SUBJECT: Applications for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision, “Woodland Manor”, and Amendments to the Ancaster Official Plan and Zoning By-law No. 87-57, for Lands Located at 437 Wilson Street East (Ancaster) (PED08306) (Ward 12)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That approval be given to Subdivision Application 25T-200612, by the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate, Owner, as redline revised, to establish a draft plan of subdivision on a portion of the property located at 437 Wilson Street East (Ancaster), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED08306, subject to the following conditions:

(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision, 25T-200612, prepared by Planning & Engineering Initiatives Limited, and certified by Dan McLaren, O.L.S., dated May 19, 2006, showing 62 lots (Lots 1-62) for single detached dwellings, 1 block (Block 63) for stacked townhouses, 1 block (Block 64) for storm water management, 1 block (Block 65) for wetland compensation, 1 block (Block 66) for an Environmentally Significant Area, 1 block (Block 67) for a buffer to the Environmentally Significant Area, 4 blocks (Blocks 68-71) for a treed buffer, 1 block (Block 72) for a 0.3m reserve, the creation of 3 new streets (Streets “A”, “B” and “C”), attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED08306, subject to the owner entering into a Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, as approved by City Council, and with the special conditions attached as Appendix “F” to Report PED08306;

(ii) Acknowledgement that there will be no City share for any municipal works associated with this development;
(iii) That payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required, pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning Act, prior to the issuance of each building permit for the lots (Lots 1 - 62) within the plan. The calculation of the Cash-in-Lieu payment shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of issuance of each building permit. Payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland for Block 63 will be calculated in accordance with the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law currently at a rate of 1 hectare for each 300 dwelling units proposed, and shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the issuance of the first building permit;

(iv) That the lands described as Part 1 on Plan 62R-1858 be declared surplus in accordance with the City’s Procedural By-law for the Sale of Lands, being By-law No. 04-499, and that the Economic Development and Real Estate Division, Planning and Economic Development Department, be authorized and directed to sell the land at fair market value to the proponents of the subdivision lands;

all in accordance with the Financial Policies for Development, the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, the City’s Procedural By-law for the Sale of Lands, and the City’s Site Plan Control By-law, as approved by Council.

(v) That the City Solicitor be directed to prepare a By-law to amend By-law No. 03-294, which established Site Plan Control in the City of Hamilton, by adding Lots 34-42, inclusive, as shown on Appendix “B” to Report PED08306, as an area of Site Plan Control.

(b) That approval be given to amended Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-06-017, by the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate, Owner, to amend Schedule ‘B’, Land Use - Urban Area Plan from “Institutional” to “Residential” and “Open Space and Conservation”, and to create a new Special Policy Area in order to permit the adaptive reuse of the existing manor building and school building, on lands located at 437 Wilson Street East (Ancaster), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED08306, on the following basis:

(i) That the Draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED08123, be adopted by Council.

(ii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

(c) That approval be given to Zoning Application ZAC-07-047, by the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate, Owner, for changes in zoning from the Institutional “I” Zone to the Residential “R3-582” Zone (Block “1”), the Holding - Residential “H-R3-583” Zone (Block “2”), the Residential Multiple “RM3-584” Zone (Block “3”), and the Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone (Block “4”), for
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lands located at 437 Wilson Street East, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED08306, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED08306, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(ii) That the amending By-law be added to Map 1 to Schedule “B” of Zoning By-law No. 87-57.

(iii) That the ‘H’ Holding provision, may be removed by a further amendment to this By-law, at such time as the applicant has satisfied the Director of Development Engineering that the land area designated for a storm water management facility will accommodate the proposed facility including, but not limited to, an adequately sized decanting area adjacent to the forebay.

(iv) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED08306, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(v) That the amending By-law be added to Schedule “A”, Map Nos. 1123 and 1174 of Zoning By-law No. 05-200.

(vi) That the proposed changes in zoning will be in conformity with the Town of Ancaster Official Plan upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. 53.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of the applications is for a draft plan of subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, and changes in zoning to permit the development of the lands for 62 lots for single detached dwellings, a block for approximately 54 stacked townhouse units, a block for storm water management, a block for wetland compensation, a block for an Environmentally Significant Area, a block for a buffer to the Environmentally Significant Area, blocks for treed buffers along Sulphur Springs Road and the east side of the townhouse block, and 3 new streets (see Appendix “B”). The application would also provide policies in order to allow for the future adaptive reuse of the existing manor and school buildings on the east side of the property for a range of commercial uses.
The proposal has merit and can be supported since it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, and that residential development is permitted within the “Institutional” designation of the Ancaster Official Plan (although the portion of the property being developed for residential uses is proposed to be redesignated to “Residential” to more accurately reflect their proposed use). The proposal provides for a residential development that is consistent in density and lot configuration with existing development both to the south on Mansfield Drive, and further to the west, in comparable residential subdivisions on the west side of Sulphur Springs Road and Lover’s Lane (Foxridge Drive, Lloyminn Avenue, and Deerview Avenue), and with the existing townhouse development to the east. The proposal also implements Official Plan and Zoning By-law provisions in order to recognize and protect the existing portion of the property which contains an Environmentally Significant Area and in order to provide adaptive reuse options for the existing historic manor house and school building in order to ensure their continued retention and maintenance.

**BACKGROUND:**

**Proposal**

The purpose of the applications is for approval of a draft plan of subdivision (see Appendix “B”), and for Official Plan Amendments and changes in zoning to develop the subject lands for 62 single detached dwellings with a range of frontages mostly from 18m to 24m, and 54 stacked townhouses on a condominium road. Specifically, the applications would permit:

- 62 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1-62).
- 1 block for stacked townhouses on a condominium road (Block 63).
- 1 block for storm water management (Block 64).
- 1 block for wetland compensation (Block 65).
- 1 block for an Environmentally Significant Area (Block 66).
- 1 block for an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) buffer (Block 67).
- 4 blocks for treed buffers (Blocks 68-71).
- 1 block for a 0.3m reserve (Block 72).

The proposed Official Plan Amendment would recognize the portion of the property being developed for residential uses and the portions of the property being utilized for open space purposes (the ESA and ESA buffer, storm water management block, and wetland compensation area). In addition, a Special Policy Area is proposed, which would apply to the east portion of the property in order to permit certain adaptive reuses of the existing historic manor house and school building. Appendix “C” is the draft Official Plan Amendment.
The subject lands are also subject to proposed changes in zoning from the Institutional “I” Zone to a modified Residential “R3” Zone, a modified Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone and to the Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone (see Appendix “A”). The proposed zoning modifications to the Residential “R3” Zone are to address minor changes to setbacks, lot coverage and corner lot frontages. Specific zoning provision for the medium density residential block are also required in order to implement the proposed plan for the stacked townhouses on a condominium road (see Appendix “G”).

Consent Application AN/B-07:127

Consent Application AN/B-07:127 was approved by the Committee of Adjustment in February 2008. The application was to permit the conveyance of the west portion of the subject lands for the proposed development, and to retain the easterly portion for its existing institutional use. The application was approved based on a number of conditions including confirmation of the Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) boundary, a heritage conservation easement being required, road widening on Wilson Street and Sulphur Springs Road, and payment for outstanding servicing costs for sewers on Sulphur Springs Road. The application was supported by staff as it served only to subdivide the lands to be developed from the lands to be retained, and appropriate conditions were included to ensure future heritage preservation. It was also noted that other issues would be dealt with through review of the current development applications in this report. The approval of the application by the Committee of Adjustment was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board by the applicants, a neighbouring property owner and by a local advocacy group. No hearing has occurred or been scheduled on the Consent Application as the Ontario Municipal Board will wait for decisions to be made on the other related applications first.

Location: 437 Wilson Street East, Ancaster.

Owner: Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate.

Applicant: Mark R. Frederick.

Agent: IBI Group (formerly Planning and Engineering Initiatives Limited), c/o John Ariens.

Property Description:

Frontage: 295m (measured along Sulphur Springs Road).

Depth: 590m (measured along west property line).

Lot Area: 21.08ha (west side of property subject to subdivision and rezoning applications).

Servicing: Municipal services on Sulphur Springs Road and municipal sewers on all new roads.
EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Lands</strong></td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Institutional “I” Zone and Niagara Escarpment Commission Development Control, “Escarpe...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td>Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area</td>
<td>Niagara Escarpment Commission Development Control, “Escarpe...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings and Open Space</td>
<td>Existing Residential “ER-204” Zone, Residential “R2-321” Zone and Residential “R3” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>Convent (east side of subject property) and Townhouses</td>
<td>Institutional “I” Zone and Residential Multiple “RM3-442”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings and Open Space</td>
<td>Niagara Escarpment Plan Development Control Area, “Escarpe Protection Area” and Agricultural “A” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:**

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

   (i) It is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms with and implements the “Urban” designation of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

   (ii) It conforms with both the existing “Institutional” designation of the Ancaster Official Plan in that residential uses are permitted within this designation, and the proposed “Residential” designation.

   (iii) It provides for the protection of the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) through the implementation of the appropriate land use designation, the conveyance of the ESA to the Hamilton Conservation Authority, and through buffering.

