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RECOMMENDATION:

That Amended Zoning Application ZAC-09-045, by Clark Cerello, Owner, for a change in zoning from the “D” (Urban Protected Residential - One and Two Family Dwellings) to the “DE” (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified, for lands located at 16 Strathcona Avenue South (Hamilton), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED10147, be DENIED on the following basis:

(a) That it does not comply with the intent of the policies of the Hamilton Official Plan and the Hamilton Urban Official Plan in terms of intensification policies.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposal is for the rezoning of lands located at 16 Strathcona Avenue South, to permit the expansion and conversion of an existing single-detached dwelling to allow for the development of 5 condominium apartment units, with 2 parking spaces (see Appendix “B”). In review of the application, staff recognizes that the proposal employs adaptive re-use principles to maintain the character of the existing dwelling on the
street, and would utilize innovative and attractive architectural design, which would include a green roof (see Appendix “G”).

The proposal is unique and forward thinking in terms of promoting rapid transit use and alternative modes of travel in proximity to existing and planned transit corridors. The proposal would be consistent with the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement and Places to Grow Plan with respect to encouraging intensification.

However, notwithstanding the recognized merits, the proposal does not comply with the intent of the City of Hamilton Official Plan and the Hamilton Urban Official Plan in terms of intensification policies. Due to the massing and scale of the proposed building, there is a concern that the proposal would result in the development of an enlarged building on a small lot. To address the parking shortfall, the applicant is proposing a parking demand management strategy that relies on incentives that may be difficult to sustain over the long term. The proposal would exceed the recommended density requirement of 40-80 units per hectare in the draft Strathcona Neighbourhood Plan.

Alternatives for Consideration - See Page 25.

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

**Financial:** None.

**Staffing:** None.

**Legal:** As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property is located at 16 Strathcona Avenue South (Hamilton) and consists of an existing 2-½ storey building (circa early 1900’s) with a mansard style roof, which is currently being utilized as a lodging house for 10 lodgers. The lodging house is not licensed. The front yard has been paved in its entirety with a concrete surface to replace the former landscaping and to accommodate 3 vehicles. The parking spaces encroach partially into the right-of-way. The property also has legal frontage (4.5m) at the terminus of Edison Street, which forms a dead-end along a portion of the rear property line.
Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

The applicant is proposing a 4-storey rear walkout addition to allow for the development of 5 condominium apartment dwelling units within the expanded dwelling (2 units in the existing driveway, 3 units in the proposed addition). The proposed addition would be approximately 11.5 metres in length, and would have an overall gross floor area of 624.5 square metres (6,250 square feet). The proposed addition would be 1.6 metres lower in building height than the current dwelling due to the sloping nature of the rear yard and the use of a smaller roof. The individual units would range in area from 100 square metres to 141 square metres (1,000-1,400 square feet).

The applicant had initially proposed 5 parking spaces for the 5 units, consisting of the existing 3 spaces in the front yard and 2 spaces in the rear yard, with a new access proposed from Edison Street. The initial proposal also identified the use of rear yard balconies, which would project to within 2.6 metres of the rear property line. A green roof is also proposed for additional amenity space.

The parking arrangement was modified following a Neighbourhood Meeting. Vehicular access from Edison Street would be eliminated to address the concerns of the neighbours on Edison Street with respect to child safety and the removal of one permit parking space on the street. As such, the amended proposal is for 2 parking spaces for 5 units. Additional modifications include the provision of a rear courtyard having a depth of 5.59 metres in-lieu of a paved driveway, and the removal of the rear yard balconies. In recognition of the reduced parking requirements, the applicant is promoting a parking management strategy through incentives for the potential purchasers that include transit passes, scooters, car share plans, and facilities for the secure indoor storage of bicycles and scooters.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment would require a change in zoning from the “D” (Urban Protected Residential - One and Two Family Dwellings) to a Site-Specific “DE” (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District to permit the 5 condominium apartment units.

As outlined below, a number of Site-Specific Zoning provisions would be required for the “DE” District to address the following changes from the standard provisions for the development of the proposed 5 unit apartment condominium. Note: Although the property is a through lot with 2 front yards, Strathcona Avenue is deemed to be the front lot line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Provision</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>“DE” Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of Lot</td>
<td>11.56 metres</td>
<td>24 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Lot</td>
<td>370 square metres</td>
<td>800 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.
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Details of Submitted Application

Owner: Clark Cerello
Agent: A.J. Clarke and Associates (c/o Steve Fraser)
Location: 16 Strathcona Avenue South, south of King Street West (See Appendix “A”)
Property Size: Width: 11.55m
Depth: 31.69m
Area: 367.28 square metres

EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Lands:</strong></td>
<td><strong>“D” (Urban Protected Residential) District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not Licensed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surrounding Lands:**

| North, South, East, and West | Single-detached Dwellings | “D” (Urban Protected Residential) District |

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The following Provincial and local policy documents were examined in the review of these applications.
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Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement encourages residential intensification, the efficient use of land and infrastructure, and the promotion of healthy, livable, and safe communities. Among other factors, the promotion of efficient development and land use patterns, which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term, is identified as a key component in Policy 1.1.1 for maintaining healthy communities.

The proposal is consistent with Policy 1.1.3.1, which encourages growth to be focused in settlement areas.

Policy 1.1.3.2 directs that land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on the development of densities and a mix of land uses that use land efficiently, are appropriate for the available or planned infrastructure, and which minimize negative impacts to air quality and promote energy efficiency.

Policy 1.1.3.4 directs that appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification, redevelopment, and compact form, while maintaining appropriate levels of health and public safety.

Concerning this policy, staff notes that the proposal would achieve a certain compactness in form, which would meet the general intent of the Provincial Policy Statement.

The PPS further directs in Policies 1.4.1 and 1.4.3 that an appropriate range of housing types and densities are to be provided. The policy encourages variation in housing types and densities, providing the uses are appropriate for the area and allow for compatible development. The proposal would provide for the development of innovative housing that would utilize adaptive re-use principles to maintain the character of the existing streetscape and would meet the intent of this policy.

In addition, Policy 1.7.1 outlines that major facilities (i.e. airports, transportation corridors, industries, etc.) and sensitive land uses (i.e. residential dwellings) should be appropriately designed, buffered, and separated from each other to prevent adverse effects such as noise. Since the subject property is located approximately 70m from King Street West, 170m from Main Street West, and 320 metres from the Canadian Pacific Railway lands, which are major transportation corridors, there is a requirement for a noise study.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal would contribute to the provision of higher density development within the Strathcona Neighbourhood, which is generally consistent with the intent of the PPS.
Places to Grow

The subject property is within the “Built-up Area” of the Places to Grow Growth Plan, which includes the lands within the limits of the developed urban boundary.

The policies encourage development and redevelopment within the Built-up Area of the City, and encourage the provision of a range and mix of housing, which includes affordable housing needs. The direction provided in Places to Grow has also been incorporated into the City’s New Official Plan for the Urban Area to ensure that the growth management targets, as mandated by the Province, are met.

The City of Hamilton is required to accommodate 40% of all new residential growth within the Built-up Area starting in 2015. In addition, development is required to be designed to support public transit and maximize the use of existing infrastructure.

As the proposal would contribute to intensification within the Built-up Area of the City by providing for condominium apartment units which would support public transit use, it would generally meet the intent of the residential intensification objectives of the Growth Plan.

Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan

The subject property is designated as “Urban Area” in the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. Policy C-3.1.1 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.

Policy C-3.1.1 identifies that a compact higher density urban form, with mixed-use development in identified Regional and Municipal Centres and along corridors, best meets the environmental, social, and economic principles of sustainable development.

In terms of public transit objectives, Policy C.4.3.2.1 is supportive of optimizing transit service levels as a viable alternative to the automobile, and Policy C.4.3.2.7 promotes the concentration of high density development in the immediate proximity of major transit corridors.

