Division consider that traffic movements associated with the proposed residential units would be fewer or comparable to those associated with the former use of the site as a school. Staff, consider that the proposed applications would not prejudice the safety or amenity of vehicular or pedestrian traffic.

Loss of Open Space / Greenspace

Several residents were concerned about the loss of open space/green space, as the proposed development would eliminate such uses on the subject property. Residents are concerned that the neighbourhood is already deficient with respect to the amount of open space available.

The subject property is currently designated and zoned for institutional/public use (i.e. public school), and the property was never designated or zoned for an open space or park use. The school has open space associated with it which was historically used by the students as a recreational area.

In accordance with the City of Hamilton’s Parkland Dedication and Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland By-law, the application is subject to a parkland dedication, or a Cash-in-Lieu of parkland dedication payment. The application would be subject to a dedication of five percent (5%) of the total land area of the subject property. Given that the subject lands are not designated for a future park, the City does not require the inclusion of a parkland dedication into the draft plan of subdivision.
Therefore, in accordance with City By-laws, a cash payment to the City of Hamilton, in lieu of the conveyance of the land, will be required prior to the issuance of each building permit for the lots within the plan. The City’s Parkland Dedication Policies include a phase-in provision for Cash-in-Lieu of parkland requirements for residential plans of subdivision. A Cash-in-Lieu payment of four percent (4%) of the land value is required until December 31, 2006, and from January 1, 2007, and onward, a payment of five percent (5%) of the land value is required. The payment will be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of the issuance of a building permit.

Residents also raised the concern that the integrity of on-site mature trees may be affected by the proposed road allowance of this development. Staff reviewed the plans and following an on site inspection, concluded that there are no Municipal Forestry concerns or conflicts. There are four trees fronting the Springside Drive portion of this property but these are not located on the Road Allowance of the proposed development. There are also no Municipal trees located on the Seneca Avenue side of this site and, as such, the plan is not considered to prejudice any Municipal trees.

Infrastructure Issues

Residents were concerned with regard to the existing sewer system and services in the area, its capacity and surcharging possibilities due to the increase in residential units. The applicant submitted a Site Servicing Brief in support of their application, which was reviewed by staff.

As discussed previously, staff is, in general, satisfied with the conclusions of this report, and subject to the recommended conditions, have no concerns to the scheme.

6. The conditions of draft approval set out in Appendix “D” to this report are comprised of relevant conditions from the Streamlining and Harmonization of Subdivision, Condominium and Part-Lot Control Approvals and Administration Process and have been updated to meet the new Financial and Engineering Guidelines for development.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

If the application is denied, the applicant can use the subject property for a range of residential, institutional and public uses that are currently permitted under the existing “B” District zoning.
FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial: N/A.

Staffing: N/A.

Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider an application for a change in Zoning and Draft Plan of Subdivision.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

Provincial Policy Statement

The applications have been reviewed with respect to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The subject applications have shown proper regard towards focusing growth in settlement areas (Policy 1.1.3.1). However, Policy 1.1.1. (c) outlines that healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns. Secondly, Policy 3.2.2 states that contaminated sites shall be remediated, as necessary, prior to any activity on the site associated with the proposed use such that there will be no adverse effects. Therefore, due to the former use of the site and the age of the building, staff recommends that the owner completes a Record of Site Condition (RSC) for the property in accordance with Standard Development Planning Condition No. 6, as provided for in Appendix “D”.

Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan

The subject property is 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. As well, the Urban Areas are intended to accommodate approximately 96% of new residential housing units in the Region to the year 2020.

Therefore, as the nature of the applications are for the development of a residential rezoning and plan of subdivision where full municipal services are available, the applications conform with the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan policies.

Hamilton Official Plan

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

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

C.7.7.1  In the development of new RESIDENTIAL areas and, as far as practicable, in the infilling or redevelopment of established areas, Council may undertake or require the following in order to achieve high standards of RESIDENTIAL amenity:

i) Provision and maintenance of adequate off-street parking.

ii) Alteration of traffic flows.

iii) Improvement and maintenance of Street landscaping.

iv) Acquisition, removal or improvement of buildings or uses incompatible with a zoning district.

v) Provision of advice and assistance in the improvement and maintenance of private dwellings.

vi) Investigation into, and application of, other methods of encouraging the maintenance and improvements of buildings in RESIDENTIAL areas.

vii) The maintenance of adequate separation distances and the placement of buffering features between RESIDENTIAL and Industrial uses.

viii) Other similar actions or matters as Council may deem appropriate.

C.7.7.2  Varieties of RESIDENTIAL types will not be mixed indiscriminately, but will be arranged in a graduation so that higher density developments will complement those of a lower density, with sufficient spacing to maintain privacy, amenity and value.

C.7.7.3  Council will encourage a RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT of an adequate physical condition that contains a variety of housing forms that will meet the needs of present and future residents. Accordingly, Council will:

(iii) Support RESIDENTIAL development such as infilling, redevelopment and the conversion of non-residential structures that
makes more efficient use of the existing building stock and/or physical infrastructure that recognize and enhance the scale and character of the existing residential area by having regard to natural vegetation, lot frontages and areas, building height, coverage, mass, setbacks, privacy and overview; (O.P.A No. 128).

(v) Encourage new RESIDENTIAL development that provides a range of dwelling types at densities and scales that recognize and enhance the scale and character of the existing residential area by having regard to natural vegetation, lot frontages and areas, building height, coverage, mass, setbacks, privacy and overview;”

The proposal will increase the supply of housing in the neighbourhood in a manner that is compatible with existing surrounding residential uses. The proposal represents an appropriate example of infill development that will make efficient use of existing services, while ensuring that the existing low density, grade oriented character of the neighbourhood is maintained.

Based upon the forgoing, Planning staff is of the opinion that these applications conform to the Hamilton Official Plan.

Neighbourhood Plan

The property is located within the Allison Neighbourhood and is designated “Civic and Institutional”. A Neighbourhood Plan Amendment will be required to re-designate the subject lands to “Single and Double Residential”.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

Agencies/Departments Having No Comment or Objections

- Traffic Engineering and Operations Section, Public Works Department.
- Forestry Section, Operations and Maintenance Division, Public Works Department.
- Culture & Recreation, Public Health & Community Services Department.
- Ministry of Transportation Ontario, Corridor Management Section.

Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, Capital Planning and Implementation Division, Public Works Department, has reviewed this proposal and has the following comment:

“As no parkland has been dedicated in the draft plan of subdivision, we request 5% of the total land area, or 1ha/300 units, whichever is greater, for parkland dedication, with payment in the form of Cash-in-Lieu, to be calculated and accepted by the City.”
Revenues Division, Corporate Services Department, has indicated that there are outstanding Municipal Act Sanitary Sewer Rate charges, in the amount of $94,596.58, to this address in respect to the Allison Neighbourhood.

Strategic and Environmental Planning Section, Public Works Department, has reviewed this proposal and has the following comments:

“We have reviewed the zoning and subdivision applications for the above mentioned parcel of land and have no objection, as it is understood that access will be obtained through a local public road.

If infrastructure upgrades or expansions outside of the draft plan of subdivision are proposed, a Class EA approval may be required. This will be determined once the scope of the work is known. Section A.2.9 of the Municipal Class EA provides the option of integrating the Class EA approval with the Planning Act process.”

Hamilton Region Conservation Authority has reviewed the plan of subdivision application and has the following comments:

“The subject property is located on the west side of Springside Drive south of Rymal Road within the Upper Ottawa subwatershed. The site currently contains one building and associated parking area. The remainder of the site is vacant. We understand that the applicant proposes to create eighteen lots for single-detached residential purposes. Such a development will require an increase in the amount of impervious area currently on the site. As such, the Authority will require storm water quality and quantity controls to be implemented as per Ministry of Environment guidelines.”

Recommendations

That the following Hamilton Conservation Authority Conditions be included (Appendix “D”):

1. That the applicant prepares and implements an erosion and sediment control plan for the subject property, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority. The approved plan should include the following notes:

   (a) All erosion and sediment control measures shall be installed prior to development and maintained throughout the construction process, until all disturbed areas have been revegetated.

   (b) All erosion and sediment control measures shall be inspected after each rainfall to the satisfaction of Authority staff.

   (c) Any disturbed area not scheduled for further construction within 45 days will be provided with a suitable temporary mulch and seed cover within 7 days of the completion of that particular phase of construction.
(d) All disturbed areas shall be revegetated with permanent cover immediately following completion of construction.

2. That the applicant prepares and implements a stormwater management plan for the subject property, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority. The approved plan shall address stormwater quantity and quality to current Provincial standards.

3. That the applicant prepares and implements a lot grading plan, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

Requirements 1 and 2 above have been addressed by Conditions 1 and 2 of Standard Draft Plan Condition (ii) (3) of Appendix “D”, and the third requirement has been addressed by Special Draft Plan Condition (xvii) of Appendix “D”.

**Bell Canada**

Bell Canada has determined that there are adequate telecommunication facilities existing within the area, therefore, Bell Canada does not require any easement or lease.

However, Bell Canada has requested that one condition be included as a condition of draft plan approval requiring the developer to enter into a Letter of Understanding for underground servicing.

**Recommendations:** That Bell Canada Standard Condition No. 1 be included in the draft plan of subdivision approval (Appendix “D”).

**Public Consultation**

In accordance with the Public Participation Policy that was approved by City Council on May 29, 2003, a preliminary notice of this application was sent to ninety-eight property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. A Public Notice sign was posted on the subject lands and notice of the Public Meeting will be given in accordance with the Planning Act. In addition, a community meeting was held on November 1, 2005, by the Ward Councillor, with the applicant and staff in attendance.

Twenty-nine letters were received in response to the preliminary notice of circulation letter and two petitions of 96 and 121 signatures, respectively, (attached as Appendix “E”). Numerous concerns were raised in the letters and at the meetings, including: compatibility with existing neighbourhood; traffic/safety; noise; drainage and loss of trees/open space/greenspace. An analysis of these issues is included in the Analysis/Rationale Section of this report.
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.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Human health and safety are protected.

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

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

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?
☐ Yes ☑ No
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Attachs. (5)
Corners

Change in Zoning from the "B" (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District to the "C" (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified.

Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T200515, "Ryckman's Corners"
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. __________

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), respecting lands located at 80 Springside Drive

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statues 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 Corporation of the City of Hamilton” 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 the Council of The Corporation of the City of Hamilton passed Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) on the 25th day of July 1950, which by-law was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board by Order dated the 7th day of December 1951, (File No. P.F.C. 3821);

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

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

1. That Sheet No. E-9e of the District Maps, appended to and forming part of By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), as amended, is hereby amended by changing from the “B” (Suburban Agriculture and Residential, etc.) District to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified, the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”. 
2. That the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District regulations as contained in Section 9 of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

(a) That notwithstanding Subsection 9(3)(i) of Zoning By-law 6593, a front yard along a front lot line abutting Seneca Avenue shall have:

   (i) a depth of at least 6.0 metres for a lot with both side lot lines not greater than 32.0 metres in length;

   (ii) a depth of at least 8.0 metres for a lot with the longest side lot line greater than 32.0 metres and equal to or less than 38.0 metres in length; and,

   (iii) a depth of at least 11.5 metres for a lot with any side lot line greater than 38.0 metres in length.

(b) That notwithstanding Subsection 9(3)(ii) of Zoning By-law 6593, a side yard along each side lot line abutting Springside Drive shall have a width of at least 4.2 metres.

(c) No building or structure, including a fence, shall be permitted within 4.2 metres of Springside Drive.

3. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered or enlarged, nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used, nor shall any land be used, except in accordance with the “C” District provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Section 2.

4. By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) is amended by adding this by-law to Section 19B as Schedule S-154.

5. Sheet No. E-9e of the District Maps is amended by marking the lands referred to in Section 1 of this by-law as S-154.

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

PASSED and ENACTED this    day of     , 2006.

_________________________________   _______________________________
MAYOR                        CLERK
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“Ryckman’s Corners – 80 Springside Drive”
Conditions of Draft Approval

(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision entitled “Ryckman’s Corners” comprised of Lots 136, 137 and 152 Registered Plan 1001 and Lots 48, 49, 64 and 65 Registered Plan 1013, in the City of Hamilton, prepared by Urbex Engineering Limited, dated November 21, 2005, to provide for eighteen (18) lots (Lots 1-18) for the development of single-detached dwellings and a new public road (Court A).