   (iv) It provides for the preservation of the existing historic manor house and school building and the Cultural Heritage Landscape through implementation of a Special Policy Area to permit adaptive reuse of these
buildings and a condition of approval for designation of the buildings and landscape under the Ontario Heritage Act and for a heritage easement. The existing heritage pond will also be maintained.

(v) It provides for a range of dwelling types at frontages and densities consistent with the character of the area.

2. **Heritage Issues**

As part of the development applications submitted by the applicant a Built Heritage Assessment study was submitted, prepared by Nina Chapple Heritage Consultant. The report details the history of the property, its significance as a cultural heritage landscape and the heritage aspects of the existing buildings. The owner of the property at the time of the development of the site that exists today was Frederick Dalley. The landscaped grounds on the property were completed in 1924 by the landscape architecture firm of Dunington-Grubb, whom also designed landscapes for Whitehern and the Gage Park gardens in Hamilton, and landscaping along the QEW from Toronto to Niagara Falls. The design was to transform the former farm into a "scenic landscape of a gentleman’s estate" including a bridal path, pond with teahouse overlook, bridges, entry gate and wall, and associated plantings and lawns.

The main manor building was constructed in 1925-26 as a French Revival mansion in the tradition of country estates by the architect John Lyle. John Lyle is a renowned Canadian architect who also designed Union Station and the Royal Alexandra Theatre in Toronto, and Central Presbyterian Church, Gage Park Memorial Fountain and the High Level Bridge in Hamilton. The manor building, named “Wynnstay”, has survived in good condition.

In 1943, the manor was utilized by the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) as a convalescent hospital, and then sold in 1946 to the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate who also ran an orphanage, children’s home, day care, and missionary centre. The school building on the property was opened in 1952 and operated until 1975, and since that time has functioned as a religious retreat centre. In conclusion, both the applicant’s submitted Heritage report and City of Hamilton review of the applications have identified a number of important features of heritage value, including the overall site as a scenic landscape, the high quality of the design, craftsmanship and plantings, the landscape designed by Dunington-Grubb, the architecture of the manor building by John Lyle, and the combined total of the above as a cultural heritage landscape. The heritage report also identifies the primary heritage sites, heritage sensitive areas, and accessory lands.

In this regard, the Niagara Escarpment Plan, Provincial Policy Statement, and Ancaster Official Plan have policies to promote the retention of heritage features. The proposed development of the west side of the subject lands will be contained
almost exclusively within the accessory lands heritage area, as identified by the heritage study, while the heritage buildings, the primary cultural heritage landscape, and the pond will either be retained by the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate or in the case of the pond, retained by a public body (the Hamilton Conservation Authority). A portion of the grounds altered by the owners (tree plantation planted in the shape of a cross and the far westerly portion of the manicured lawns) will be developed, however, the portion of the lawn will be a wetland compensation area and a stream, and will remain as open space as a visual buffer for views between the manor building area and the new residential development.

In order to provide for the protection of the cultural and heritage resources of the property in the context that they have been identified by the applicant’s heritage consultant as having Provincial if not National value, the primary heritage sites warrant the highest level of protection. Therefore, as conditions of approval of the subdivision, the retained lands should be designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and with a heritage easement (Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval No. 39 and 40). A condition for a heritage easement was also included in the approved Consent Application (AN/B-07:127). It should also be noted that the existing pond, which forms part of the cultural heritage landscape, will be located within the wetland compensation block and is proposed to be retained and taken off-line. This block of land will be conveyed to the Hamilton Conservation Authority, which has advised that they will endeavour to maintain the pond as an open water heritage feature so that it does not ultimately convert to a marsh.

3. *Proposed Official Plan Amendments and Special Policy Area*

When the development applications were initially submitted the applicant had requested Official Plan Amendments to redesignate the entire property to “Residential” and “Open Space” designations. This was because while only the west side of the property was proposed to be developed initially, a preliminary plan for future residential development on the east side of the property was also submitted and the applicant sought to obtain the Official Plan designations to enable the east side of the property to be redeveloped in the future. More specifically, the applicant had proposed new Official Plan designations to identify low density residential areas, medium density residential areas, and a special policy area for the reuse of the existing manor building and school. Since that time, the applicant has advised that there are no plans for the development of the east side of the property. In addition, through the detailed review of the applications there are substantial development constraints on the east side of the property including, but not limited, to traffic and access, impacts to the cultural heritage landscape, and environmental constraints.
Therefore, the application for Official Plan Amendments has been amended to now only include the west portion of the subject property, although the applicant has still requested specific policies to allow the existing manor building and school to be converted in the future. It should be noted that the existing “Institutional” designation on the subject lands now permits residential development as-of-right without the need for amendments which would apply to both the east and west sides of the property. The following Official Plan Amendments (see Schedule “A” to Appendix “C”) are now proposed:

- Change in designation from “Institutional” to “Residential”. This would apply only to the portion of the west side of the property being developed for single detached dwellings and stacked townhouses.

- Change in designation from “Institutional” to “Open Space and Conservation”. This would apply to the Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) at the rear of both the portion of the property being developed and the rear of the east side of the property being retained. It would also apply to the ESA buffer, wetland compensation area and the storm water management areas.

- Establishment of a Special Policy Area on the east side of the subject lands to provide permission for the future adaptive reuse of the existing manor and school building for certain commercial uses.

The above noted amendments would implement the proposed draft plan of subdivision. While the west portion of the subject property could be developed for residential uses under the current “Institutional” designation, it is preferred to establish the appropriate residential designation. The “Open Space and Conservation” designation would provide greater protection to the existing Environmentally Significant Area and is the appropriate designation for storm water management facilities and to provide assurances that the wetland compensation block will remain undeveloped.

The proposed Special Policy Area (SPA) on the east side of the property would only allow the existing manor building to be converted to a range of other uses. The existing “Institutional” designation already allows any of the buildings on the east side of the property to be converted to other institutional or residential uses. The proposed SPA would provide for additional commercial uses to be permitted only in the existing manor building and school building, including business and professional offices, medical clinics, personal service shop (which would permit uses such as a spa), hotel, restaurant (excluding fast food), funeral home, and places of entertainment or recreation (which would include a banquet hall and conference centre), and commercial school.

The SPA would also identify that a detailed review of any proposal would be undertaken through requirements for a change in zoning and through site plan applications, where matters such as the specifics of the proposed use, traffic,
access and parking, impacts to the cultural heritage landscape and built heritage, landscaping, and engineering and servicing matters would be addressed. These uses are consistent with other commercial uses already permitted in the Ancaster Village Core Area and, provide greater certainty that the existing manor building, which is of historic and architectural significance, would be retained by a potential future property owner.

4. **Urban Design and Neighbourhood Character**

In order to provide for high quality urban design, to obtain a high quality development that will fit with the established character of Ancaster, and to address some specific comments and concerns from the public, there are a number of urban design considerations that should be addressed and implemented through zoning provisions, subdivision design, and as part of the Official Plan Amendment, including:

- Appropriate buffering and preservation of views across the property from and to the cultural heritage landscape;
- Maintenance of the streetscape character of Sulphur Springs Road, which is a non-urbanized road containing substantial treed areas;
- A mix of lot sizes and frontages and dwelling types that is complimentary to both abutting land uses and general residential uses in the surrounding area; and,
- Assurance that the architecture and design of dwellings and new streets is compatible with the architecture and design of the Ancaster Village Core.

In order to address the above noted matters, there are a number of design elements that must be incorporated into the development. Firstly, the proposed plan includes Block 65. This block of land is for wetland compensation and more specifically contains wetland restoration, a new stream, and associated riparian vegetation and other plantings. This piece of land is approximately 100m wide and will create a further distance between the new development and the existing cultural heritage landscape and the historic buildings. Plantings in this block, including retention of an existing swamp thicket on the south side of the block, will provide an attractive visual landscape providing a transition from the formal landscaped area to the east and the proposed development. In addition to this block, the storm water management facilities have been located immediately to the west, providing further open space and buffering between the single detached dwellings and lands to the east. Therefore, maintenance of significant views will be retained.

With respect to the streetscape character of Sulphur Springs Road, the applicant has agreed to provide a 15m wide buffer to preserve the existing trees in that...
area. This would serve to both protect any existing municipal trees in the road allowance, and retention of the trees within the 15m buffer. The 15m wide buffer will be zoned “Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone” to ensure that no buildings or structures will be permitted. In addition, Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 38 has been included which is a restrictive covenant for the owners of the 3 lots and the townhouse block, who would own the 15m buffer that specifies that the area is to remain undisturbed. The current Ancaster Tree By-law and ultimately a new comprehensive Tree By-law for the City of Hamilton will further regulate impacts to trees within the buffer upon completion of the subdivision. The built form will also ensure preservation of the Sulphur Springs streetscape, in that no dwellings will have direct frontage onto Sulphur Springs. There will be 3 dwellings with flankage yards abutting Sulphur Spring (which would include the 15m buffer), and none of the future townhouses would have access from Sulphur Springs Road.