The proposal would meet the general intent of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan in terms of creating a compact, higher density urban form, which is supportive of public transit.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal conforms to the intent of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.
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Hamilton Official Plan

The subject property is designated “Residential” in the Hamilton Official Plan, which identifies in Policy A.2.1.1 that the primary uses are for dwellings. The policies which are of relevance to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment include the following:

“A. 2.1.8 It is the intent of Council that a variety of housing styles, types, and densities be available in all RESIDENTIAL areas of the City, and further, that proposals for new development or redevelopment will contribute to the desired mix of housing, where practicable. In this regard, Council will be guided by the Housing Policies of Subsection C.7 and the Neighbourhood Plan Policies of Subsection D.2.

A.2.1.10 Subject to the Ontario Building Code, as amended from time-to-time, development and redevelopment designs, which reflect improved energy efficiency and take into account innovations in building technology, will be encouraged.

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

A.2.1.14 In evaluating the merits of any proposal for multiple-family RESIDENTIAL development, Council will be satisfied that the following considerations are met:

(i) The height, bulk, and arrangement of buildings and structures will achieve harmonious design and integrate with the surrounding areas; and,

(ii) Appropriate open space, including landscaping and buffering, will be provided to maximize the privacy of residents and minimize the impact on adjacent lower density uses.

C.7.1 (i) 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: provision and maintenance of adequate off-street parking.

C.7.2 Varieties of RESIDENTIAL types will not be mixed indiscriminately, but will be arranged in a gradation so that higher-density developments will complement those of a lower density, with sufficient spacing to maintain privacy amenity and value.
C.7.3 Council will encourage a RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT of an adequate physical condition that contains a variety of housing forms that will meet the needs of present and future residents. Accordingly, Council will:

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

(ix) Support the concept of a RESIDENTIAL community that provides a diversity of dwelling forms and housing options accessible to all Hamilton residents.

(xi) Encourage development at densities conducive to the efficient operation of Public Transit, and which utilizes designs or construction techniques that are energy efficient.

D.2.2 The detailed planning for the distribution and location of various land uses in each PLANNING UNIT will be determined or reviewed through the preparation of NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS. In this regard, Council will ensure that all new development and/or redevelopment complies with the provision of this PLAN and the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN. However, Council may permit a minor extension to, or the intensification of, an existing use or a use that is deemed temporary which does not meet the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, provided that such a use is appropriately regulated in the Zoning By-law.”

In terms of the above-noted policies, staff is of the opinion that the proposal would not meet the intent of Policy A.2.1.13 and Policy A.2.1.14 (i) because the proposed expanded building would be substantially larger than existing dwellings along Strathcona Avenue South, which would affect residential character with respect to building massing and the integration of the use with adjacent dwellings. However, the proposal would maintain the existing character of the streetscape because the front façade (facing Strathcona) would not be affected.

The proposed massing would not be consistent with the character of the lower density dwellings in this area, which are located on comparable-sized lots. Staff is of the opinion that the size, height, and massing of the enlarged dwelling would contribute to potential overview, reduced privacy, and possibly overshadow, for the abutting neighbours.
In particular, the proposed building would have approximately 50% lot coverage, and would maintain reduced side yard setbacks which are not characteristic of a multiple dwelling. In comparison, lot coverages for apartment zones, where regulated, are typically in the range of 25%-30% to accommodate parking, access, landscaping, and amenity areas, and to allow for appropriate siting (i.e. setbacks) to minimize impacts on adjacent uses. The proposed addition would also be more than twice the length of the existing dwelling, and would be larger and higher than the sizeable addition on the abutting property to the north, which is only one-storey.

Policy C.7.1 provides direction for the provision of adequate parking for infill proposals. The revised proposal would not allow for adequate parking on site consistent with current standards (i.e. 0.8 -1.0 spaces per unit), and the proposed incentives to address alternative travel modes and the shortfall of parking, while innovative, are not considered to be sustainable over the long term.

Respecting Policy C.7.2, it is noted that the proposed 5 unit building is bounded on either side by single-detached dwellings, and a higher density apartment building is located on the opposite side of Strathcona at the corner of King Street West. On this basis, the proposal would represent a minimal gradation in density, which could be supported if the massing of the building was to be reduced.

Certain aspects of the proposal may be considered innovative, such as the use of a green roof to facilitate improved runoff, and for additional amenity area as provided in Policy A.2.1.10, and the incentives for public transit and other alternative modes of transportation, as provided in Policy C.7.3(xi). Staff's concern however, is that these matters should not be viewed in isolation of the other policies. Due to concerns with the height, massing, and size of the proposed addition to accommodate the 5 apartment condominium units, and the deficiency in off-street parking, staff is of the opinion that the proposal does not meet the intent of the Hamilton Official Plan.

**Strathcona Approved Neighbourhood Plan**

The subject lands are designated “Single and Double Residential” in the approved Strathcona Neighbourhood Plan. Approval of the application received necessitates a redesignation to “Low Density Apartments”.

**Strathcona Neighbourhood Secondary Plan**

The subject property is designated Low Density Residential in the draft Strathcona Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, which is presently on “hold”, pending the completion of two transportation studies affecting this area, which are the Strathcona Transportation Management Study and the City-Wide Rapid Transit Initiative.
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The Low Density Residential designation permits single-detached, semi-detached, duplexes, street townhouses, and multiple dwellings at a density of 40-80 units per hectare, whereas the proposal would yield a density of 135 units per hectare.

On this basis, the proposal would not meet the intent of the draft Strathcona Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

**City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan (Council Approved)**

The subject property is designated “Neighbourhoods” in the Hamilton Urban Official Plan.

Policies 2.4.1.3c) and 2.3.3.4 directs that 40% of the City’s Residential Intensification target is expected to occur within the Neighbourhoods designation, which is approximately 26,500 units to be built between 2015 and 2031. Within the Built-Up area, the subject property is more specifically identified within the Central Area on Appendix “G”.

The subject lands are also identified as being within a Primary Corridor on Schedule “E”, which is a primary intensification area. The subject property is part of the Primary Corridor, which extends westward between King Street West and Main Street West from Queen Street to Cootes Drive. Primary Corridors are linked by a higher order of transit services.

Residential Intensification proposals are generally evaluated on the basis of the following criteria provided in Section B.2.4.1.4:

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

(b) The development’s contribution to maintaining and achieving a range of dwelling types and tenures;

(c) The compatible integration of the development with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form, and character. In this regard, the City encourages the use of innovative and creative urban design techniques;

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

(e) Infrastructure and transportation capacity; and,

(f) The ability of the development to comply with all applicable policies.”
More specifically, proposals in the Neighbourhood’s designation are subject to the following evaluation criteria provided in Section B.2.4.2.2:

“(a) The matters listed in Section B.2.4.1.4;

(b) Compatibility with adjacent land uses, including matters such as shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, traffic, and other nuisance effects;

(c) The relationship of the proposed buildings with the height, massing, and scale of nearby residential buildings;

(d) The consideration of transitions in height and density to adjacent residential buildings;

(e) The relationship of the proposed lot with the lot pattern and configuration within the neighbourhood;

(f) The provision of amenity space and the relationship to existing patterns of private and public amenity space;

(g) The ability to respect or enhance the streetscape patterns, including block lengths, setbacks, and building separations;

(h) The ability to complement the existing functions of the neighbourhood;

(i) The conservation of cultural heritage resources; and,

(j) Infrastructure and transportation capacity impacts.”

On the basis of the proposed density, which would be 135 units per hectare, the proposal would be considered a high density residential use. High Density Residential development is intended to occur within the context of the following policies:

- Policy 3.6.1 - the preferred location is on the periphery of neighbourhoods in proximity to major or minor arterial roads.

- Policy 3.6.4 - the location should also be within safe and convenient walking distance of existing or planned community facilities, services, including public transit, schools, and active or passive transit services.

- Policy 3.6.6.c) - the permitted net residential density is between 100 units per hectare and 200 units per hectare in the Neighbourhoods designation.

Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.
Values: Honest, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork
The list of criteria for evaluating high density residential proposals is provided in Policy 3.6.7; however, given the generally low building form and the limited number of units, it would be appropriate to consider the proposal based on the criteria provided in Policy B.2.4.2.2 for residential intensification.

Urban Design policies apply to all forms of development and are provided in Section B.3.3. The following policies are noted as they are considered to be relevant to the proposed rezoning:

“3.3.1 Urban Design Goals:

3.3.1.4 Create communities that are transit-supportive and promote active transportation;

3.3.1.8 Promote intensification that makes appropriate and innovative use of buildings and sites, and is compatible in form and function to the character of existing communities and neighbourhoods;

3.3.1.9 Encourage innovative community design and technologies;

3.3.1.10 Create urban places and spaces that improve air quality and are resistant to the impacts of climate change;

3.3.2.3 Urban Design Principles:

3.3.2.3a) Respecting existing character, development patterns, built form, and landscape;

3.3.2.3b) Promoting quality design consistent with the locale and the surrounding environment; and,

3.3.2.3g) Contributing to the character and ambience of the community through appropriate design of streetscapes and amenity areas.”

The Hamilton Urban Official Plan also supports proposals which encourage energy efficiency, innovation, and environmental design in Section 3.7. In particular, the following matters from Policy 3.7.2 are supported and would have relevance to this proposal:

“3.7.2g) Designs that encourage sustainable forms of transportation, including active transportation, transit, and energy conserving vehicles;

3.7.2j) Water and storm water conservation/management practices such as green roofs, water recycling systems, urban swales.”
With respect to the above-noted policies, the proposal would be located within a Primary Intensification Area, which would support future intensification initiatives. It is the opinion of staff that the proposed expanded dwelling would result in over-development for this site, and would not meet the residential intensification criteria of B.2.4.1.4 with respect to:

- Compatibility with adjacent land uses in terms of shadowing and overlook;
- The relationship to existing buildings in terms of massing and scale; and,
- Transitions in height for adjacent dwellings.

As noted, the proposed enlargement of the building would introduce new building development into the rear yard of the subject property, which would extend beyond the existing limits of development, and which would employ massing which is much greater than other dwellings in the area. The proposed development of a 4-storey addition in close proximity to abutting property lines (i.e. 1.2m) may affect privacy and create affects of overshadowing for the abutting neighbours (see Appendix “G”). It would also be much greater in massing and height than the abutting property to the north.

In terms of urban design principles, the size and mass of the proposed building addition does not follow the existing established built form for the area because the amount of lot coverage and building massing would be much greater than for the surrounding development. A reduction in the extent of the proposed addition, in terms of length and height to provide a less intrusive building presence on the subject property may, however, be considered as an alternative to the current proposal.

The proposal would meet the intent of the new policy direction to encourage increased transit use and alternative modes of travel through various incentives which the developer is intending to pursue through the sale of the units under condominium ownership. However, it is staff’s view that the policies to encourage transit use and alternative travel still need to be properly developed and implemented to provide long-term solutions that will best serve the community.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal would not conform to the residential intensification policies of the Hamilton Urban Official Plan due to the scale and massing of the proposed building.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

In accordance with the Public Participation Policy, this application was pre-circulated to all property owners within 120 metres, and a sign was posted on the site. A total of 383 notices were circulated. There were 15 letters submitted from the public for the
circulation of this application. The letters identified concerns with traffic, safety, access, street parking, density, and character changes to neighbourhood, primarily with respect to Edison Street (see Appendix “F”). On April 21, 2010, an Informal Public Meeting was held by the applicant, which was attended by the Ward Councillor and 16 residents.

Notice of the Public Meeting will be given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act through the circulation to property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands and through the posting of a sign on the property.

### RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The Recreation Division, Community Services Department, had no concerns or objections to the proposed application.

**Forestry and Horticulture**

There is a concern that a Red Maple, located at 14 Strathcona Avenue South, will be affected due to the development of hard surfaces. The hard surfaces between the south side of the tree and the stairs at 16 Strathcona Avenue South should be returned to soft surface, through the removal of concrete and the replacement with topsoil and sodding.

A professionally stamped landscape plan shall be required to show trees on the Edison Street side in the event that a new driveway is proposed at the time of Site Plan Approval.

**Rapid Transit Initiative**

The property is located within the Main/King/Queenston Corridor, which is shown as a Primary Corridor in the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

The new Plan identifies Primary Corridors as the primary area for re-urbanization activities such as population growth and infrastructure investment, and the location for higher order transit. The urban corridors are also to be the primary location for intensification in the City.

The City is currently evaluating options for the development of a B-Line Rapid Transit Corridor along King Street West. From a rapid transit perspective, the application would result in additional units and, therefore, population that supports existing transit and future rapid transit projects through the corridor.

The site is shown as part of a Primary Corridor in the New Plan, but is designated Neighbourhoods in the New Official Plan.
Traffic Engineering

Traffic Engineering was initially concerned that vehicles exiting the north garage of the proposed addition from Edison Street may not be able to manoeuvre properly due to the narrow nature of the lot.

The south garage would allow for suitable ingress and egress. (Note - The proposal has since been modified to remove the parking from the rear yard that would be accessible from Edison Street.)

Hamilton Municipal Parking System

A Special Paving Agreement was enacted June 15, 1981, between the property owner and the City, where approval was granted to establish a single parking space with a single approach on the south side of the property. Although the entire frontage has been paved to accommodate additional vehicles, any vehicles parked beyond the limits of the existing driveway approach are subject to parking infractions for illegal boulevard parking.

Should the applicant chose to utilize the boulevard on Strathcona Avenue for the purpose of parking, the conversion of the dwelling will require that all parking within the boulevard be accessible via a single access driveway approach. The proposed parking layout is not acceptable. A parking layout plan, and a letter of intent to enter into a Commercial Boulevard Parking Agreement, would need to be submitted for review.

The applicant must ensure that all parking requirements are met on-site, as overflow on-street parking is not to be an option on Edison Street due to parking by permit only.

Parking on Strathcona Avenue South is unrestricted, but is in very high demand, and any additional overflow parking generated by this site is likely to burden the existing residents on Strathcona. The proposed building would not qualify for on-street permits on Edison Street, or for any time exemption permits, if required in the future.

The proposed access off Edison Street would need to be provided in such a way as to not impact the on-street parking layout on Edison Street.

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

(include Performance Measurement/Benchmarking Data, if applicable)

1. The amended proposal would meet the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement, Places to Grow, and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, which support residential intensification, public transit use, and compact forms of development. However, the proposal cannot be supported for the following reasons:
(ii) It does not comply with the intent of the policies of the Hamilton Official Plan and the Hamilton Urban Official Plan in terms of meeting the intensification policies due to the proposed scale and massing of the building and the lack of sufficient parking; and,

(ii) It would conflict with the Strathcona Neighbourhood Plan in terms of exceeding the preferred density for the Strathcona Avenue South area.

2. Residential intensification is one of the City’s most current and important planning considerations, and is necessary for accommodating future growth. The City’s Intensification Strategy notes that 20% of all growth will be in the Downtown Urban Growth Centre, 40% in urban nodes and corridors, and 40% in Neighbourhoods. The need for a balanced approach to intensification, based on sound planning and design principles, is necessary to ensure that new projects will be compatible with existing development, and will have a “good fit” within established neighbourhoods.

The new Urban Official Plan defines “compatibility” as being land uses and building forms that are mutually tolerant and capable of existing together in harmony with the area. “Compatibility” or “compatible” should not be narrowly interpreted to mean the same as, or even as being similar to. The intensification of small lots such as the subject property is particularly important in order to maintain neighbourhood character and to minimize impacts on adjacent properties. In addition, the establishment of precedents is also an issue for future development considerations with the introduction of new standards, such as reduced parking.