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

   (1) Development Engineering Conditions Nos. 1, 2, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 28;

   (2) Development Planning Conditions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 20, and 21;

   (3) Hamilton Region Conservation Authority Conditions Nos. 1 and 2;

   (4) Bell Canada Condition No.1;

Development Engineering

(iii) That the Owner enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City of Hamilton prior to registration of any portion of the draft approved plan.

(iv) That the Owner agree in writing to satisfy all conditions, financial and otherwise, of the City of Hamilton prior to registration of any portion of the approved plan.

(v) That the Owner agree in writing to make a cash payment to the City in-lieu of providing Horizontal and Vertical Control Survey Monumentation.

(vi) That as part of the detailed engineering design; the grading plan shall indicate all proposed driveway locations for all lots within the subdivision.

(vii) That the Owner’s Engineer as part of the detailed engineering design provide a future road profile of Seneca Drive and Springside Drive. All houses and driveways to be set to mitigate further impact.

(viii) That the Owner provides a geotechnical report prepared by a qualified professional engineer prior to final engineering design.
(ix) The Owner agree in writing to construct Court “A” with no sidewalks. Further that the Owner shall include a notice in all Purchase and Sale Agreements advising future home owners of no sidewalk installation.

(x) The Owner pay all urbanization costs associated with the full frontage/flankage of the subject lands as it relates to Seneca Drive and Springside Drive.

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

(xii) That the Owner shall provide securities under the Subdivision Agreement to cover any damages to all existing sidewalks, curbs etc. adjacent to the subject lands as a result of the development.

(xiii) The Owner agree in writing to install all services and be responsible for the cost to repair and resurface Seneca Street fronting the development.

(xiv) That the Owner submit a detailed storm water management report to address quality and quantity and to confirm adequate outlet for the minor and major systems. The Owner must demonstrate that resulting run-off from the proposed development for the two to 100 year storm will not negatively impact downstream properties, including sewer surcharging, in accordance with the City of Hamilton Storm Water Policy.

(xv) That the Owner agree in writing that all costs associated with any and all upgrades to the City infrastructure as a result of the development will be their responsibility.

(xvi) That the Owner provide 3 m X 3 m daylight triangles at the south east corner of Lot 1 and the north east corner of Lot 11, at the intersection with Springside Drive.

**Hamilton Region Conservation Authority**

(xvii) That the applicant prepares and implements a lot grading plan to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

**Budgets and Finance**

(xviii) That the owner pays all outstanding municipal taxes to the satisfaction of the City of Hamilton's Corporate Services Department (Tax Administration/Banking Section).
21 Springside Dr.
Hamilton, Ontario
L9B 1M5
August 8, 2005

Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
City Hall, 71 Main St. West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Quinn

Re: File: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515

As a homeowner in the Rykman’s School area I am totally against the rezoning of the school area. 18 homes in no way protects the character and integrity of the neighbourhood. An ugly fence along Springside in no way improves the aesthetics of the area. I have seen enough of fences along Rymal at Upper Wellington that make you feel like you’re driving through a ghetto. Surely, Hamilton deserves better planning than that.

The Rykman’s School is also right under an airport flight path. If the city wants to develop its airport it doesn’t need complaints from people living under the flight path. When Westjet was in Hamilton it really did get quite noisy on occasion since Hamilton has no restrictions on flying.

Springside Drive already has enough traffic on it. It gets heavy traffic from the Allison Survey and from seniors who live in the Glenbrook Estates who want to avoid Upper James. And, ever since the left turn lane from Rymal was instated people use it as a short cut to Upper James.

The Rykman’s School area which includes, Springside Dr., Lister, Allison, Seneca and Aldercrest is a small area that has average homes on big lots. This is becoming very rare. Isn’t this worth preserving? Do we have to be rich to have a home on a large lot? Does the whole city have to carved up “piecemeal” in order to get more tax revenue? Hamilton has lots of land for development. In conclusion I would like to state that I am against rezoning and if the developer wishes to build homes, they should be on lots the same size as those that exist now.

Anne Devries
August 11, 2005

Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Dept.,
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
City Hall, 721 Main Street West
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Quinn,

RE: Notice of Preliminary Circulation Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-06-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T200515, Sulphur Springs Development Corp.,
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton, Ward 7

We are writing to express our concerns in response to the above named proposed zoning amendment application. Based on our understanding of the described zoning change and location map with subdivision plan, it appears that the proposed change would result in lot sizes that would be significantly smaller than the existing neighbourhood properties surrounding the school property. The proposed plan indicates that there would be eighteen lots and this appears to be quite congested and not congruent with the existing housing in the surrounding and well-established neighbourhood. Also, the proposed high density housing subdivision plan will create a significant increase in traffic volume associated with the new development. This causes safety concerns associated with the plan that perhaps should be further studied.

Although we do not disagree that residential development of this property is appropriate, the density and lot allocation does not appear to give reasonable consideration for the existing and surrounding residential properties. Thus, a revised plan that would include larger lot sizes to accommodate approximately twelve bungalow or back-split style homes would be more congruent with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Lastly, the existing plan appears to indicate that the trees at the front of the property facing Springside Drive will be removed to accommodate the development of this subdivision. These are large mature trees that should be preserved and incorporated into the revised plan.

We look forward to participating in the consultation process to assist with developing alternate plans and solutions to make this new development a welcome addition to our neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Michael Nakoneshny & Sharon Carr
153 Jacqueline Blvd.
Hamilton, ON L9B 2S9
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes roof to roof into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our homes. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighbourhood, please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual.

Yours Truly

[Signature]

Long Time Residents (42 yrs)
City Hall  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515  
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

We are writing in regards to the proposed zoning changes to the above lot presently being used as a local park. We are strongly opposed to the idea of so many homes being placed in our neighbourhood. Our concern is not only for the amount of traffic, noise and intrusion of these homes but also the increased strain on the water consumption and sewer capabilities.