With respect to the desire from both the public and staff that the proposed subdivision fits into the character of Ancaster and with surrounding residential development, there are a number of aspects of the development that will address this. The proposed block for stacked townhouses would be located immediately abutting a property at 71 Sulphur Springs Road containing townhouses. Therefore, by placing the proposed townhouses abutting the existing townhouses, like densities and built form will be located together. The applicant has also proposed a 10m buffer to be zoned “Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone” between the two developments to provide an enhanced buffer between the two developments. The west side of the development will contain single detached dwellings that back onto 2 existing large properties to the west that contain a single detached dwelling with open space. The applicant has indicated that it is intended that many of the existing trees in a 5m area at the rear of the new abutting lots can be preserved to provide further buffering. Also, to ensure that future residents do not trespass or otherwise impact abutting private open space, the applicant has agreed to provide a chain link fence along the west property line of these lots (Lots 10-13 and 28-38) through Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 41.

The proposed subdivision will establish large lots for single detached dwellings with frontages ranging primarily from 18m to 24m with some lots containing treed buffers having frontages over 40m. These larger lots would enable a built form that is consistent with other residential development in the area. In this regard, there are two low density residential areas that the proposal could be compared to. These would be the existing dwellings on Mansfield Drive and subdivisions on the west side of Sulphur Springs Road at Lover’s Lane. The existing dwellings on Mansfield Drive range mostly from 25m to 30m in frontage with lot depths varying considerably. The proposed lots, while on average slightly smaller, would still enable similar sized dwellings to be constructed.
Secondly, the proposed development is also similar and consistent with the residential character of other subdivisions to the west off Deerview Avenue, Foxridge Drive, and Lloyminn Avenue. Those subdivisions are an example of a newer subdivision being located adjacent to both environmental land and adjacent to older residential development. Woodland Manor would be compatible with this type of development, although the scale of Woodland Manor is considerably less with respect to total number of lots and would contain a greater percentage of dwellings with lot frontages over 20m.

Of further concern pertaining to Woodland Manor is a desire from both staff and the public that the architecture and internal streetscape are consistent with and enhance the character of the area. This includes having the architectural and streetscape design of the subdivision being compatible with both the cultural heritage landscape to the east and with the unique aspects of the Ancaster village core. To address these matters, the applicant has provided a Community Design Vision which highlights a number of design features that are proposed (see Appendix “H” for excerpts) including:

- Entry feature at the main entrance to the subdivision from Sulphur Springs Road across Mansfield Drive consisting of a pavilion with landscaped entry island;
- Masonry privacy wall along Sulphur Springs Road;
- Secondary entrance feature at the 2nd road access;
- Decorative wall feature with plantings in the roundabout at the intersection of Street ‘B’ and Street ‘C’;
- Wetland and storm water management pond lookouts;
- Decorative street lighting;
- Decorative paving at a number of locations;
- Various design features within the townhouse block; and,
- A mix of architectural elevations and designs for the single detached dwellings and townhouses.

When completed, the above noted design features would contribute greatly to providing a quality development that is compatible with adjacent uses and developments and that would enhance the Ancaster Village Core Area. Internal design aspects and architecture for the townhouse block can be reviewed through the Site Plan Control stage. However, there are a number of
implementation matters to be addressed with the above noted design features, and it must be noted that while staff are generally supportive of the attempt by the applicant to enhance the development with these proposals, there must be flexibility in the final design, location, and details of the design elements. The information submitted by the applicants is conceptual, and a detailed review of the proposals and implementation plans would be undertaken after draft plan approval. This could result in not all of the proposals being accepted by the municipality, or different design features being proposed. Some issues to be addressed would include:

- Detailed review of the specific proposals with respect to the architecture and design of the elements;
- Final location of decorative wall location along Sulphur Springs Road so as to not impact the 15m treed buffer. The wall must also be on private property and would be the obligation of the future property owners to maintain;
- Acceptance from the Public Works Department of alternative street lighting which may not be in accordance with municipal standards and alternative street paving (i.e. interlock or cobblestone) which must also meet municipal standards;
- The proposed wetland and pond lookouts may be on property ultimately not to be owned by the applicants (Hamilton Conservation Authority and City of Hamilton land respectively). Appropriate agreements for construction, maintenance and public access must be negotiated; and,
- Proposed enhancements and features in the roundabout and entry island may require special maintenance agreements with the City of Hamilton including payment of monies for perpetual maintenance or the use of a Common Element Condominium.

In addition to the foregoing, it would be prudent to include a number of conditions within the Draft Plan approval to ensure that design elements are incorporated into the final development. Therefore, the following conditions of approval should apply:

- Submission of Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines, which will be included as an appendix to the Subdivision Agreement (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 42);
- Retaining a “Control Architect” to ensure the development of each lot is in compliance with the Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 43);
Acknowledgement that the City of Hamilton may undertake reviews of certified drawings to ensure compliance with the guidelines (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 43);

Acknowledgement that the applicant must submit detailed proposed designs for review and agree to construct at their cost, all required design features including but not limited to the masonry wall along Sulphur Springs Road; entrance features; landscaped features within the roundabout, entry islands, and wetlands; and storm water management pond lookout features (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 44);

Submission and implementation of a streetscape plan to address streetscape enhancements such as boulevard landscaping treatment, street furniture, and street lighting (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 45);

The applicant must satisfy the City of Hamilton with respect to any special maintenance agreements or payment of monies for maintenance of the features if they will become owned by the City of Hamilton (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 46); and,

The applicant must satisfy the Hamilton Conservation Authority with respect to future maintenance of any structures to be built on Block 63 (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 47).

5. **Zoning Modifications**

The applicant has proposed to rezone the proposed lots for single detached dwellings to the Residential “R3” Zone, and the proposed block for townhouses to the Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone. As part of the proposed zoning changes the applicant has requested a number of zoning modifications. A review of the proposed modifications to these two zones follows.

**Modifications to the Residential “R3” Zone Applicable to Lots 1-62:**

**Modification for Lot Frontage**

The applicants have proposed a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of 20m, whereas 22m is required (the required 18m for interior lot frontage is being maintained). The modification can be supported as the reduction from 22m to 20m is minor, and an appropriate side yard setback for corner lots will be provided. The proposed subdivision is also self contained and would not result in a reduced sized lot being located abutting existing larger lots.
Modification for Setback

The applicants have requested a maximum lot coverage of 55%, whereas 35% is permitted. Planning Division staff has concerns with this increase. Through the review of the application, a number of design objectives have been identified including the intention to promote escarpment views and views from and to the cultural heritage landscape to the east, and a desire to provide an open space character for the development. Many area residents and the SAVE group have commented that due to the unique location of the property adjacent to the Ancaster Village Core Area that a subdivision with large lots with ample open space should be provided. An increase in lot coverage to 55% would result in each lot being dominated by structures, not open space. This could also reduce both the potential for preservation of existing trees, and result in less open space on a lot to provide new tree plantings. None of the adjacent residential areas to the west or on Mansfield Drive have provisions for revised lot coverage. However, it is acknowledged that with 35% lot coverage on some lots, once a dwelling is constructed with an attached garage, there may be some difficulties should future homeowners propose accessory structures such as detached garages, cabanas, pool outbuildings, etc. Therefore, a modification to increase lot coverage to 45% would be supportable, which would allow for a dwelling with a ground floor area of 324 square metres (3,487 square feet), or a slightly smaller dwelling with an accessory structure(s). This would serve to ensure that since the lot coverage is less then 50%, that it maintains the open space feel promoted by both the applicant and desired by the public, while still providing greater flexibility for the applicant and future home owners.

Modification for Front Yard Setback

The applicants have requested a minimum front yard setback of 6.0m, whereas 7.5m is required. While a 6.0m setback is sufficient in order to provide for front yard parking, there is no need for a reduction in front yard setback. For an 18m wide lot providing 7.5m front and rear yard setbacks and 1.5m side yard setbacks a building envelope of 375 square metres remains, which is a lot coverage of 52%, even more than the 45% supported. Therefore, there is ample area in which to construct a dwelling on the property. All of the lots also provide at least 40m of lot depth. There are no other subdivisions in the surrounding area that provide for this type of reduction in front yard setbacks, and there are public concerns with compatibility of the subdivision with existing development in the area. By providing the required 7.5m front yard setback, the open space feel of the development would be better maintained and options for enhanced tree plantings and landscaping are provided. Therefore, the proposed reduction in front yard setback cannot be supported.
Modification for Side Yard Setback

The applicants have requested a side yard setback for a corner lot of 2.4m, whereas 5.5m is required. A reduction in side yard setback for corner lots can be supported for a 20m corner lot, should a 5.5m setback be required it would not be possible to construct a similar sized dwelling to interior lots. However, a 3.0m side yard setback would be more appropriate as that is a reduction more common in other Ancaster subdivisions, and a reduction to 3.0m would still ensure that the same sized dwelling could be constructed as on interior lots. A 3.0m setback is also sufficient for site lines at intersections and no concerns from the Public Works Department (Traffic Engineering and Operations Section) have been identified.

Modification to Height

The applicants have requested a maximum height of 2 ½-storeys (12.5 metres), whereas a maximum height of 10.5 metres is permitted. The applicant has not provided any substantive justification for the increase in height. None of the existing residential areas surrounding the proposed development have provisions for increases in height. In addition, the proposed lots are large and able to accommodate a large building envelope even with the lot coverage or other setback restrictions. Preservation of views and the desire to provide for a subdivision that respects the character of existing residential areas and the natural environment would not be served by an increase in height. Therefore, the increase in height cannot be supported.