The policy context for evaluating the merits of the current intensification proposal includes, among others, the following:

- The use of appropriate densities and development standards (PPS, Policy 1.1.3.4);
- The need for the height, design, and arrangement of buildings and structures to achieve harmonious design and integration with the surrounding area (Hamilton Official Plan, Policy A.2.1.14);
- The provision of adequate parking (Hamilton Official Plan, Policy C.7.1.1i);
- The consideration of height massing and scale of other nearby residential buildings and transitions in height (The Hamilton Urban Official Plan, Policy B.2.4.2.2); and,
• The consideration of existing character, built form, development patterns and
landscape. (The Hamilton Urban Official Plan, Policy B.3.3).

The merits of the proposed building are recognized in terms of the attractive
architecture and design of the proposed addition, which maintains the existing
streetscape along Strathcona Avenue North; the use of innovative building
techniques, such as a “green” roof, to provide additional amenity space; the
support of public transit and alternative modes of transit, and the developer’s
willingness to work with the neighbours along Edison Street to address access
and parking concerns.

However, the proposal does not meet the intent of the above-noted policies for
the following reasons:

• The proposal would substantially exceed the scale and massing of adjacent
dwellings;

• The proposal does not provide adequate on-site parking; and,

• The proposal does not provide a suitable transition in height to minimize the
effects of overview and overshadowing.

As a result, the proposal would need to be modified further to reduce the size of
units, to acquire additional parking, and to maintain an appropriate scale that will
provide for a better integration with the neighbourhood.

3. The applicant has submitted a revised concept plan with the application (see
Appendix “C”). The proposal does not meet the requirements of Hamilton Zoning
By-law 6593, and would require a number of major modifications to the “DE”
District based on the specific nature of the proposed building design. An analysis
of the zoning issues is provided in the discussion below:

(1) Reduced Parking Requirements

The current parking requirements for the proposed 5 unit dwelling are 7
parking spaces based on 1.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit, of which
0.25 spaces are required for visitor’s parking. Based on the applicant’s
current design, 2 parking spaces are proposed in the front yard only, a
requirement of 0.4 spaces per unit, in order to remove access for rear yard
parking from Edison Street.

In lieu of requiring parking spaces for all of the condominium owners, the
applicant is proposing incentives that will attract condominium purchasers
that do not require automobiles, and who can rely on transit and
alternative modes of travel for their personal transportation needs. The incentives include the provision of electric scooters for prospective purchasers, and an accessible and secure storage area within the building for scooters, motorcycles, and bikes, and the offering of transit passes for local and inter-City use (i.e. Go Train).

The purpose is to create a multiple unit building that can exist with reduced parking due to optimized public transit use and alternative modes of travel, in recognition of the proximity of the property to transit services and to existing commercial services along Dundurn Street to the west. The site is located approximately 83m from King Street West, and is 185m to Main Street West. Parking for visitors cannot be provided on the site, and would need to be provided as-needed along Strathcona Avenue South. Strathcona Avenue currently permits public parking and is not regulated by the parking pass program.

The applicant’s Parking Study has identified that Strathcona Avenue South is operating at approximately 81% capacity for on-street parking since many of the dwellings are without driveways and require on-street parking. The Parking Study was undertaken based on the applicant’s intention to provide 1 space per unit. However, the removal of 3 parking spaces from the subject site for 5 condominium units is likely to create conflicts and may displace existing parking users along Strathcona Avenue South.

The reduced parking provisions would be lower than the requirements for multiple unit dwellings in the Downtown provided in By-law 05-200, which are based on 1.0 space per unit, with the exception of 0.3 spaces per unit for units under 50 square metres in gross floor area. In reviewing this matter, staff would note that the proposal is introducing a parking standard which does not currently exist in the City and for which there is limited empirical information (see Item 5).

Parking reductions for areas outside of the Downtown would typically be for proposals in which there is both the availability of public transit and good access to amenities, such as shopping and parks. In such cases, the reduction would generally be to permit 1 space per unit, which provides some assurance for visitor parking to minimize street parking in the event that not all residents will own vehicles. However, in the rezoning of 427 Aberdeen Avenue, a further reduction to 0.8 spaces per unit was permitted for a new 32-unit apartment building at the corner of Aberdeen Avenue and Locke Street South due to the availability of transit and amenities.
The merits of public transit use are recognized in Places to Grow and the Hamilton Urban Official Plan, particularly in Policy 3.7.2g), which supports “designs that encourage sustainable forms of transportation, including active transportation, transit, and energy conserving vehicles”. In addition, climate change policies also encourage alternative modes of travel to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A further consideration is the positioning of the site between the Downtown, McMaster University, and Innovation Park to attract working professionals who are able to utilize public transit or alternative modes of travel.

Notwithstanding the proximity to high levels of public transit and the relatively small nature of the use, there is merit in considering reduced parking requirements in proximity to major transit corridors. However, the proposal provides assumptions for parking reductions that are much greater than current policies, and Best Practices would suggest for locations outside of the Downtown. An important consideration is that the choice to commute by public transit does not necessarily mean that the commuter does not own a personal vehicle, particularly within a 2-person household, which is a possible scenario based on the size of the proposed condominium units. Also, with parking reduced appreciably below the City’s current standards, there are no controls that would prevent a condominium owner from later purchasing a vehicle for on-street parking. If a person’s circumstances change (i.e. employment location or health), they may need to acquire a vehicle for commuting purposes. On a street with very limited additional parking, this could create problems for existing home owners as parking supply is currently close to capacity as previously indicated by Municipal Parking staff.

(2) Front Yard Parking

Due to the location and size of the existing dwelling, the proposal would require the continued use of front yard parking, which is not permitted for multiple unit dwellings in the “DE” District. Under the proposed arrangement, vehicles would be required to reverse onto the street rather than exit in a forward manner without a manoeuvring space. In this regard, the proposed use would maintain the standard currently used for single or semi detached dwellings. Front yard parking would need to be limited to 2 vehicles, both for aesthetic purposes and since additional curb cuts (i.e. to permit 3 spaces) would not be permitted. The current proposal would involve the provision of additional landscaping in the front yard to replace concrete portions that would not be required for parking.
Additional changes through the amending zoning would also be necessary to address the limited size of the parking spaces and the need for encroachments onto the City’s road allowance. The proposed parking spaces would have dimensions of 2.7 metres by 4.4 metres, rather than 2.7 metres by 6.0 metres, with the encroachment accounting for 1.6 metres.

(3) Reduced Lot Width and Lot Area

The proposed expanded building to establish a 5 unit multiple dwelling would require site-specific regulations to address substantial reductions in lot area and lot width. The proposed lot width for a small multiple unit building in the “DE” District is 24 metres, whereas the proposed lot width is only 11.55 metres, which is less than 50% of the requirement. The proposed lot area for a small multiple unit building in the “DE” District is 800 square metres, whereas the proposed lot width is 370 square metres, which is also less than 50% of the required area.

The current provisions are performance standards, which are in place to ensure compatibility and public safety with other uses, to allow for proper building siting, and to accommodate landscaping, amenity areas, and adequate parking areas. The proposal would establish a lot coverage of 50%, which creates an overdeveloped site and leaves limited space for other amenities. As a result of the site limitations in conjunction with the large building massing, it would not be possible to accommodate both the required landscaping and parking areas on the subject property.

Special provisions, either to reduce or remove parking or landscaping, would be required in order for the project to function. As noted, the consideration of reduced parking requirements for the site, based on transit use, as proposed, would preserve greenspace and limit the intrusion of parking into the rear yard; however, it may not be a sustainable solution over the long term.

(4) Side Yard Setbacks

The proposed building addition identifies side yard setbacks of 1.2 and 1.4 metres, which generally maintain the existing line of development and the setback for the “D” District. The “DE” District, however, typically requires setbacks of 3 metres to provide for proper building siting between uses, particularly with lower density development, to maintain appropriate levels of privacy, and to minimize the effects of overshadow and overview.
Due to the scale and massing of the building addition, the proposed side yards would result in development which is slightly intrusive because it would extend the building nearly the length of the property. The proposed addition would be less intrusive for abutting neighbours if the building height was reduced to create a better transition for at least part of the addition, and if the building was limited to the existing rear setback of the abutting property to the north.