We see pressure changes to our water regularly with people watering their lawns or washing cars etc. We feel an increase in the number of homes would cause a large drop in the water pressure we now enjoy.

Most of the homes in the area are one story homes on large treed lots that suit the neighbourhood. There is no place for so many two story homes crowded in to small lots which we see far too often in new subdivisions crowded roof to roof. Children in this area will be forced to walk to busy subdivisions several blocks away to access a park raising serious safety concerns.

We look forward to hearing from you in the near future regarding our concerns.

Yours truly,

[Signatures]

**Long Time Residents (40 yrs)**
August 12, 2005

Owen Quinn
Development Planner 11
City of Hamilton

Re: File ZAC-05-07 and 25T-200515

Having been made aware of the above noted zoning amendment and plan of subdivision draft plan for property at 80 Springside Dr., we are writing to express our opposition to the proposal, as presented, for the following reasons.

1) current zoning: the subject parcel of land (formerly Ryckman Corners Public School) is located in the midst of well established single family residences all of which are located on B zoned property.

2) compatibility: C zoning of the subject lands would create development that is not compatible with the surrounding area.

3) safety: C zoned properties being significantly smaller than B zoned properties typically do not have room for off-street parking of vehicles. Since there are no sidewalks in our area, street parking and more traffic would create a major safety concern since pedestrians must walk on the roadway.

4) Character and scale: the proposed plan of subdivision places 18 residential lots on property that should accommodate only 8 residential lots in order to maintain the same character and scale as the existing area.

We understand that development of the subject property is inevitable and in the long term good for the area. Our concern is that B zoning must be maintained in this established area.

Yours truly,

Douglas Keys
Catherine Keys

45 Allison Cres.
Hamilton, On
L9B 1E4
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

We are writing in regards to the proposed zoning changes to the above lot presently being used as a local park. We are strongly opposed to the idea of so many homes being placed in our neighbourhood. Our concern is not only for the amount of traffic, noise and intrusion of these homes but also the increased strain on the water consumption and sewer capabilities.

We see pressure changes to our water regularly with people watering their lawns or washing cars etc. We feel an increase in the number of homes would cause a large drop in the water pressure we now enjoy.

Most of the homes in the area are one story homes on large treeed lots that suit the neighbourhood. There is no place for so many two story homes crowded in to small lots which we see far too often in new subdivisions crowded roof to roof. Children in this area will be forced to walk to busy subdivisions several blocks away to access a park raising serious safety concerns.

We look forward in hearing from you in the near future regarding our concerns.

Yours truly,

ALEXANDER L. KUN
43 SPRINGSIDE DRIVE
HAMILTON ONT
L8P 1H5
City Hall  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515  
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton  

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.  

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.  

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning.  

Yours Truly  

ALEXANDER L. KULIY  
43 SPRINGSIDE DRIVE  
HAMPTON, ONT.  
L9B 1M5
83 Aldercrest Ave
Hamilton, On
L9B 1H3

Re: Notification Preliminary Circulation Zone Bylaw Amendment App 296 05-07

I want zoning to stay at B-1 in my neighborhood.
18 houses & the man at the corner wants 3 extra lots, this place, this charming place will become like a miszsmash.
We all had Septic Systems & kept the water table clean, (look what happened to Upper James) we the people of our neighborhood had to pay big money for sewers so that we can change to Zone E no way.

Yours truly,
Mary Kerr
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention: Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be extremely detrimental to our established neighbourhood.

We only just purchased the property at 77 Springside Drive on August 5, 2005, and the main reason we did so was because of the type of neighbourhood and the community. We purchased this property to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non-intrusive one level homes in the area. For the past 5 years we have been waiting and saving up for this move, only to find out the day after we moved in, there was a proposal for the zoning change.

Changing to C zoning will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple two story homes roof to roof in a very small area meant for only 8 lots, but will also allow other home owners in the area to sever their lots and crowd more homes in as well.

All of the homes on our street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street, which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our home which is entirely the concept we were trying to avoid by moving into this area. Our old home was in such a community and we rarely had a space to park our own vehicles. Crowded houses, lead to more vehicles on the roads, which leads to crowded streets, and an unsafe environment for pedestrians taking their daily walks down narrow streets with too many parked cars and no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighbourhood. Please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Jennifer Killins & Mike Dzierzba
77 Springside Drive,
Hamilton ON
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes roof to roof into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our homes. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighbourhood, please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual.

Yours Truly

[Signature]

Don & Jean Piette
95 Seneca Ave
Hamilton, ON
L9B 1L8
Mr. Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development & Real Estate Division (West)  
August 11, 2005

Dear Mr. Quinn:

My husband and I live in the Allison Survey 2 blocks away from the property zoning amendment application ZAC-05-70 and the draft plan of subdivision 25T-200515.

This amendment would require changing the B-zoning which is in existence for the entire survey.

We are very much against this proposed housing subdivision because it would change the character of this neighbourhood from a parklike setting into a crowded city dwelling area.

Please consider our request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gunter and Gertrude Mensch  
94 Aldercrest Ave.  
Hamilton, ON L9B 1L4
Dear Sir:

I write in regard to your sale of the school property on Springside Drive in the Aldercrest Survey.

It has come to the attention of the residents of this survey that the property was purchased by a builder who intends to have it rezoned to allow the building of some 18 houses. According to the present zoning the school land takes up eight lots representative of the lot size, of not only the immediate area but that of the rest of the survey.

The insertion of ten extra houses in such a short space would interrupt the normal open concept of this prestigious ranch style neighborhood. Two story houses crammed into such a small area would deface Seneca Ave. and Springside Drive and destroy the quiet home like feeling of the residents, for their remaining years.

To allow such out of place development is cruel and as aesthetically out of place as the abomination of that cement block building put up in Gore Park some years ago. The building was rightly torn down after the public out cry. We would like to see you keep our zoning intact and so prevent such a mistake from happening again.

Our request is that the Council keeps our zoning as “Zone B” so we can keep our peaceful neighborhood intact.

Trusting that you will give full consideration to this matter, I remain

Yours Truly

[Signature]

Tom Fugler
120 Aldercrest Ave.
Hamilton, Ont.
L9B 1L4
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning.

Yours Truly

[Signature]
119 Springside Dr
Hamilton
City Hall  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515  
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning.