Other Special Setbacks

Lots 1, 9 and 10 contain a portion of their lands being zoned Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone in order to provide the appropriate zoning to preserve the 15m treed buffer along Sulphur Springs Road. Without special setbacks, dwellings could be constructed immediately abutting these buffers and the buffers could otherwise end up forming part of the side yard amenity areas for the dwellings. To avoid this, a 1.5m setback from the 15m treed buffer along Sulphur Springs Road has been included (to function as a side yard).

Modification to the Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone Applicable to Block “2” on Appendix “A”.

Modification to Permit Stacked Townhouses

The applicants are proposing to develop Block 63 (see Appendix “B”) for stacked townhouses. The Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone permits block townhouse dwellings. While the applicant would like to maintain block townhouses as a permitted use for flexibility purposes, they have specifically identified that stacked townhouses are proposed. Stacked townhouses are not a defined use
in the Ancaster By-law and would be considered consistent with the definition of a multi-plex dwelling. Appendix “G” is a preliminary plan of the proposed development. Each building would have side-by-side units like a traditional townhouse with additional units on the second floor resulting in each building containing between 4 and 12 units for a total of 54 dwelling units. The proposed use of a multi-plex dwelling can be supported as it provides a similar built form to townhouses with slightly higher density and would be compatible with the adjacent townhouses, but it should be defined in the By-law as a “Multi-Plex Dwelling containing a minimum of 2 dwelling units and a maximum of 12 dwelling units in any configuration”. This would provide both the flexibility for the applicant and assurances that the block would not be dominated by one or two larger apartment style dwellings. All required parking must be provided, including any necessary visitor parking spaces. This could impact on the total number of dwelling units that could be accommodated on the property.

**Modification to Minimum Lot Frontage**

The applicants are proposing a minimum lot frontage of 15m, whereas 46m is required. Sulphur Springs Road is considered the front lot line for this block and is shown with a frontage of 114m. Therefore, this modification would not be required.

**Modification to Maximum Lot Coverage**

The applicants are proposing a maximum lot coverage of 30%, whereas 25% is permitted. This increase can be supported as it is minor in nature, and through the Site Plan Control stage of development, an appropriate amount of landscaping will be required. The block will also provide a 10m treed buffer along the east property line to provide screening from and to the adjacent townhouse development, and a 15m treed buffer along Sulphur Springs Road.

**Modification to Minimum Rear Yard**

The applicants are proposing a minimum rear yard setback of 4.5m, whereas 7.5m is required. The only rear lot line in the block is at the furthest north side of the block. At this area, a setback of 17.18m is shown and, therefore, the reduction is not needed. However, the applicant has shown a line on the preliminary plan that divides the block into 2 phases. It is unclear if that line could ultimately be a lot line. It would not be prudent to prejudge future subdivision of the block prior to detailed review of a Site Plan Application. It is also important that sufficient private amenity area is provided between units. Therefore, it would be premature to support such a reduction at this time.
Modification to Maximum Height

The applicants have requested a maximum height of 2 ½-storeys (12.5 metres) whereas a maximum height of 10.5 metres is permitted. The applicant has not provided any substantive justification for the increase in height. Preliminary sketches of elevations only show a 2-storey built form. Without further information, it is difficult at this time to support the increase. Preservation of views and the desire to provide for a subdivision that respects the character of existing residential areas and the natural environment would not be served by an increase in height. Therefore, the increase in height cannot be supported at this time.

Modification to Minimum Landscaping

The applicants have requested to provide a minimum landscaped area of 45%, whereas 50% is required. This decrease in landscaping is minor in nature and can be supported, as through the review of the required Site Plan Control application high quality landscaping will be required. The 10m treed buffer along the east property line and 15m buffer along Sulphur Springs Road also provides additional landscaping.

Modification to Minimum Side Yard

The applicants have requested to provide a minimum side yard setback of 6.0m, whereas 7.5m is required. This reduction is minor in nature as there is a 10m treed buffer along the east property line and the block would not otherwise abut any other residential development.

Special Setbacks from a Private Road or a Public Street

The applicant has proposed a number of special zoning regulations to regulate the setback of the buildings from both public streets and private roads (future condominium roads). These setbacks can be supported as they would still maintain a minimum 3m side yard setback from the side of a dwelling unit to a public road, which is the same setback required for a single detached dwelling. The other setbacks proposed are also appropriate. All buildings will still be setback sufficient from the existing townhouses to the east due to the location of the 10m treed buffer, and setback sufficiently from Sulphur Springs Road due to the location of the 15m treed buffer.

Modification to Privacy Area per Dwelling Unit and Children’s Play Area

The applicants have requested to delete the requirement for individual privacy areas and for children’s play areas. Individual privacy areas would not be practical for multi-plex dwellings and is not a requirement within other zones that permit this use. However, this modification cannot be extended to block
townhouses should that building form ultimately be proposed. The deletion of the children’s play area can be supported as the demographics of the townhouse development would be less likely to be for families with children, and the provision for adequate outdoor amenity area will be addressed at the Site Plan Control stage of development.

Other Special Setbacks

To ensure that the 15m and 10m treed buffers are not utilized as part of required yards and/or amenity area, a special setback from the buffer should be included. The sketch submitted from the applicants provides for a minimum 7.5m setback from the buffer adjacent to Sulphur Springs Road, and a 2.5m setback from the side of a dwelling unit to the buffer along the east property line. Therefore, a 7.5m setback from the 15m treed buffer along Sulphur Springs Road should be included (to function as a rear yard), and a 2.5m setback from the 10m buffer along the east property line should be included (to function as a side yard).

Traffic Issues

Through the review of the development applications and the comments submitted from the public, it was identified that there are certain traffic issues with the development. The applicants submitted two separate traffic studies for the application. One to address matters pertaining to the new proposed intersections of Street ‘B’ and Street ‘A’ at Sulphur Springs Road, and another to address greater traffic issues at other signalized intersections in Ancaster, most notably at Wilson Street and Rousseaux Street. The studies have concluded, and staff concur, that the proposed new road connections to Sulphur Springs Road do not create a traffic issue both at that location and at the intersection of Sulphur Springs Road and Wilson Street. However, a condition of approval is required for the applicant to reconstruct the centreline profile of Sulphur Springs Road so that the required 160m of sightline looking east is achieved for Street ‘A’. All costs to design and reconstruct the change in road profile will be at the expense of the applicant (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 23).

The principal traffic issue is with the capacity of the intersection at Wilson Street and Rousseaux Street. The applicant’s traffic study concluded that the intersection currently operates poorly during the AM and PM peak hours at level of service F, and as a result of the increase in traffic from Woodland Manor, the intersection would continue to operate at a failing level but with a higher level of delay. The Public Works Department (Traffic Engineering and Operations Section) had initially advised that this is unacceptable, and that the proposed development should not proceed due to the impact on traffic capacity until such time that this issue could be addressed through the Ancaster Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). However, due to the timing of completion of the ATMP and because the traffic capacity issue would also be a development constraint on any other new developments in the Wilson Street corridor, the Public Works
Department initiated a study of the Wilson and Rousseaux intersection, which was completed by iTRANS Consulting. The purpose of the study was to confirm the existing problems with the intersection and develop solutions for improving its operation. This study concurred with the applicant’s studies with respect to the current operating level of the intersection, and with respect to future increases in delay and provided a number of options for future improvements, including:

- Adding dual southbound left turn lanes on Wilson Street;
- Adding dual westbound left turn lanes on Rousseaux Street;
- Adding northbound left turn lane on Wilson Street (in combination with dual southbound left turn lane); or,
- Construction of a modern two-lane roundabout in place of the existing intersection.

The above noted measures each would improve the intersection to an acceptable level of service. Depending on the option selected, the level of service would improve to acceptability for a number of years (between 4 years for the simplest least-costly option to greater than 50 years with the roundabout option). It should be noted that the intersection study does not make recommendations on which option should be chosen. That will be addressed through the overall Ancaster Transportation Master Plan, which is not completed. However, the study has provided enough assurances that there are viable options available that could be implemented by the City of Hamilton in a cost-effective manner in order to deal with both existing traffic demands and foreseen increases due to both background traffic increases and increases due to traffic from the proposed development. As the development is contributing traffic to the intersection, the applicant has agreed to provide a proportionate payment based on their impacts to the delay of the intersection. Therefore, Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 24 is included which requires the applicant to provide such payment to help fund the cost of whichever intersection improvement project is selected by the Ancaster Transportation Master Plan and that the improvements must be implemented.

7. **Environmental Issues**

The west portion of the subject property being developed contains a mix of different vegetative communities, including deciduous forest, cultural woodlands (planted and/or successional habitats), some swamp/marsh areas, and a cultural meadow (lawn). The north portion of the property contains the core Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) of the Dundas Valley and is a deciduous forest. To the south of this is a cultural meadow (lawn area) with a plantation of trees planted by the current owners of the property in the shape of a cross and the existing man-made pond feature. Further south is the cultural woodland...
consisting of mixed successional vegetation. This is because the entire area of the property south of the ESA was farmed into the 1950’s and the area is now regenerating naturally. Further south toward Sulphur Springs Road are marshy and swamp areas with some portions being former tree plantations. A deciduous forest is located more immediately abutting Sulphur Springs Road and toward the east side of the development adjacent to the existing townhouse development to the east.