(5) Building Height

The proposed building height of 10.9m would contribute to massing issues such as overview and overshadowing, which may affect adjacent properties. As noted, the proposal would need to be further reduced in height through the removal of one or more floors to address these impacts given the small nature of the lot.

(6) Rear Yard

The proposed addition would provide a rear yard of 5.59 metres, whereas the “DE” District would require 7.5 metres. In light of the narrow nature of the lot, and the large building addition that is proposed, the rear yard should be ideally increased to provide a better fit of the building with abutting dwellings.

(7) Landscaped Area

The proposed addition would provide approximately 20% landscaped area on the site, whereas the requirement under the “DE” District is for 25% landscaped area. In addition, a green roof is proposed, which would allow for additional amenity area. The proposed landscaped area has been improved in the revised proposal only through the removal of parking and manoeuvring areas in the rear yard. Ideally, the landscaped area could be increased through the reduction of the building size to provide a better integration of the expanded building with neighbouring properties.

4. In accordance with the City’s public participation policies, notice of a complete application was circulated to the neighbouring property owners. In response to this notice, 15 letters were received from residents of this area (see Appendix “E”). The concerns identified relate to the initial circulation, which proposed access from Edison Street and includes the following matters:

- Traffic;
- Parking;
- Children’s Safety;
- Snow Removal;
- Drainage;
- Density and Scale of Development;
- Changes to Character of Area; and,
- Nuisances.

The specific concerns and analysis of the issues relate primarily to the initial proposal to access rear yard parking from Edison Street and are provided in the following discussion:

Traffic

The concerns expressed relate primarily to the potential for increased traffic on Edison Street for the proposed rear driveway, which has been removed in the "revised" proposal.

Parking

Concerns were expressed with the loss of one or more street parking spaces on Edison Street and the need to find alternative parking elsewhere in the neighbourhood. Residents of Edison Street are of the opinion that the required parking should be provided on the Strathcona side, and not along Edison Street. In the "revised" proposal, the access from Edison Street was removed.

Children’s Safety

The concerns relate to the common use of the end of Edison Street as a relatively safe area for outdoor play for children within the neighbourhood (i.e. road hockey, outdoor games). As the subject property extends the width of Edison Street, there are concerns that this area would be removed to accommodate a driveway or that it would be too unsafe to use. (Note - This concern would not currently apply due to the removal of the driveway access from Edison Street).

Snow Removal

The concerns with snow removal relate to how the proposed rear driveway would impact the current practice of piling snow at the end of Edison Street. The development of a new driveway at the end of Edison Street would remove most of the space for snow to be stockpiled. Residents along Edison Street are concerned that snow may not be able to be cleared if the new rear driveway for 16 Strathcona Avenue South were to be developed.
Drainage

The drainage concerns are with respect to whether the proposed addition and rear driveway would create drainage problems, such as flooded basements, for the abutting neighbours along Edison Street due to extensive re-grading and the proposed driveway and parking areas.

Typically, this matter would be addressed at the Site Plan Approval stage through storm water management to ensure that drainage from the site is diverted into the City’s sewer system.

Density and Scale of Development

The concerns expressed are that the size of the building would be doubled, which is not consistent with the surrounding single-detached development in this area.

Changes to Character of Area

The concerns expressed relate to changes to the end of Edison Street (i.e. proposed driveway access), which has been shown to be an important feature for locating to the area. Concerns also indicate that the massing and scale of the proposed building are uncharacteristic of the historical nature of the area.

Nuisance Issues

Concerns were expressed about construction activity and the use of excavating equipment for the addition at the end of Edison Street.

In addition, several letters of support were provided. The positive comments identified the proposal as being interesting and appropriate for the neighbourhood, making efficient use of space, beneficial for tax savings, environmentally forward thinking, and the attempt to provide improvements to an existing street (i.e. the end of Edison Street).

The applicant held an Open House for the residents on April 21, 2010, to discuss the concerns with the proposal. The applicant agreed to remove the proposed parking from the Edison Street side in a “revised” proposal, which has appeased many of the Edison Street neighbour’s earlier concerns with respect to traffic, children’s safety, snow removal, and street parking.
5. The City does not currently have specific alternative parking standards in place to address parking reductions that are based on proximity to public transit or incentives for public transit and alternative modes of travel, however, transportation demand management measures (i.e. car sharing), to reduce parking requirements, are mentioned in the Hamilton Urban Official Plan in Policy 4.2.4.1. Moreover, the City’s requirements for reduced parking in the Downtown recognize the optimized transit opportunities within the City Centre, and are considered to be among the lowest of any major Canadian municipality.

A review of current Canadian findings by CMHC for Transit-Oriented Development indicates that reductions for parking are most common for large-scale and mixed-use developments that are in proximity to rail or rapid transit stations (i.e. mostly Downtown locations within 0.6 kms or less), or those which are located along major transit lines. The adjusted parking requirements with the reductions ranged from 1 space per unit for Metropole in Ottawa to over 1.5 spaces per unit for Port Credit Village in Mississauga. The adjusted parking requirements, in most cases, were found to be higher than the City’s current parking requirements for multiple dwellings outside of the downtown.

The incentives for reduced parking that are proposed for this application include transit passes, secure storage for bicycles and scooters, the provision of a scooter with each condominium purchase, and car share memberships. These incentives are recognized in current planning literature as viable options to encourage reduced parking within urban areas and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; however, they are not commonly used at this time.

Of the municipalities which provide incentives for apartment developments in proximity to major transit corridors, the City of Victoria, BC has adopted adjustment factors which provide reductions for car share services through a 5-10% reduction in parking, if the development is located close to such a service.

Additional findings indicate that where transit passes were introduced, transit reductions for parking for apartments have been granted by up to 21% in Saanich, BC, and up to 15% in Montgomery County, Maryland.

The findings illustrate that a conservative approach is followed at this time for considering reductions in parking based on proximity to transit services and for other incentives. One consideration for generally maintaining the 1 space per unit requirement is that there is a likelihood that condominium owners outside of the downtown may also own vehicles in which the choice to commute by transit or other mode of travel may be more geared to convenience and preference, rather than due to necessity. This rationale would be applicable to condominium ownership as well due to the likelihood of higher income levels than for rental accommodations, in which vehicles could be purchased, if required. The parking
proposed is, therefore, not supportable because it would be too far below the City’s accepted standards, and the incentives, while innovative, are not a guaranteed long-term solution for the application of reduced parking requirements.

6. If the application is approved, an Amending By-law will be required to address new Zoning provisions for the property under a Site-Specific “DE” (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District. Special zoning provisions would be required to address minimum lot width, minimum lot area, reduced setbacks, reduced parking, parking space location, and minimum landscaped area that would be required for the proposed development.

An application for Site Plan Approval would be required to address issues related to the development of the site, which include conformity to the approved zoning, site grading, storm water management, landscaping, parking, and building design.

The approval and registration of a plan of condominium would also be required for the units to be purchased and sold under condominium ownership.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

(include Financial, Staffing, Legal and Policy Implications and pros and cons for each alternative)

Should the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application be denied, the existing building could continue to be utilized for any of the uses permitted under the “D” District of Hamilton Zoning By-law 06593.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN**  (Linkage to Desired End Results)


**Environmental Stewardship**

- The proposal does provide an innovative approach to encourage public transit use and alternative modes of travel. However, the proposal does not meet acceptable parking standards.
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Appendix “B” to Report PED10147
Proposed Conceptual Site Plan for
16 Strathcona Avenue South
(Page 1 of 1)
To: Brian McHattie, Ward 1 Alderman

Dear Mr. McHattie,

I am writing in support of a proposed condominium project by Clark Cerello. Mr. Cerello's plans for a 4 unit condo renovation for his property on Strathcona in downtown Hamilton are interesting and, I believe, appropriate for the neighbourhood. My children and their mother currently reside on Henry Street, accessed from New Street, a similar position to Edison Street, the proposed rear entrance to the Strathcona address. The current condition of the end of Edison Street is unkempt and messy in appearance. I think the street will benefit from a clean residential appearance offered by this project. I also understand that parking spaces for each of the units is included in Mr. Cerello's plan so there would be no impact on the current on-street parking situation for area residents and owners.