Yours Truly

Bernie [Signature]
57 Springside Dr.
Hamilton
City Hall  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515  
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton  

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes roof to roof into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in. 

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our homes. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks. 

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighbourhood, please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual. 

Yours Truly  

[Signature]  

59 Springside Dr.  
Hamilton
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes roof to roof into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our homes. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighbourhood, please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual.

Yours Truly

[Signature]

44 SPRINGSIDE DRIVE
HAMILTON, ONTARIO
L9B 1M7
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning.

Yours Truly

[Signature]
54 Springside Drive
Hamilton
Zaki Ullah
10 Bartlett Ave Hamilton Ont.
L9B 1L2 Phd


Mr. Owen Quinn
Development Planner
City Of Hamilton

Dear Mr. Quinn,

I am a property owner who has been residing in this neighborhood for the last 27 years. Our neighborhood has been maintained as Zoned B. I understand that you have received an application to change the zoning from B to C in regards to the former Ryckmans Corner school property located at 80-springside Drive.

We have been very proud of living in our neighborhood and grateful to the city of Hamilton to recognize and maintain the appropriate Zoning “B” for many years.

It is true that progress and development has to be considered as the land becomes scarce. However we also have to preserve as much green space as we can. Our neighborhood is unique in that it has the appropriate size lots and well-maintained green space. These days neighborhood like this area is a rarity.

Therefore it is requested that the proposed zoning change be disallowed and current Zoning of B is maintained. This will retain the green space, which is desperately needed in order to enrich the environment, rather than destroying the uniqueness of this neighborhood, which offers both, the appropriate lot sizes and green space as well as desperately needed in the city of Hamilton.

I also think the proposed zoning change will open the door for more severance requests by the residents of this neighborhood and encourage the addition of smaller lots which will ultimately destroy the character of such neighborhood in the City of Hamilton.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Sincerely Yours,

Zaki Ullah
City Hall  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  

Attention Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515  
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton  

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. We moved to this community to avoid the crowded new developments and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes into a very small area meant for only hold 8 lots, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.  

All of the homes on this street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians as there are no sidewalks.  

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning.  

Yours Truly  
[Signature]

100 Springside Dr.
August 21st, 2005

Owen Quinn, Development Planner 11
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Dept.,
Development and Real Estate Division (West),
City Hall,
71 Main St. W.
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Re: ZAC-50-70 AND 25T-20015

Dear Mr. Quinn;
I am a resident of 94 Springside Drive and would like to respond to the developer's proposal for 80 Springside Drive.
I am located on the south side of this property I am vehemently opposed to the rezoning request from "B" District to "C" District. This change would certainly do harm and definitely not enhance this mature neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood is well known and admired for its lot size. Homes are never on the market for long and new residents purchase their property for its lot size. Second and third generations of the original residents keep coming back to this neighbourhood to purchase their homes as they appreciate the quality of the neighbourhood.
The developer has not offered any quality proposal by building lots with 12 metres frontage and minuscule lot sizes of 360 metres. I do not consider a "cul de sac" a new public street. Our neighbourhood has no sidewalks and all our streets are frequented by children, walkers, joggers, bicyclists and pet owners at all times of day and night. We barely manage to stay safe especially with the traffic and speedsters on Springside Drive during the summer and winter leaves us with less than two lanes for pedestrians and cars, buses, trucks traveling in both directions. In the new "Allison" survey off Kirkfield Ave. the cars are packed up and down each street in that survey. Just where are these new residents going to park on their new properties and still keep us safe?
I certainly do not wish four backyards of towering 2 storey houses staring down at me and my view blocked an eight foot wall of wood which seems to be the fence of choice in the adjoining neighbourhoods. My neighbours (current and past) have lived without fences for 40 years
Has the developer indicated how he is going to address the question of drainage?
Currently I have a drop of at least five feet in my back yard from the adjacent property and receive all the run off from next door.
Are any of the mature trees on this site part of the future development or are these residents going to bake in the summer and run air conditioners non stop as another energy drain?
This property since 1955 has been a safe thoroughfare for all the residents of this neighbourhood since we have long blocks between connecting streets. Can the developer include a pathway so that we may stay connected?
The integrity of our neighbourhood should not be harmed by this rezoning proposal. I am sure the developer would have a waiting list of buyers for properties in this
neighbourhood if the lot sizes, frontage, house sizes complimented rather than degraded our neighbourhood.
These are a few of my concerns that I hope you will include in your planners report.

In addition, I would like to add that the residents of this neighbourhood have lived here for many decades. I myself moved here in 1958 at the age of 3 years. I left when I married but returned to purchase my family home from my parents in 1986. I have raised my children and plan staying here through retirement until death. We are fortunate to have a piece of heaven right here on earth. Drop by for a visit and you will see why!

Sincerely,

Cathy Blancher
City Hall
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention: Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside from B to C. We feel that this would be extremely detrimental to our established neighbourhood.

We have lived in our home (248 Seneca Ave.) for 9 1/2 years and the main reason we chose this area was because of the type of neighbourhood and the community. We purchased this property to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets and to enjoy the spacious and non-intrusive one level homes in the area. We also have many close friends who eagerly wait for homes in this neighbourhood to go up for sale so that they can also get away from the crowded areas that they live in. In fact just recently very good friends of ours were fortunate to find a home in this neighbourhood only to find out the day after they moved in, there was a proposal for the zoning change.

Changing to C zoning will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple two story homes roof to roof in a very small area meant for only 8 lots, but will also allow other home owners in the area to sever their lots and crowd more homes in as well.

All of the homes on our street have enough parking allowing them to not park on the street, which is only two lanes wide with no shoulder. The homes proposed would only have single car drives which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our home. Crowded houses, lead to more vehicles on the roads, which leads to crowded streets, and an unsafe environment for pedestrians taking their daily walks down narrow streets with too many parked cars and no sidewalks.

We would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the entire neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighbourhood. Please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual.

Yours truly,

Quinn and Kathy Murdy
248 Seneca Ave.
Hamilton

RECEIVED
SEP 21 2005
Dear Mr. Quinn:

Subject: File ZAC-05-70 and 25T-200515

In regards to the above noted file numbers, I am opposed to the change in zoning for this property.