Three small ditches/streams are located on the property, which outflow to a stream that flows into the Dundas Valley and the Sulphur Creek. The existing pond on the property also outflows into this creek and provides warm water into the system. The proposed development will result in a number of alterations to the existing landscape including the removal of the west and south tributaries, relocation of a portion of the easterly tributary, and removal of the majority of the cultural woodlands and some of the marsh/wetland areas. The following are major issues to be addressed through the environmental and ecological review of the proposal:

- Loss of fish habitat due to removal of the streams;
- Downstream impacts on the cold water fishery within Sulphur Creek and the Dundas Valley;
- Loss of wetland/marsh areas;
- Loss of woodlands;
- Impacts to the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area; and,
- Identification and management of any Butternut species on the property.

In order to address the above noted matters, the applicants have submitted a number of studies and undertaken substantial consultation with the Hamilton Conservation Authority, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), and with ESAIEG (Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group). Studies submitted have included multiple revisions to the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), which have included terrestrial and aquatic studies, engineering related studies pertaining to storm water management and groundwater (hydrogeology), and tree preservation/compensation.

With regard to the loss of the fish habitat and impacts to the cold water fishery, the removal of the south tributary was always supported by DFO due to its intermittent nature and poor quality. It should also be noted that all of the watercourses on the property only provide indirect habitat to fish and no fish communities currently exist on the lands. To deal with the removal of the west and south tributaries, the applicant has proposed to divert the east tributary,
which carries colder water, into a new channel that outlets into the combined channel at the ESA, which would ensure the cold water in the creek is delivered directly into the cold water stream and not into the pond. The west and south tributaries are proposed to be enclosed and will discharge into a widened combined channel with energy diffusers (an improvement to reduce storm flows). In addition, the proposed site servicing includes foundation drain collectors within the roadways and from proposed weeping tiles to discharge the cold groundwater to the combined channel and ultimately into the cold water stream in the Dundas Valley. It should be noted that the City of Hamilton has concerns with the proposal for foundation drain collectors (see engineering issues section) from a liability and maintenance standpoint.

The Department of Fisheries and Oceans, ESAIEG, and the Hamilton Conservation Authority are satisfied with respect to the proposal, in that it improves downstream water quality by adding cold water into the system. The existing online pond is also proposed to be removed from the stream system. This would eliminate warm water leaving the pond and entering the stream. The proposed fisheries compensation plan details the new channel which includes a 15m riparian corridor and a fishery compensation buffer area.

With respect to the loss of wetlands, the wetlands were evaluated under the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) and scored as non-provincially significant due to their small size, common vegetation types, and predominance of non-native species. Of the wetlands on the property, approximately 50% will either be retained or replaced through wetland creation. This proposal has satisfied ESAIEG, although the Hamilton Conservation Authority has advised that more information regarding proposed compensation is needed (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 29). The wetland restoration area will include a seepage wetland/wet meadow with salvaged wetland soil seedbanks, although re-naturalization of the existing channel corridor and other riparian plantings will be utilized throughout the wetland compensation block. The wetland compensation block (Block 65) will be conveyed to the Hamilton Conservation Authority. This will provide continued assurances that the block will be properly maintained as conservation land in the future. The Hamilton Conservation Authority is also being conveyed the Environmental Significant Area (ESA) on the west side of the property (Block 66) and the ESA buffer block (Block 67). Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 37 addresses the conveyance of lands to the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

With respect to Butternuts, the applicant has initially identified 8 possible Butternut trees in varying degrees of health (including one dead) on the west potion of the subject property. Some of these Butternut trees may be in areas where buffer areas or the wetland compensation block is located and may be able to be preserved. Of the total 8 trees, 6 are also below the heritage size (45 cm d.b.h) covered by the Ancaster Tree Cutting By-law, but they are protected under the Endangered Species Act, 2007 and O. Reg. 242/08. Many Butternut
trees, through genetic testing, are also sometimes identified as hybrid varieties or through a review of cankers and callused cankers may be in declining health and would likely ultimately die. Approval for removal of Butternut trees is through the Ministry of Natural Resources and, therefore, Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 48 would apply, which will require the applicant to receive approval from the Ministry of Natural Resources for the removal of any Butternut trees.

With regard to impacts to the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area, the Environmentally Significant Area Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) has approved the Environmental Impact Study, as amended, submitted by the applicant (through its various amendments). The applicant is proposing to provide a 15m buffer abutting the ESA (Block “67”). This buffer has been approved by ESAIEG, and will be included in the Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone and conveyed to the Hamilton Conservation Authority. In addition, the applicant is proposing substantial restoration plantings in the buffer area. ESAIEG is satisfied that the loss of the woodland area and wetland areas, made up by the new stream, restoration area, buffers, and improvements to water quality, would not impact the Dundas Valley ESA.

With regard to the loss of Woodland areas, there are a number of factors involved. The Environmental Impact Study (EIS), submitted by the applicants, which was approved by ESAIEG, identified the deciduous forest within the ESA as being the primary woodland constraint on the property due to its maturing, domination by native species, and wildlife habitat features. The woodland may also constitute a ‘significant woodland’, although the property is not currently protected by any such designation in the Official Plan and neither the City of Hamilton, nor the Ministry of Natural Resources has approved criteria at this time for the evaluation of woodlands in the urban area. The other forested areas on the property do not contain as much biodiversity or maturity of vegetation. The approved EIS also notes that the wildlife species most likely to be impacted by the development, most notably some bird species, would be using the affected woodland for foraging purposes, and not for primary habitat and/or breeding. The wetland compensation block would also provide habitat for aquatic based species. Never-the-less, the loss of the woodland areas would certainly displace existing species utilizing these areas. In order to address the loss of the woodland areas, the applicant has proposed a number of proposals to address and compensate for this loss including:

- The ESA, in its entirety, is being preserved and designated “Open Space” in the Ancaster Official Plan (along with the ESA buffer, storm water management block, and wetland compensation block);

- The ESA, ESA buffer block, and wetland compensation block are being conveyed to the Hamilton Conservation Authority to provide assurances that they will be managed in perpetuity as open space by a public body (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 37);
A 15m buffer block is included between the proposed single detached dwellings and the ESA. This buffer will include the retention of approximately 20 trees and is proposed for substantial additional native plantings on both this buffer and the wetland compensation area totalling approximately 3,250 tree whips/saplings. Final approval of the tree compensation plan and implementation is addressed through Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 29 and 50;

The 15m buffer from the ESA will be fenced to reduce encroachments into the ESA (Appendix “F” - Special Condition No. 34);

The existing swamp thicket and deciduous forest will be preserved within the wetland compensation block (Appendix “F” - Special Condition Nos. 31 and 49);

As noted above, the wetland compensation block will include reforestation plantings, naturalization areas, and wetland plantings. Implementation of the works is addressed through Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 49;

A 15m wide treed buffer is provided adjacent to Sulphur Springs Road and a 10m wide treed buffer is provided on the east side of the proposed stacked townhouse block. Within these areas 61 trees will be preserved along Sulphur Springs Road and 48 trees along the east side of the townhouse block. To complement the preserved trees, an additional total of 190 native tree whips/saplings are proposed within these two buffer areas. Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 29, 30, 31, and 38 deal with tree preservation, final review of proposed compensation by the Hamilton Conservation Authority, establishment of a vegetation monitoring program, and restrictive covenants;

While not formally included as a zoned buffer, due to minimal grading activity there is the opportunity to preserve approximately 20 trees in a 5m wide area along the westerly property line in the rear yards of the proposed single detached dwellings. In addition, 30 native calliper sized trees can be planted in this area to assist with screening and reforestation. This has been addressed through Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 29, 30, 31 and 50, which speak to tree preservation, compensation, monitoring, and planting; and,

Approximately 102 calliper sized native trees can be planted in other areas of the development along lot frontages, entry features, and various amenity areas. This will be addressed through a standard condition of approval within the Subdivision Agreement for a street tree planting plan; within Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 45 for a streetscape plan with enhanced boulevard treatments and landscaping; and, by Special Condition of Draft
Plan Approval No. 50 for a tree planting plan for additional trees on private property within the proposed lots.

In total, the applicants are proposing to plant approximately 3,500 trees of varying sizes as part of the proposed compensation, in addition to the retention of various trees and forested areas along the various buffer areas, in the wetland compensation area, and in the ESA. Staff is generally satisfied that the cumulative effect of the compensation, preservation, and buffering proposed will serve to provide for a form of development that respects the natural environment and protects the Environmentally Significant Area. ESAIEG and the Niagara Escarpment Commission also have no further concerns subject to implementation of the Environmental Impact Study. The Hamilton Conservation Authority does, however, recommend that the tree whips and saplings being proposed for compensation are of concern due to their small size making them easy for grazing from deer and rodents, and have recommended that larger stock be used. In this regard, through Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 30, a vegetation monitoring and management program is required, which will look at the success of the plantings and if any replanting is needed after a certain number of years. In addition, the HCA retains concerns that impacts to the ecological function of the woodland could be better addressed and some additional compensation may be able to be provided in Block 65 (wetland compensation block). The HCA, however, does recognize that the application can proceed to Draft Plan Approval, and these matters can be addressed through conditions of approval.