I have reviewed the proposed condo plans and they are environmentally forward-thinking and pay respect to the existing architecture and neighbourhood character. If you wish to discuss my support of this project further I can be reached at this email address.

Yours Truly,

Mark Tharne
Thomas, Cameron

From: Sue Yarwood
Sent: Saturday, January 02, 2010 11:22 AM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Cc: Cam and Kim
Subject: Edison St.

To Whom It May Concern,

As residents of #7 Edison St. we wish to officially object to the proposed creation of a driveway from #16 Strathcona onto the presently, dead end of Edison St. The nature of Edison St. is defined by the fact that it is a dead end. The concensus of our community is that we bought properties on this street precisely because of the safety and self contained quality of the street. Between the 8 houses located on our cul-de-sac we have 6 children under age 8 who frequently play at the end of the street where they know they are safe from traffic. Many other children from the neighbourhood use the dead ends of Henry and Edison Streets to play safely away from New St. which is often viewed as a test track for the customers of Sturges Cycle. The creation of a driveway would not only bring a huge increase of traffic it would create a blind spot whereby drivers and children would be unable to see each other. This is a disastrous proposal for the safety of our kids! We look forward to meeting with you in order to demonstrate how very much this supposedly minor proposal would redefine our community.

Sincerely,

Sue Yarwood
Tom Giancani and Isabel (age 5)

Windows Live: Make it easier for your friends to see what you're up to on Facebook.
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To: Cam Thomas, City Planner

Dear Mr. Thomas,

I am writing in support of a proposed condominium project by Clark Cerello. Mr. Cerello's plans for a 4 unit condo renovation for his property on Strathcona in downtown Hamilton are interesting and, I believe, appropriate for the neighbourhood. My children and their mother currently reside on Henry Street, accessed from New Street, a similar position to Edison Street, the proposed rear entrance to the Strathcona address. The current condition of the end of Edison Street is unkempt and messy in appearance. I think the street will benefit from a clean residential appearance offered by this project. I also understand that parking spaces for each of the units is included in Mr. Cerello's plan so there would be no impact on the current on-street parking situation for area residents and owners.

I have reviewed the proposed condo plans and they are environmentally forward-thinking and pay respect to the existing architecture and neighbourhood character. If you wish to discuss my support of this project further I can be reached at this email address.

Yours Truly,

Mark Tharme
Appendix “F” to Report PED10147
Letters from Residents
(Page 4 of 17)

Thomas, Cameron

From: Jennifer Banaszak
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2009 12:05 AM
To: Thomas, Cameron

Subject: Objections to the Zoning by-law Amendment Proposal of 16 Strathcona South, Hamilton

Dear Mr. Thomas,

Regarding file no. ZAC-09-045, Zoning by-law Amendment Proposal of 16 Strathcona Street South, Hamilton

We are the residents of 9 Edison Street, Jen and Stef Banaszak, the house directly in front of the proposed driveway. We have reviewed the building and by-law amendment proposal and have the following objections to the Edison Street access driveway:

1) First and foremost, neighborhood children’s safety. Many of the children, who live on Edison, New, and Henry Streets play at the end of Edison St. It would needlessly endanger their lives and take away one of the areas in which they play if the driveway goes through. More personally, we are the house that is most directly affected by the driveway, and one of the reasons we bought this particular house was the safety of a dead-end street for our 3 and a half year old son, River.

2) Parking: It is difficult to get parking in this neighborhood, which is, I believe, why the developer wants to put parking in the back of the property. However, this does not benefit the parking situation of anyone on Edison St. If anything, it makes it worse: we will lose at least one parking space on the road, perhaps two. This means that residents and guests of Edison St. alike will have to try and find parking elsewhere. New St. is the next best option, but this is often very difficult because of Sturgess Cycle patrons. These patrons and other visitors (to non-Edison residents) often ignore the ‘Permit Parking Only’ signs on Edison, as I am predicting, guests of the Strathcona home most likely will as well. As it is, residents of Edison who rely on the permit parking of Edison, are already forced to park on New St., or even the Fortino’s parking lot at times. This is particularly troublesome for some of our elderly neighbors as well as those with small children.

3) Snow Removal: The proposed driveway is going to be in the exact place where the snow from the street is piled. It is very difficult to get the street plowed as it is. Logically speaking, if the driveway were to go in, it would be impossible to accomplish snow removal. The snow would have to be physically removed in a dump truck or something of the sort, not to mention the added snow from the proposed 3-car parking lot, which would mean added cost to the city and inconvenience to the residents. I also predict a general winter mayhem as people will go to any means in an attempt to drive an unplowed street after heavy snowfall. As Edison often is not plowed, a group effort on the part of residents is required to free the street of it’s snow and we cannot imagine what another 3 car parking lot at the end of the street is going to do to improve this situation.

4) Changing Traffic Flow: Most of the residents of Edison St. have bought houses here because of the appeal of a dead-end street. It is one of the defining features of Edison. No one on the street is willing to lose that in exchange for the parking convenience of 3 theoretical tenants of a proposed addition that doesn’t even have an Edison St. address. Putting the driveway in will take away one of the biggest reasons we bought our house as well as the resale value of our home. We are presently having drawings made and plans finalized to completely remove and rebuild the grade and landscaping of our property and were hoping to ask the city who to contact regarding repairs to existing retaining wall where the driveway is proposed. If we had any idea that this driveway was a possibility, we may have considered taking our money and putting it into a neighborhood where we could sit on our front porch and watch our kids play instead of the residents of a completely different street enjoying their private parking. We are not an alley for the convenience of a Strathcona resident.

5) Strathcona Issue: The proposed by-law amendment and addition is for a Strathcona address. Parking for these proposed tenants should be on Strathcona. If Strathcona cannot absorb an extra three parked cars, then perhaps they cannot sustain three extra units. Once again, the point is that Edison St. is neither an alley way, a cut-through nor an outflow pipe for Strathcona. While the tenants of the proposed addition would benefit in terms of convenience for this driveway to go through, not a single person on Edison St. benefits from it. It lowers our property values, takes away a defining feature of the street, and increases the danger to children in the neighborhood and snow-removal costs for the city. This driveway cannot be allowed to happen.

We do not have an issue with the house addition itself, but we will not allow car access for that property to be cut through to Edison St.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jen and Stef Banaszak

12/30/2009
Objections to the Zoning by-law Amendment Proposal of 16 Strathcona Street South,
Hamilton Ontario, file no. ZAC-09-048

We, the undersigned, are the residents of Edison Street and we have reviewed the
building and by-law amendment proposal for 16 Strathcona St. South. We have the
following objections to the Edison Street access driveway:

1) First and foremost, neighborhood children's safety: Many of the children who live on
Edison, New, and Henry Streets play at the end of Edison St. It would needlessly
endanger their lives and take away one of the areas in which they play if the driveway
goes through.

2) Parking: It is difficult to get parking in this neighborhood, which is, we believe, why
the developer wants to put parking in the back of the property. However, this does not
benefit the parking situation of anyone on Edison St. If anything, it makes it worse: we
will lose at least one parking space on the road, perhaps two. This means that residents
and guests of Edison St. alike will have to try and find parking elsewhere. New St. is the
next best option, but this is often very difficult because of Sturgess Cycle patrons. These
patrons and other visitors (to non-Edison residents) often ignore the 'Permit Parking
Only' signs on Edison, as we predict guests of the proposed Strathcona units most likely
will as well. As it is, residents of Edison who rely on the permit parking of Edison are
already forced to park on New St., or even in the Fortino's parking lot at times. This is
particularly troublesome for some of our elderly residents as well as those with small
children.