I feel the property size lots should be kept to the same as what they currently are on Seneca Avenue. I do not feel putting the amount of houses as laid out in the draft plan would fit into the current surroundings of this area. I do not wish to look out and see houses crammed together on small lots. I do not wish to have cars parked all down the street for additional parking. I do not wish to have an increase in traffic due to the many additional homes requested to be on this lot.

I would like to request that a walking path be put in from Seneca Avenue through to Springside Drive as the lot the school is on has always been used as a “walk through” for the people residing this area.

This area has been zoned Suburban Agriculture & Residential for a reason and I would like to keep it as this as this is what it was when I purchased my home and is suitable for the rest of the area.

Please take my comments into consideration.

Sincerely

Kim Chandler

Copy: Bill Kelly, Councilor Ward 7
Quinn, Owen

Subject: File Nos. ZAC-05-70 and 25T200515

Owen Quinn, Development Planner II, City of Hamilton

Mr. Quinn,

We are in receipt of your notice regarding the above mentioned filed numbers. We live at 103 Springside Drive. We are opposed to the zoning change. We are not opposed to houses being built at 80 Springside Drive as long as they will blend in with the rest of the neighbourhood. This meaning that they would be 1 floor ranch style homes on large lots keeping this neighbourhood zoned "B". Putting 2 storey homes on smaller lots will stick out like a sore thumb.

I have also heard rumour that when Mr. Allison donated the land at 80 Springside Drive it was to be used for educational purposes only. Even if someone that has donated a parcel of land for educational purposes has passed away, should their wishes not continued to be honoured after death?
We have lived in this neighbourhood for 11 plus years. What drew us here was the large lots, mature trees, etc. It is like living in the country without leaving the city.

I believe that if you leave this zoned "B" and go ahead with permitting a builder to build homes they could put a maximum of 6 homes which would still appeal to prospective buyers. We are constantly approached to sell our home as buyers like the large lots, so you are not sitting on top of your neighbours.

Please do not allow a builder to change the look of this unique neighbourhood.

Thank you for allowing us to speak out on this matter.

Cordially,

Harvey & Heidi VanderGaast
103 Springside Drive
Hamilton, ON L9B 1M5

cc Bill Kelly

8/8/2005
Quinn, Owen

Subject: Rezoning protest - 80 Springside Dr.

August 11, 2005

Owen Quinn, Development Planner 2
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
City Hall, 71 Main St. West
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Quinn:

Re: File: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515

Our family, which includes four young children, recently moved to 75 Allison Cress. We were attracted to the area because of the larger lots and quiet street. We also noticed that the whole community has larger than average size lots.

In speaking with a number of our new neighbours, we understand that there is a proposed development of 18 homes on the Rykman's School area along with an application for rezoning. If this development goes through it defeats the whole reason that our family relocated to this area. We feel that the character of the neighbourhood needs to be protected. As we searched for our new home we realized that there are very few neighbourhoods like this in Hamilton. Any housing development should incorporate lots that are similar in size to the existing neighbourhood. So many of the newer developments seem to jam as many homes as possible into a small area. It is our feeling that a community such as this is worth protecting.

Please add our names to the list of those who are protesting this rezoning and development.

Sincerely,

Paul & Wilma VanderVeen
To: Quinn, Owen
Subject: Planning Dept Letter

Mr. Owen the Quinn, development planner 11
Planning And Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (west)

Dear Mr. Quinn:
Over the past 25 years we have participated in the development of our
“Allison Neighborhood” plan. At that time 88 percent of our neighbors
responded on a petition to the planning department in favor of maintaining the
“B” zoning of our large lots.

To maintain the character and conformity of our neighborhood the”B” zoning
is essential “C” zoning within the “B” zoning would produce splinter in filling
an nonconformity within our neighborhood.

The owner of this(formerly school property) was aware of this “B”
neighborhood zoning when the land was purchased.

It is imperative that the planning department support and maintain Our
Allison Neighborhood Plan.

I trust that you will keep us informed concerning this application and any
relevant changes or proposals.

With Thanks
Wilf & Carole Hart
6 Lister Ave

8/15/2005
Message

Quinn, Owen

Subject: RE: ZAC-05-70 (80 Springside Drive)

To: Owen Quinn:

I received the information you sent me for the plan of subdivision - thank you very much.

My comments and questions are as follow.

1. A 40 km/hr road speed along a section of Springside Drive should be rescinded, and the 50 km/hr reinstated since the school use is no longer in existence.
2. A 3-way stop exists at Springside and Kirkfield Road. I feel this should be removed as it was put in place just a few years ago for the school use. It served a good purpose of ensuring people stopped for the school, however it is no longer needed given the school use is gone. A stop sign at Kirkland (onto Springside) would be sufficient and consistent with where Kirkland meets Jacqueline Boulevard, to the east (it would be a mirror image).

Would these two points be addressed via this development application?

I would like to be kept informed of upcoming neighbourhood or public meetings on this project.

Regards,

Greg Simon
199 Alderlea Avenue
Mount Hope, Ontario
LOR 1WO

-----Original Message-----

Subject: ZAC-05-70 (80 Springside Drive)

Attached please find a copy of the preliminary notice, circulation map and draft plan of subdivision that was circulated to all property owners within 120 metres (400 feet) of the subject lands.

If you have any questions or required additional information then please contact me.

Regards,

Owen Quinn, MCIP, RPP
Planner
Development Planning - West Team
Planning and Development Department
City of Hamilton

8/30/2005
80 Springside Dr.
Rezoning and Development

♦ zoning should be compatible with the existing character of the
neighbourhood “B” Suburban Agriculture and Residential

♦ the proposed plan is not in keeping with the existing character of
the neighbourhood

♦ the proposed plan is not sympathetic to the established
streetscape, continuity in the pattern of land use, density of
development and intensity of activity, uniformity

♦ proposed development does not include any greenspace for a
parkette or sidewalk to get from Springside to Seneca or vice-versa

♦ noise disturbance from the Aerotropolis Cluster may cause
conflicts between the operation of the airport and surrounding
land uses; by-laws on airport noise restrictions; such as those at
Pearson International where no flights are allowed between
2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m.