It must also be noted that through the Site Plan Control stage of development for the proposed townhouse block, substantial landscaping will be required, and as the proposed lots for single detached dwellings are quite large, there will be ample opportunities for further homeowners to plant trees and other landscaped materials on their lots in addition to special plantings required of the applicant. Finally, the west portion of the subject property proposed to be developed is currently zoned and designated for institutional uses (as is the east portion of the property being retained and not developed). Therefore, the property could currently be utilized without the need for Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-law Amendments, or a Plan of Subdivision for religious, charitable, education, health or welfare purposes including places of worship, schools, day cares, hospitals, retirement homes, long term care facilities, etc.

8. **Engineering Issues**

The proposed development provides for a number of unique engineering challenges, some of which are cross-jurisdictional in that they are the result of a need to protect the downstream aquatic ecosystems by discharging cold, not warm water into the creek system. A number of standard conditions of approval that are included in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement would apply, and in addition, a number of special conditions of approval would apply. Special
Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 1 through 24, and 53 through 56, are the special engineering conditions of approval, although certain other conditions do require the Director of Development Engineering to be satisfied. There are 4 major engineering issues:

- Due to the high water table (and bedrock), hydrogeological (and geological/geotechnical) concerns have been raised by the City of Hamilton, the Hamilton Conservation Authority, and abutting property owners. The applicant has a specific proposal for how to deal with this issue.

- The final design of the Storm Water Management pond has not yet been final approved and, as such, the ultimate size of the block for storm water management (Block 64) could change.

- There is an existing City of Hamilton pump station on lands that are owned by the City of Hamilton on Sulphur Springs Road at the location of the proposed Street “B”. The pump station must be decommissioned and moved to another location at the north side of the development.

- In the absence of detailed designs and more information, there may be issues with the design and location of a proposed retaining wall, located primarily at the rear of Lots 34 - 42.

With regard to the hydrogeological issue, there have been a number of studies submitted by the applicants to deal with how the proposed development will be serviced. At the request of the City of Hamilton and Hamilton Conservation Authority, a complete Hydrogeologic Assessment was submitted in October 2008, prepared by Stantec Consulting. This study concluded that there would be a reduction in groundwater recharge, but that through mitigation, a more continuous flow of cold water will occur due to the proposed foundation drain collector system. The report also identifies the shallow bedrock and high water table as the primary constraint. The use of foundation drain collector system, with water provided from weeping tiles discharging to this system is proposed by the applicant.

Due to the complexities of the technical information and the desire by the City of Hamilton to ensure that the proposed system will function properly, the Stantec study was peer reviewed, at the cost of the applicant, by a roster approved consultant. The peer review did identify certain matters where more information is required pertaining to the mitigation measures proposed. The peer review also advised that the proposed weeping tile/foundation drain system, while not a standard practice due to potential flood and/or water damage, could be effective.

The City of Hamilton has also advised the applicant that the foundation drain system is not a methodology supported due to the liability and potential additional future maintenance costs that would ultimately be bourn by the City of
Hamilton. For example, basements will be below the water table which may need continuously running sump pumps, and the City of Hamilton would also be liable for environmental impacts associated in outletting the system to a cold-water creek. The Engineering Design and Construction Section has advised that a ditch system in the right-of-way could be an alternative along with the use of other low impact development features, although roads would have to be sized to accommodate such a system and any other system would also have to be approved by the Hamilton Conservation Authority and Department of Fisheries and Oceans. This issue is addressed through Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 2, 6, 18, 21 and 56.

With regard to the Storm Water Management pond located at Block “64”, the applicant and the City of Hamilton are still working together on the final review of the pond design and size, and whether the block provided is of sufficient size to meet municipal standards. Should the pond block need to be larger, the reasonable location is for the block to be expanded to the west to encompass some or all of Lots 41, 42, 43 and 50. Therefore, these 4 lots are being placed into an ‘H’ Holding Provision to prohibit development on these lots until such time that the final pond size is determined. Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 11 also details what information is required in order to determine the final pond size.

With regard to the sanitary pump station relocation, there are a number of aspects involved with the relocation of the station. The applicant has shown on the proposed draft plan a relocated pumping station within the Storm Water Management block (Block “64”). It must be determined which parts of the existing pump station property will be added to the road allowance, and which to adjacent lots and/or blocks. Council approval will be required for transfer of the lands to the Owner, provided the Owner completes decommissioning which may be subject to Class Environmental Assessment requirements, which must be completed at the full cost of the owner. In addition, the location of the existing pump station is such that until it is relocated, there could only be one road access to the development. To ensure that the City policies pertaining to the need for a 2nd driveway access are met, Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 20 limits the maximum number of lots to 100 within a first phase. Other Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval to deal with the pump station include Condition Nos. 9, 19 and 53.

With regard to the retaining walls, due to the grade differential on the property, retaining walls have been proposed by the applicant on Lots 34 - 42. There will be a detailed review of the design and engineering of such retaining walls at the engineering design stage (and subject to Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 5 and 54). However, due to the size (height and width) of the retaining walls that may be needed, there are issues with final placement of the walls, implications on lot grading and drainage, and potential impacts on rear yard amenity areas for these dwellings. Therefore, it would be prudent to place
these lots under Site Plan Control. Lots 38 to 42 would already be subject to Site Plan Control as By-law No. 03-294 (Subsection 9.1) provides that single detached dwellings contiguous to Environmentally Significant Areas are subject to Site Plan Control. This would not apply to Lots 34 to 37. Therefore, Recommendation (a)(v) of Report PED08306 has been included in order to direct the City Solicitor to amend Site Plan Control By-law No. 03-294 to include the above noted lots (Lots 34-42) as an area of Site Plan Control. This will ensure that a proper review of grading would occur for any development on these lots and for the construction of accessory structures which could impact or undermine the stability of the retaining wall.

9. **Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland**

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 of five percent (5%) of the total land area of the subject property or 1 hectare per 300 dwelling units if the density of development is between 20 and 75 dwelling units per hectare inclusive. There is no proposed parkland being conveyed to the City of Hamilton and conveyance of land to other public bodies, such as the Hamilton Conservation Authority as part of the proposal for environmental purposes, is not considered parkland for the purposes of the By-law. Therefore, a payment of cash-in-lieu of parkland is required.

The payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required, pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning Act, prior to the issuance of each building permit for the lots (Lots 1 - 62) within the plan. The calculation of the Cash-in-Lieu payment shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of issuance of each building permit. Payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland for Block 63 will be calculated at a rate of 1 hectare for each 300 dwelling units proposed, as the proposed density is between 20 and 75 dwelling units per hectare, and shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the issuance of the building permit (after final site plan approval is granted for that Block). This requirement has been included in Recommendation (a) (iii).

10. **Other Conditions**

Sidewalks will be provided on both sides of Street “B” and the south side of Street “A” (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 22). In addition, a number of other special development engineering and other conditions of approval would apply. These include obligations on the applicant to:

- Submit a storm water management report and operate and maintain the storm water management facility until assumption by the City of Hamilton (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 1);
• Provide appropriate fencing abutting the storm water management facility where it abuts residential lots (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 3);

• Submit a servicing report to confirm the adequacy of the existing forcemain on Mansfield Drive (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 4);

• Dedication of road widenings on Sulphur Springs Road and to show the required road widening on the draft plan as a block (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 13 and redline revision on plan);

• Provisions for watermain looping on Sulphur Springs Road from Mansfield Drive (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 7);

• Confirmation that conveyance of the major overland flows can be achieved over Street “B” (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 8);

• Confirmation that Street “B” line up centrel ine to centrel ine to Mansfield Drive (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 10);

• Revision to the draft plan to show Street “B” at a width of 20.12m in order to accommodate sidewalks on both sides and to provide 9m x 9m daylight triangle dedication at the corner of Sulphur Springs Road and Street “B” (Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 12 and 14 and redline revision on plan);

• Provision on the draft plan for a 9m wide storm water conveyance easement between Lots 29 and 30 (Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval No. 15 and redline revision on plan);

• Payment of the applicant’s proportionate share for future urbanization of Sulphur Springs Road and for outstanding servicing costs to the existing sanitary sewer along Sulphur Springs Road (Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 16 and 17);

• Monitoring of the storm water management pond to ensure the effectiveness of its functioning (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 21).

11. Public Comments/Concerns Review

Through the pre-circulation of the applications to all property owners within 120m of the subject lands, approximately 35 letters were received from residents with a range of comments and/or concerns (see Appendix “I”). In addition to these letters, staff has had correspondence and consultation with a local advocacy group called Save Ancaster Village Environment (SAVE). This group has
submitted two formal documents, one entitled “Guiding Recommendations & Principles for the Development of the Woodland Manor Subdivision” and the other being “A Vision of Ancaster - Our Potential”, which is a supporting document to the first document (see Appendix “J”). Many of the comments from SAVE are replicated through other public comments and indeed many members of the public expressed support for the position of SAVE. Therefore, staff will review the specific principles and objectives from SAVE along with any other additional concerns based on the other public comments. The review will address each of the main guiding principles and objectives from SAVE which are:

Ancaster’s Village Heritage – Preservation

SAVE and other area residents have provided comments pertaining to the preservation of the Village environment and its historic characteristics, including preservation of the heritage buildings and characteristics of Sulphur Spring Road. In this regard, the application would not negatively impact the village environment. Only the west portion of the property is proposed for development at this time, which is not connected to Wilson Street East through the east portion of the property. The existing heritage buildings are being preserved through heritage designation conditions and through permission for future adaptive reuse. The historic character of Sulphur Springs Road is also maintained in that a 15m treed buffer will be provided and entrance features and a stone wall are proposed which would fit with the existing wall along the Wilson Street frontage and with the historic stone architecture in the Village core. No impacts to Wilson Street would occur as a result of the applications.