3) Snow Removal: The proposed driveway is going to be in the exact place where the
snow from the street is piled. It is very difficult to get the street plowed as it is.
Logistically speaking, if the driveway were to go in, it would be impossible to
accomplish snow removal in a reasonable way. The snow would have to be physically
removed in a dump truck - or something of the sort, not to mention the added snow from
the proposed 1-car parking lot, which would mean added cost to the city and
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inconvenience to the residents. We also predict general winter mayhem as people will go
to any means in an attempt to drive an unplowed street after heavy snowfall. An Edison
often is not plowed, a group effort on the part of residents is required to free the street of
it's snow and we cannot imagine what another 3 car parking lot at the end of the street is
is going to do to improve this situation. The houses on the South side of Edison also
have trouble with street drainage in the winter because of snow and ice build-up in the
gutters, and the addition of a three car lot at the end of the street will add to those
problems, which would in turn incur more cost to the city for the repairs.

4) Changing Traffic Flow: All of the residents of Edison St. have bought homes here
because of the appeal of a dead-end street - without a driveway and three car parking lot
at the end of it. No one on the street is willing to lose this in exchange for the parking
convenience of 3 theoretical tenants of a proposed addition that doesn't even have an
Edison St. address. Putting the driveway in will take away one of the biggest reasons we
bought our houses as well as the resale value of our homes. It appears that this means
very little to the home owner of 16 Strathcona or the City of Hamilton, but we are not an
alley for the convenience of a developer who purchased a Strathcona St. property, nor the
theoretical tenants who will potentially live there. Edison St. is our home.

5) Strathcona Issue: The proposed by-law amendment and addition is for a Strathcona
address. Parking for these proposed tenants should be on Strathcona. If Strathcona
cannot absorb an extra three parked cars, then perhaps the street cannot sustain three
extra units. Once again, the point is that Edison St. is neither an alley way, a cut-through
nor an outflow pipe for Strathcona Street. While the tenants of the proposed addition
would benefit in terms of convenience for this driveway to go through, the city would
benefit from the extra taxes it can collect due to the parking spaces and extra residential
units, and the developer would benefit by being able to rent downtown units with their
own parking spaces, not a single resident of Edison St. benefits from it all. we lose
parking, snow removal becomes a nightmare; drainage becomes an even greater issue for
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South side Edison residents: it lowers property values, it takes away a defining feature of the street, it increases the danger to children in the neighborhood. This driveway cannot be allowed to happen.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>20 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>7 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brown</td>
<td>2 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam Johnson</td>
<td>5 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Petersen</td>
<td>3 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Griffin</td>
<td>3 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Harris</td>
<td>18 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Andersen</td>
<td>10 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Fairman</td>
<td>9 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Steven</td>
<td>9 Edison St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ZONING AMENDMENT FILE NO. ZAC-09-045

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

MY PARTNER AND I LIVE AT #1 EDISON STREET. WE
OBJECT TO THE PLANS OF CHANGING THE ZONING
BYLAW ON STRATHCONA AVE. SOUTH #16.

ACCORDING TO THE PLANS IT LOOKS LIKE YOU WANT TO
ACCESS EDISON STREET FOR THE REAR PARKING TO
THIS BUILDING. THIS WILL MEAN MORE TRAFFIC ON
A NICE QUIET STREET, WITH YOUNG FAMILIES. WE
ALSO HAVE PERMIT PARKING ON OUR STREET.

THE CONSTRUCTION ALONE IS GOING TO CAUSE HAVOC,
BECAUSE IF YOU PLAN ON ACCESS, TO THE BACK OF
THIS PROPERTY YOU HAVE TO BRING EXCAVATING
MACHINES AND THE BUILDING SUPPLIES DOWN OUR
STREET. WE DON'T WANT THIS!

THIS IS A QUIET STREET AND A SAFE STREET
AND WE WANT TO KEEP IT THAT WAY.

FROM

GLORIA BETHLE
CHRIS STENCIL
Hello Cameron,

I am responding to the letter you sent us about the proposed renovation of 16 Strathcona Ave. S. I have some serious concerns about the driveway proposed to enter Edison St. I live on Edison St. and I pay for permit parking on this street. As far as I know, the street is at capacity for parking and this proposal will eliminate one spot on the street. This may make it difficult for me to have a spot to park my vehicle near my house some days. Ultimately that would also degrade the resale value of my house. I also think it would affect snow removal as the plows put the snow at the end of the street. Are there any plans to address the issues of parking and snow removal on Edison St.?

Thank-you,
Cameron Paterson.
5 Edison St.
905-546-9960
Thomas, Cameron

From: Dawn Graham [ ]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 1:42 AM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Subject: ZAC-09-045

Good evening Mr. Thomas,

I would like to go on record as saying I have serious reservations regarding the zoning by-law amendment from Clark Cerello on lands located at 16 Strathcona Avenue South. While I appreciate that a number of homes on Strathcona Avenue South have been divided into apartments I do not feel it is appropriate to construct such a large addition to the existing home, thereby essentially doubling the building on site. The proposed building is not in keeping with the character of the rest of the neighbourhood. No such similar buildings exist on the street. Larger scale building such as the new development at 19 Strathcona Street North are acceptable since this part of the street is more mixed use (commercial, low and high-level apartment buildings, etc.). However, Strathcona Avenue South is strictly residential, 2 1/2 storey homes (with the exception of along King Street) so I don't feel this proposed addition belongs on this street.

I also do not approve of, nor understand, the parking at the rear of the building. Am I to understand that the cars would be entering the lot off of Edison Street? This is completely unacceptable for the neighbourhood. As I am sure you are well aware of, Edison is currently a cul-du-sac. Families with young children live on this street, and I know for a fact they are very upset with the prospect of a multi-car parking lot being established at the end of their street. I am sure this is not what they had in mind when they purchased their homes at the end of a quiet street.

In closing, while appreciate the need to infill and intensify in the lower city I truly believe doing so on this particular property, and to this extent, is ill advised. Please note my objections.

Sincerely,

Dawn Graham
38 New Street.

Windows Live: Keep your friends up to date with what you do online.
Thomas, Cameron

From: David Newman
Sent: Sunday, January 03, 2010 8:57 PM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Cc: McHattie, Brian
Subject: 16 Strathcona Avenue South Condo Proposal

Dear Mr. Thomas,

My wife and I recently learned about the proposed renovations of 16 Strathcona Avenue South and would like to offer our support for this project.

Before our recent move in September 2009, we had lived on Strathcona for five years — the first two years living as students and the final three years living as young professionals. We were initially attracted to this location due to its available local amenities as well as the fact that it appeared to be a quieter refuge from the usual student housing areas.

Even after we graduated, Strathcona was still our preferred living location due to its proximity to the 403, as well as the joys and treasures offered by Hess Village and Locke Street. We feel strongly that not only would Strathcona suit the needs of other young professionals as well, but the community would benefit from having this group of people support the local establishments.

McMaster University as well as Hamilton in general have been promoting themselves as being on the forefront of innovation and new ideas. A technologically-advanced condo such as the one proposed would attract young, eco-minded professionals that would help influence others in the community. The proposed changes would certainly upgrade the curb appeal while keeping the appearance in line with the other houses on the street.

Parking can be an issue on Strathcona and by adding on-site parking spots, this upgrade will not negatively affect the current parking situation. In addition, Victoria Park offered ‘spill over’ alternatives for guests from time to time.

We have many fond memories of our time on Strathcona, and should our careers take us back to Hamilton, we would strongly desire to live in the proposed eco-conscious condos.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours truly,

David J. E. Newman, Chartered Accountant
(also on behalf of Julie E. Newman)
phone - w 519.821.1555
phone - h 417.348.3935

cc: Councillor McHattie
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Thomas, Cameron
From: J.C. Dionisio
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 7:17 AM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Cc: McHattie, Brian
Subject: Proposed Development Plan for 16 Strathcona Ave S filed by Clark Cerello

Cameron Thomas
City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division (West)

Dear Mr. Thomas,

I am writing to endorse the application of Clark Cerello to develop his property on 16 Strathcona Ave S into five environmentally conscious condominium units, which would be equipped with the latest Smart Technology and provided with on-site parking.