[Signature]
21 Springside
Nov 1, 05
August 24, 2005

Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
City Hall, 71 Main St. West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y6

Dear Mr. Quinn

Re: File: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515

We moved to 17 Springside Dr. several years ago. We enjoy our large property. Our many friends who visit often comment that they would like to purchase a home in the neighbourhood.

I can’t believe that developers are planning to rezone the Ryckman’s School Property on 80 Springside Dr. This would totally destroy the character of this unique neighbourhood. Already traffic on Springside Dr. is too busy and I always have to watch my three year old son to make sure that he doesn’t wander in front of the house and onto the road.

Please do not rezone the school property. It will destroy the neighbourhood.

Daphne and Peter Sampson
17 Springside Dr.
Hamilton
City Hall  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development and Real Estate Division  
71 Main Street West, 7th Floor  
Hamilton Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Attention: Owen Quinn, Development Planner II

Re: FILE: ZAC-05-70 & 25T200515  
80 Springside Drive, Hamilton

This letter is in regards to the above noted file in which you are proposing a change to the zoning of 80 Springside Drive from B to C. I feel that this would be very detrimental to our established neighbourhood. I moved to this neighbourhood to avoid the crowded new surveys and busy streets, and to enjoy the spacious, non-intrusive one level homes. Changing the zoning to C will not only allow this particular builder to crowd multiple 2 story homes roof to roof into a very small area meant for only 8 lots, but, it will also allow other home owners to sever their lots and crowd more homes in.

All of the homes in our neighbourhood have enough parking, allowing them to not park on the street. The homes proposed would only have single car drives, which would lead to multiple cars being parked on the street and in front of our homes. The streets in our neighborhood are two lanes wide with no shoulder. Traffic would have to avoid these cars by going into oncoming traffic and creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians, since there are no sidewalks.

I would very much appreciate you addressing these concerns shared by the neighbourhood as soon as possible to prevent any change in the zoning. We have worked hard over the years to preserve the integrity and beauty of this neighborhood, please do not let it be destroyed for the profit of one individual.

Yours truly,
Kelly Rogers  
66 Springside Drive
August 22, 2005

Owen Quinn
Development Planner II
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)

re: File # ZAC-05-07 and 25T-200515

A petition regarding the above noted applications has been circulated by a citizens committee to home owners in the Allison Survey with properties in close proximity to the proposed development.

The attached petition identifies home owners that are opposed to this Zoning change and Plan of Subdivision proposal.

On behalf of the Committee

[Signatures]

[96 / RESIDENTS]
Note: This is a GUIDE PLAN only and subject to change. For details contact the City Planning and Development Department.
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>15 Lister Ave</td>
<td>06/11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>15 Lister Ave</td>
<td>06/01/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Brown</td>
<td>60 Bynum Rd. E.</td>
<td>02/28/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td>45 Allison Cres.</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Miller</td>
<td>75 Allison Cres.</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Lee</td>
<td>85 Allison Cres.</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Wong</td>
<td>57 Allison Cres.</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chang</td>
<td>3 Lister Avenue</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Davis</td>
<td>3 Lister Avenue</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Taylor</td>
<td>48 Allison Cres.</td>
<td>08/08/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200815 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroli Hart</td>
<td>6 Lister Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Motley</td>
<td>6 Lister Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Seidman</td>
<td>42 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luma Fieras</td>
<td>42 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaki Ullah</td>
<td>4 Bartlett Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Raisis</td>
<td>10 Bartlett Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonita Clark</td>
<td>20 Bartlett Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad McMaster</td>
<td>15 Bartlett Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Roder</td>
<td>3 Bartlett Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Goette</td>
<td>9 Bartlett Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yma Gault</td>
<td>68 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Heenei</td>
<td>68 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyx Mendell</td>
<td>94 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark May</td>
<td>98 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gunnell</td>
<td>104 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Knox</td>
<td>104 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>08/07/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Hadley</td>
<td>108 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>08/05/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Keller</td>
<td>112 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>08/05/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Allen</td>
<td>114 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>08/05/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Brown</td>
<td>116 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>08/05/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Uke</td>
<td>116 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>08/05/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ferguson</td>
<td>120 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Ferguson</td>
<td>120 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Johnson</td>
<td>124 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gregory</td>
<td>126 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>130 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Olds</td>
<td>130 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Dibner</td>
<td>123 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Dibner</td>
<td>123 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Strick</td>
<td>117 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>10/08/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application 5AC-08-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 2ST-200515 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory Lamners</td>
<td>129 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 18/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.J. Jones</td>
<td>120, Sneec Ave</td>
<td>Aug 18/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Miller</td>
<td>168 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 26/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Roberts</td>
<td>46-0 Lester Ave</td>
<td>Aug 26/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Roberts</td>
<td>51 Allison St</td>
<td>Aug 31/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 Allison St</td>
<td>Aug 21/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
Development & Real Estate Division (West)  

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to  
the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70  
and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that  
the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the  
following reasons:  

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject  
   parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not  
   comply with the Official Plan.  

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with  
   the established B zoning in the surrounding area.  

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character  
   and scale as the existing area.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B. Reifoser</td>
<td>126 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey White</td>
<td>130 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wasson</td>
<td>119 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regine Huyck</td>
<td>125 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Palowski</td>
<td>128 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Harris</td>
<td>21 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Godby</td>
<td>21 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Okey</td>
<td>18 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Okey</td>
<td>25 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn O. O'Keefe</td>
<td>31 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacye A. O'Keefe</td>
<td>11 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 12/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O'Bryant</td>
<td>11 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 12/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann O'Bryant</td>
<td>17 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 12/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann O'Bryant</td>
<td>17 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 12/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

Name: P. Sampson  
Address: 17 Springside Dr. 
Date: 8/12/05

Name: Ed Quinn
Address: 127 Springside Dr. 
Date: 6/14/05
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that we, the undersigned, strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry van der</td>
<td>53 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch Johnston</td>
<td>40 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hewetton</td>
<td>21 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Read</td>
<td>52 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Ward</td>
<td>58 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Bakers</td>
<td>58 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Wilson</td>
<td>58 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. S. Benson</td>
<td>58 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. A. Henshaw</td>
<td>68 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. N. Keating</td>
<td>51 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Manganiello</td>
<td>50 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. McCaffrey</td>
<td>60 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. O. Brown</td>
<td>65 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Jones</td>
<td>40 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie Van Ede</td>
<td>35 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. W. Quinn</td>
<td>35 Lister Ave.</td>
<td>Aug 11/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row &amp; Cathy Verheg</td>
<td>33 Lister Ave</td>
<td>08/11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zella Rilieco</td>
<td>27 Lister Ave</td>
<td>08/12/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 Lister Ave</td>
<td>08/15/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 22, 2005
Owen Quinn Development Planner 11
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)

re: File # ZAC-05-07 and 25T-200515

A petition regarding the above noted applications has been circulated by a citizens committee to all persons that were notified by the Planning and Economic Development Department.