Promotion of Comprehensive Development Planning

SAVE and other area residents have commented that planning for the Village core should take place comprehensively through a detailed Secondary Plan, which would include a review of the complete development of both the west and east sides of the subject property. This is also a concern due to a number of other properties in the area that may also have future redevelopment potential. It has also been expressed that the applications may be premature until such secondary planning is complete. While the applicant did initially provide information as to future development on the east side of the property, and propose special Official Plan policies for the east side of the property, they have since advised that there are no immediate plans to initiate that or any other development. It should be noted that a Special Policy Area is still proposed, to establish policies to permit future adaptive reuse of the historic buildings, but any specific development proposal would be subject to future applications for a Zoning Amendment and Site Plan Application.

There are no current mechanisms under the Planning Act or current Official Plan policies to permit staff to not process or to deny the applications based solely on
the lack of an existing Secondary Plan for the village core. Staff would concur that Secondary Planning is useful and important to adequately plan for development, particularly in areas that may be subject to substantive change. The City of Hamilton is in the process of completing a new comprehensive Official Plan for the entire City of Hamilton. As part of the Urban Structure component of the Official Plan, the Ancaster village core has been identified as a Community Node. The draft Urban Structure policies state that detailed Secondary Planning must occur for each community node. Therefore, the City of Hamilton will be initiating a study for a new Secondary Plan upon completion of the new Official Plan. This will provide assurances to Ancaster that growth will be properly managed, but it does not mean that the municipality can not process or must deny development applications based on lack of a secondary plan.

**Sympathetic Development Supportive of Ancaster’s Village Environment**

SAVE and other residents have expressed a desire that the proposed development must be compatible with the Village architecture and that pedestrian and bicycle access to Wilson Street from the development should be provided. As noted previously in this report, in order to ensure the dwellings are compatible with the village environment, urban design guidelines should be prepared and form part of the Subdivision Agreement. In addition, the elevation plans for the dwellings will be reviewed by an impartial control architect to ensure conformity with the urban design guidelines. The townhouse block is also subject to site plan control, at which time the applicant must receive approval of the proposed elevations from the City of Hamilton. There are also numerous other design features proposed by the applicants including entrance features, enhanced boulevard treatments and paving, roundabout features, wetland and pond overlook features, and a heritage style wall. Substantial landscaping is also proposed.

The proposed lot sizes are quite large by current standards and would fit with existing residential development in the area. The Zoning By-law will provide suitable setbacks and an appropriate lot coverage percentage of 45% will aid in the preserving of the character of the area. The urban design section of this report provides a more complete review of these matters and how the proposed design will be appropriate. Finally, there is no current development proposed on the east side of the property. That portion of the property will be retained by the current owners (Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate) who will continue to operate the existing convent and retreat centre. There are no designated linkages to Wilson Street East through the east portion of the property, and there is no ability to force public access across that portion of the property at this time. In addition, any development on the east portion of the property could have other impacts on the Cultural Heritage Landscape, would involve crossing a stream, and would have other environmental impacts that have not been evaluated under this application. The applicants have provided for a potential future access to the
east side of the property on the east side of the roundabout so it may be possible in the future to provide this connection.

Sulphur Springs Road - Preservation

SAVE and some residents have expressed a desire that there should be only one access to the development from Sulphur Springs Road, with the secondary access being from Wilson Street East, and that all driveways access only internal roads. All proposed driveways for individual lots and for the townhouse block will indeed only be located from the internal road. Based on the proposed number of total dwelling units (62 single detached dwellings and 54 stacked townhouse units), there are too many lots to permit only one roadway connection for safety and traffic management purposes. In accordance with City policy/guidelines, a maximum of 100 residential units are permitted on one access. Therefore, a second access is required. As noted above, it is not possible at this time to have the second access from the existing driveway to Wilson Street as that portion of the property is not subject to development at this time. The proposed second access to Sulphur Springs Road would not result in traffic related impacts. In addition, the existing entranceway from Wilson Street may be substandard with respect to its proximity to the intersection of Wilson and Rousseaux. Finally, any roads or other changes to the east portion of the property would have direct impacts on the Cultural Heritage Landscape and have environmental impacts. SAVE also reiterated that a treed buffer along Sulphur Springs Road is warranted and this buffer has been provided.

Preservation of the Additional Lands in their Natural State

SAVE advised that the ESA lands adjacent to the escarpment should be protected and administered by the Hamilton Conservation Authority. The applicants have agreed to convey to the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) Block 66 and Block 67 (the ESA and ESA buffer) on the west side of the property. However, the current owners will retain the east portion of the property in order to provide additional privacy to the existing convent use. The HCA has also agreed to receive the wetland compensation block (Block 65) from the applicants. No impacts to the ESA on the east side of the property are envisioned.

SAVE also advised that public access to the Dundas Valley should be provided from the subject lands. This priority is also being adhered to, as with the HCA taking ownership of Block 65, which has frontage on Street ‘B’, there will now be public access to this Block, which is contiguous with the ESA and the Dundas Valley. While there are no immediate plans for the HCA to develop a trail system across Block 65 linking to trails in the Dundas Valley, having the block owned by the HCA and having it be contiguous to HCA land holdings in the Dundas Valley would ensure that such linkages may be possible in the future.
Traffic Management – Comprehensive Planning

SAVE and area residents have requested that a public road linking the east portion of the subject lands to the Wilson/Rousseaux intersection be provided. This road connection would be across lands not owned or controlled by the applicant, and as such, it is not possible for such a linkage to be established. A road in that location would have major environmental implications as it would have to cross natural lands having jurisdiction by the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Niagara Escarpment Commission. In addition, the Wilson/Rousseaux intersection study specifically recommended against such a connection as it would create other traffic problems in Ancaster. SAVE and many area residents also desire that construction traffic should use either the new Wilson/Rousseaux entrance proposed by SAVE or the existing Wilson Street entrance. While the use of the existing entrance may be possible for some construction activity, it would not be desirous to have heavy machinery use the east portion of the property to access the west as it could have significant impacts on the existing stream and the Cultural Heritage Landscape. The City of Hamilton has various by-laws and policies in place to minimize the impact on the surrounding lands from construction activities.

Other Public Comments/Concerns

While the above noted major categories of comments/concerns cover the majority of the public comments, there are some other specific items to be addressed. Some members of the public were concerned with respect to the impact of the development on wildlife in the area. This has been addressed through the Environmental Issues section of the report. While there will be impacts to the natural environment, through the environmental studies submitted by the application, appropriate preservation and compensation proposed by the applicant, and the inclusion of many conditions of approval pertaining to these matters, the majority of the impacts can be properly mitigated.

Secondly, neighbouring property owners to the west expressed concerns over impacts to their property due to flooding or other alterations to drainage and/or ground water and due to trespassing. The applicants have agreed to provide a chain link fence along the rear of all of the proposed lots along the west property line to eliminate trespassing potential. With regard to impacts on lot drainage and groundwater, through an extensive list of conditions of approval, the applicants will have to satisfy the City of Hamilton that the final system to deal with hydrogeologic issues must comply with municipal standards and will not impact abutting properties. All concerns from the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the City of Hamilton, including those raised by an independent peer review of the hydrogeologic assessment, will have to be fully addressed.
Neighbouring property owners to the east in the existing townhouse development expressed concerns with traffic impacts, density of the development, and built form. The proposed townhouse block within the development will provide a 10m treed buffer along the east property line to provide buffering. Vehicular access to the block will be from the new road, not Sulphur Springs Road, and the traffic studies have not highlighted any traffic related impacts on the abutting property. The site-specific zoning recommended for approval also does not provide for the height increase proposed by the applicants. This will ensure there will be no overview impacts.

12. Through the review of the application, it must be noted that there are a number of draft plan conditions that could result in changes to the ultimate layout of the subdivision. These include:

- Provision for road widenings on Sulphur Springs Road (to be shown as blocks on the registered plan);
- 9m x 9m daylight triangle to be shown at the intersection of Street “B” and Sulphur Springs Road (to be shown on the registered plan);
- Street “B” must be 20.12m in width;
- Final storm water management pond size requirements must still be approved which could result in the loss of lots to the west if the pond is enlarged;
- Final approval of compensation for woodlands and wetlands, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority. Should adequate compensation not be able to be provided on the open space blocks, additional land for compensation may be needed;
- The City of Hamilton has not accepted the foundation drain system, and should alternative servicing regimes be proposed or required, there may be changes needed to road widths or other changes; and,
- The pump station may not be permitted within the storm water management block due to the need for an adequately sized block of land for the pond. Should an alternative location be needed, this would result in a minor change to the plan.