I am an international student pursuing doctoral studies in sociology (with specialization in social change and development) at McMaster University and I have been living as a tenant at 16 Strathcona Ave S since September 2008. My stay in Mr. Cerello's housing unit in the past year and a half has been very pleasant. The house itself is comfortably quiet because of good enough acoustics. Mr. Cerello ensures that it is provided with adequate utilities (electricity, water, internet access, heat and A/C). Rooms are conveniently big enough and each level of the house has a full toilet and bath. A full kitchen is located in the first level but each level has its own refrigerator and microwave oven, so traffic in these parts of the house (washroom and kitchen) is not really a problem even if there would be 8 or 9 people living in the house. Coin-operated washer and dryer are located in the basement. In front of the house is a three-car parking space and at the back is a fairly maintained lawn. Mr. Cerello has professionally managed the housing unit at 16 Strathcona Ave S in a manner that is sensitive to the quality-of-life needs of his tenants.

I have also become fond of the community along Strathcona, especially of the kids from neighboring homes who are allowed by Mr. Clark Cerello to come and play in his backyard. I take this simple gesture of neighborliness as an act of civic-mindedness. For me, it shows that Mr. Cerello's concerns go beyond his property and extend to the community at-large. I believe that this is an important character trait that every urban developer must possess to ensure that the pace and direction of urban development remain rational and sustainable.

I would have wanted to stay as Mr. Cerello's tenant until the end of my doctoral program and I must admit that I am leaving 16 Strathcona Ave S with a heavy heart but I sincerely support Mr. Cerello's urban development vision. I think that the completion of his development plan would help set the trend on how the community along Strathcona could be transformed into a clean, green, and technology-enhanced community that would make it more responsive to the development trends in its larger university-centered urban context, while maintaining its Victorian architectural charm and its essential appeal as a safe and quiet neighborhood.

Thus, I reiterate my support for Mr. Cerello's proposed development plan for his property on 16 Strathcona Ave S.

Sincerely yours,

Josephine Dionisio
Assistant Professor
University of the Philippines

and

PhD Sociology student
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
Thomas, Cameron

From: Rod Frank
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 1:19 PM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Cc: csirello@yahoo.ca
Subject: re 16 Strathcona

Hi Cameron

I want to send you a quick email re an application for 16 Strathcona from Clark Cerello.

As a local Real Estate Salesperson and property owner I feel this type of project is what we need more of in the neighbourhood.

Rod Frank
Sales Representative
Remax Escarpment realty Inc., Brokerage
Independently owned and operated
550 fennell ave E.
Suite 221A
Hamilton, Ontario
L8V 4S8
Tel: (905) 575-6262
Fax: (905) 318-9153
rodlrodfrank.ca
www.rodlrodfrank.ca

Your Referrals are greatly appreciated and welcomed.

01/04/2010
Thomas, Cameron

From: George and Dorothy Donison
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 4:31 PM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Cc: McHattie, Brian
Subject: 16 Strathcona Ave. S.

To whom it may concern,

As a long time previous resident of the Strathcona neighbourhood, (our family resided at #12 Strathcona S. in the late '40s and early '50s). As a current visitor to friends in the area I became aware of the development taking place at #16 Strathcona Ave S. I think these types of developments are very good for this neighbourhood and I encourage it. Strathcona has seen its share of tough times and will only benefit from such a development.

My understanding is that it's an environmentally friendly design with serviced parking on-site. In my opinion it's an efficient use of space, supplying the community with much needed "upper scale" housing stock. Another good thing is the close proximity to excellent grocery shopping, restaurants and transportation. This is a beautiful neighbourhood and allowing more people the opportunity to live within its boundaries can only benefit everyone at large.

Thank you for the opportunity to add my input.

Sincerely,

George Donison

01/04/2010
Thomas, Cameron

From: Harry Stinson
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2009 12:12 AM
To: Thomas, Cameron; McHattie, Brian
Subject: 16 Strathcona Avenue South

I would like to offer some words of support for the proposed renovation of 16 Strathcona Avenue into 5 residential condos. Such creative projects should be encouraged. It is important to the revitalization of downtown Hamilton to create a significant new inventory of high quality residential accommodation options, particularly in the form of multi-unit buildings. Frankly people who like to live in downtown areas specifically prefer an urban lifestyle that does NOT involve the maintenance of a traditional "house property". Through converting and modifying larger old homes, it is possible to significantly intensify housing without threatening the architectural character of central Hamilton's older neighbourhoods.

From a very practical perspective, such developments can play a key part in restoring the long-term financial health of the City of Hamilton. Using 16 Strathcona as a specific example, the current property taxes I understand to be approximately $3,000. Converted into 5 new units, valued at approximately $250,000 to $300,000 each, the annual City taxes would be in the range of $20,000. Given encouragement, a blossoming of such tasteful infill projects can generate millions of dollars in new tax revenues from existing neighbourhoods without the more controversial imposition of significant high rise towers. Indeed through increasing the centre-core assessment base to a more appropriate level for a city of Hamilton's size, at some point we can hopefully bring the residential tax rates to a more competitive level, which in turn will further encourage the much needed civic Renaissance.

Since moving to Hamilton I am tempted to suggest that name of the City be changed to Parkington. Candidly, there is an unhealthy obsession with suburban-style parking designs in downtown areas, (in addition to the very 'front lawn landscaping' than erstwhile downtowners wish to escape maintaining). In contrast, the proposed configuration for 16 Strathcona is, I believe, well-executed and practical. In fact it's a noticeable improvement on the current state of affairs at this property and on this street. Boulevard parking can be elegantly configured and is extremely common in upscale and historic neighbourhoods in such great cities as New York, Boston, Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal, etc. The likely residents for such properties will have one car, and quite possibly some will have no car (and so will their circle of friends). That's why they prefer to live downtown.

I am not involved in this development, nor am I receiving any fees, consideration or 'generous Christmas gifts' for this letter. However I feel strongly that the City of Hamilton – with its large inventory of once-elegant, but now undervalued and poorly maintained old homes and buildings throughout the downtown - should pro-actively facilitate such forms of residential intensification.

01/04/2010
January 4, 2010

10 Strathcona Ave S.
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4H9

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter in support of the proposed development at 16 Strathcona Avenue South, Hamilton, ON. I am currently a tenant at the above address and have been for the last 3 years. I first moved in as a Graduate student attending McMaster University and now continue to live there as a health care professional starting out her career. My younger sister also resides in the house as she is currently attending McMaster as a Graduate student. Prior to living in the area I had lived in several apartment buildings, student only and student/local residences. Living in these locations were appropriate for the time but as I grew up and my priorities changed so did my need for a more suitable living space. With my studies first as a focus and then my career I needed a place where I didn’t need to worry about noise or disruptions. That is what I found at 10 Strathcona Avenue South. It is definitely hard to find suitable living arrangements in a city associated with a University where for the right price students will live just about anywhere. However, as I and many professionals continue to inhabit West Hamilton, the living spaces will too have to grow and accommodate the changes. Since buying a house is not within everyone’s reach when they first venture out as a professional, the proposed development will allow young professionals to invest not only in their own future but in the city’s as well.

Shawna Druchok
E-mail: sdruchok@hotmail.com
Phone: 905-962-8101
From: Larry Taylor  
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 1:50 PM  
To: Thomas, Cameron  
Subject: FW: Zac-09-045

To whom it may concern:

As 30 year residents on Strathcona avenue south we are opposed to the development of this property. Please provide us with any other information regarding this request. Potential problems include parking, traffic and compromising the historical integrity of the area.

Larry and Carolyn Taylor  
37 Strathcona Ave S  
L8P 4J1