The attached petition identifies home owners that are opposed to this Zoning change and Plan of Subdivision proposal.

On behalf of the Committee

[Signatures]
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Signatures
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200545 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>103 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina Kun</td>
<td>103 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Scafone</td>
<td>38 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Killings</td>
<td>43 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Dierzenbicki</td>
<td>54 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Killings</td>
<td>77 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Rogers</td>
<td>77 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Burke</td>
<td>100 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Jaraschke</td>
<td>95 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Blancher</td>
<td>111 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Blancher</td>
<td>94 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Hendon</td>
<td>67 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyson Gordon</td>
<td>67 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbyn Banton</td>
<td>67 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Pipe</td>
<td>62 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Pirie</td>
<td>62 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-2005.15 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary McCullough</td>
<td>57 Springside Drive</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Cullum</td>
<td>57 Springside Drive</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Cowan</td>
<td>60 Springside Drive</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis O'Meara</td>
<td>100 Springside Drive</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Kane</td>
<td>106 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Keneally</td>
<td>106 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Staziak</td>
<td>119 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Jones</td>
<td>49 Springside Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 13/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Jones</td>
<td>190 Jacqueline Dr.</td>
<td>Aug 20/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike McNeeley</td>
<td>153 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike H.</td>
<td>236 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Nimmer</td>
<td>167 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg H.</td>
<td>167 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe McLean</td>
<td>179 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray H.</td>
<td>199 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Remano</td>
<td>235 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Alice</td>
<td>209 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob B.</td>
<td>205 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Frederick</td>
<td>201 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don H.</td>
<td>197 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>173 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan S.</td>
<td>161 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim H.</td>
<td>227 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob H.</td>
<td>231 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Payne</td>
<td>149 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve A.</td>
<td>114 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda V.</td>
<td>125 Jacqueline Rd</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200505 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Annan, Chiyad</td>
<td>139 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debby Sny</td>
<td>133 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Barden</td>
<td>99 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Morrison</td>
<td>184 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Leder</td>
<td>154 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Silva</td>
<td>186 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Johnson</td>
<td>154 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Murphy</td>
<td>154 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron &amp; Dick Wells</td>
<td>170 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Wells</td>
<td>170 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle I.</td>
<td>162 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine R.</td>
<td>158 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Leonard Birch</td>
<td>150 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Birch</td>
<td>150 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dulan</td>
<td>148 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. McHare</td>
<td>142 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. McHare</td>
<td>138 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Marley</td>
<td>124 Jacqueline</td>
<td>Aug 15/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Burne</td>
<td>71 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>64 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Lepley</td>
<td>67 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Litton</td>
<td>77 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kiri</td>
<td>83 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Burnside</td>
<td>97 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barr</td>
<td>103 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat Krego</td>
<td>88 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kline</td>
<td>82 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Green</td>
<td>93 Aldercrest</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Green</td>
<td>71 Aldercrest</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Barlow</td>
<td>82 Allison Cres</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Rile</td>
<td>72 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Beale</td>
<td>12 Aldercrest Ave</td>
<td>Aug 9/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Rose</td>
<td>60 Allison Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jones</td>
<td>60 Allison Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda Clark</td>
<td>85 Springside Dr</td>
<td>Aug 17/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 2ST-200615 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doe Pretty</td>
<td>95 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nolan</td>
<td>90 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Samuels</td>
<td>105 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Sommers</td>
<td>105 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Howard</td>
<td>169 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Harvey</td>
<td>100 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Morgan</td>
<td>94 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Stone</td>
<td>116 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Brown</td>
<td>116 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam White</td>
<td>80 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank shoulder</td>
<td>74 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Lucking</td>
<td>69 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

As a resident of the Allison Survey, and in close proximity to the property subject to Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 257-200515 please be advised that the undersigned strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam Meek</td>
<td>64 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Watkins</td>
<td>58 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Randall</td>
<td>49 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Nevin</td>
<td>53 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Nevin</td>
<td>57 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Tham</td>
<td>63 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Vanderkoi</td>
<td>70 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul B. Soter</td>
<td>89 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Gharrett</td>
<td>94 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Gharrett</td>
<td>90 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gharrett</td>
<td>84 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Gharrett</td>
<td>106 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Tekhnon</td>
<td>57 Seneca Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Summerfield</td>
<td>107 Allerced Ave</td>
<td>Aug 8/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owen Quinn, Development Planner II
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)

Having received notification of Zoning Amendment Application ZAC-05-70 and Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-200515 please be advised that the undersigned neighbourhood residents strongly oppose these applications for the following reasons:

1) The application to amend the current zoning of the subject parcel of land from the B District to the C District does not comply with the Official Plan.

2) C zoning in this neighbourhood would not be compatible with the established B zoning in the surrounding area.

3) The Plan of Subdivision proposal is not of the same character and scale as the existing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacek Kuderna</td>
<td>194 Jacqueline Blvd.</td>
<td>8/15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur Janus</td>
<td>160 5th Avenue</td>
<td>8/15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Anaclito</td>
<td>182 Jacqueline Blvd.</td>
<td>8/15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Loosemore</td>
<td>164 Jacqueline Blvd.</td>
<td>8/15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Champagne</td>
<td>146 Jacqueline Blvd.</td>
<td>8/15/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirmalde Singh</td>
<td>193 Jacqueline Blvd.</td>
<td>8/18/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>