While the above noted items may result in changes to the draft plan, internal departments and external agencies such as the Hamilton Conservation Authority has not advised that the applications are premature, only that there are certain conditions of approval that must be satisfied that could have implications on ultimate design. Should revisions to the plan be required, there is an established process in accordance with the Planning Act for processing such changes.
ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:

Should the proposed draft plan of subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, and changes in zoning be denied, the subject lands could be developed for uses permitted within the existing Institutional “I” Zone, which include a large number of institutionally related land uses such as retirement homes, places of worship, long term care facilities, residential care facilities, and schools (both public and private).

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial - The foundation drain system opposed by the City of Hamilton could have financial impacts due to liability and long-term maintenance. The applicant will also have to satisfy the City of Hamilton of any maintenance related issues pertaining to some of the urban design proposals for special streetscaping, landscaping, and/or proposed special structures (entrance features, pond overlook and/or wetland block overlook) which have been addressed through conditions of draft plan approval.

Staffing - N/A.

Legal - As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider applications for a Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and changes in zoning.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

Provincial Policy Statement

The application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, in that it focuses growth in settlement areas and implements Policies 1.1.3.2, and 1.4.1, which speak to the provision of densities that efficiently uses land and to provide a mix of housing types.

Policy 2.6.1 states that significant built heritage and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved. In order to ensure consistency with this requirement, the east side of the subject property is subject to heritage conditions of approval to establish the appropriate heritage designations and easements to protect both the historic buildings and cultural heritage landscape.

Policy 2.6.2 outlines that development and site alteration may be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources, or areas of archaeological potential, if significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration that maintains the heritage integrity of the site will be permitted. Therefore, clearance of an archaeological assessment from the
Manager of Community Planning and the Ministry of Culture is required. Archaeology clearance is included within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Policy 2.1.6 outlines that development shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to natural area features identified (Environmentally Significant Areas and significant woodlands or wetlands) unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. In this regard, due to a portion of the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) being located on the property, the applicant submitted and received approval of Environmental Impact Study which has been approved by the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG).

Policy 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 outlines that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in significant wetlands and significant woodlands unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. With regards to wetlands and woodlands, the Hamilton Conservation Authority has identified conditions of approval to ensure consistency with this policy and have advised that additional compensation for woodlands may be needed to ensure no loss of the ecological functions. However, the wetland is not provincially significant, and the woodland is not currently designated in the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan or the Ancaster Official Plan as significant, and nor does the City of Hamilton currently have policies or approved criteria to evaluate significant woodlands in the urban area.

Places to Grow - Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The proposed development is consistent with Places to Grow in that it contributes to creating complete communities as per Policy 2.2.7, applicable to the Designated Greenfield Area, as the development provides for residential development in close proximity to the village core area with a mix of densities, and high quality open spaces, site design, and urban design, as implemented through appropriate conditions of approval to address urban design matters. However, the proposed density would provide for 24 persons and jobs per hectare, which is less than the 50 persons and jobs per hectare required in the whole of the designated Greenfield area. While some modest increases to the density of the development could be supported, it is difficult due to the natural area constraints, traffic constraints, and the very low density character of the area to achieve much higher densities within the plan.

Niagara Escarpment Plan

The subject lands are designated “Urban Area” and “Natural Area” in the Niagara Escarpment Plan. The “Natural Area” designation applies only to the Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) on the property and is not being impacted. The remaining portion of the property being developed (and the east portion being retained) is
designed “Urban Area” which permits the proposed development. The development objectives of the “Urban Area” from the Niagara Escarpment Plan states:

- That growth should be compatible with and provide for the protection of unique ecologic areas, wildlife habitats, stream and water supplies and other environmentally sensitive areas both inside and adjacent to urban areas;

- That development should be of an urban design compatible with the visual and natural environment of the Escarpment. Where appropriate, provision for adequate setbacks and screening should be required to minimize the visual impact of urban development on the Escarpment landscape; and,

- That Development proposals should be compatible with and provide for the protection or restoration of historic features or areas, archaeological sites and structures of architectural significance in accordance with Part 2.12.

Section 2.12 of the Niagara Escarpment Plan provides development criteria to inventory, interpret, evaluate, maintain and conserve cultural heritage features. Based on the above, the proposal is consistent with the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP), in that all environmental matters have been thoroughly addressed through appropriate conditions of approval. To address the heritage policies from the NEP, the east side of the subject property containing the cultural heritage landscape and buildings is being preserved through conditions of approval for heritage designation and easements. It is also noted that the Niagara Escarpment Commission had no objection, in principle, to the applications.

**Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan**

The subject lands are designated “Urban Area” in the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan which permits the proposed development and the proposed residential subdivision, Official Plan Amendments and changes in zoning conforms to the policies of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. Policy B-9.2, pertaining to archaeology, is addressed through the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement (see discussion above in the subsection pertaining to the Provincial Policy Statement). The proposal conforms to Policy 3.1, which outlines that a wide range of urban uses on full municipal serves will be concentrated in the urban areas.

Additionally, Policy C-1.2.2 of the Plan states that land use changes in or adjacent to Environmentally Significant Areas will only be permitted where such development:

i) Will not adversely affect, degrade or destroy any of the qualities which are the basis for the area’s designation;

ii) Will not cause any significant impacts upon water quality and quantity; and,
iii) Will not adversely affect the implementation of any resource protection policies or plans.

The proposed development has been approved by the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) and, therefore, the application conforms to these policies.

Furthermore, Policy B-9.2 requires the City to consider the protection and preservation of regionally significant historical and cultural resources, including recognized archaeological sites, in the review for proposal of development and redevelopment. Where possible, these attributes will be incorporated into the overall design in a manner which minimizes adverse impacts and encourages maintenance and protection. In this regard, the Cultural Heritage Landscape and historic buildings are being protected and preserved through appropriate conditions for heritage designations and easements.

Ancaster Official Plan

The subject lands are designated “Institutional” on Schedule ‘B’, Land Use - Urban Area Plan in the Ancaster Official Plan. The “Institutional” designation permits residential uses as-of-right under Policy 4.7.9, which states:

“Notwithstanding the policies set out above, in areas designated institutional, residential uses may be permitted without amendment to this Plan provided they are compatible with the surrounding area and are in keeping with the policies of this Plan”.

While an Official Plan Amendment is not technically required, the proposed development on the west portion of the property is residential and it would be appropriate to reflect this in the Official Plan. Therefore, an amendment from “Institutional” to “Residential” is prudent and can be supported. The proposed development would conform to the proposed “Residential” designation in that single detached dwellings and multi-residential uses are permitted in the designation. The following “Residential” policies would also apply:

“4.4.2 Types of residential development permitted in the Residential designation shall be single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, townhousing, low-rise apartment and innovative forms of attached housing.

4.4.6 Although single detached dwellings shall predominate, Council shall encourage a broad range and mix of residential units in terms of lot size, unit size, type and tenure….

4.4.8 In locating new townhouses, stacked townhouses, apartments and other forms of attached housing, consideration shall be given to the gradation of densities so that there is a gradual transition from low to high residential densities. Consideration shall also be given to the following criteria:
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i) Attached housing should abut or be in close proximity to an arterial or a collector road…

ii) Attached housing should be encouraged to locate in proximity to community services and facilities such as transit, shopping areas, schools, churches and parks;

iii) Attached housing should be dispersed rather than concentrated throughout new development areas. However, blocks of attached housing may be situated adjacent to each other, particularly if necessary to achieve gradations in density.

4.4.13 In Residential areas, great care shall be taken to preserve mature vegetation growth. Existing trees will be preserved wherever possible and the planting of trees in new subdivisions shall be a requirement in any subdivision agreement. The preservation of vegetation and natural drainage patterns shall be an essential consideration in the design and layout of the road system in all development proposals.

The preservation of trees along street and roads will be encouraged…”

The proposed development would conform to the above noted policies in that the proposal provides a range of dwelling types (single detached dwellings and stacked townhouses). The proposal also meets the gradation policy in that the proposed stacked townhouses would be located adjacent to existing townhouses and on an opposite side of a road from the proposed single detached dwellings. Trees are also being preserved along the roads and in other areas. A tree management and compensation plan which includes substantial tree plantings is required in order to address tree loss. The follow heritage policies would apply:

“2.5.2 Objectives

i) To identify sites of architectural, historical or archaeological value;

ii) To designate individual properties of heritage value or areas of similar value;

iv) To encourage new development to be sympathetic to existing heritage;

v) To encourage the retention or inclusion of heritage property in new development;

vii) To acquire easements on heritage properties to make the citizens of the municipality aware of the value of their heritage.”
Based on the above, the proposal would conform to the heritage policies from the Ancaster Official Plan in that the cultural heritage landscape is being preserved; heritage designations and easements will be acquired; and, through appropriate conditions of draft plan approval pertaining to urban design, the new development will be sympathetic to existing heritage. In addition, the proposed Special Policy Area to permit certain additional commercial uses within the existing manor building and school building can be supported as it aids in the implementation of the heritage policies in that with a wider variety of permitted uses only in those existing buildings it will be more likely the buildings will be preserved into the future.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION:**

**Public Works Department (Traffic Engineering and Operations Section)** has advised that: a condition of approval is required for the applicant to reconstruct the centreline profile of Sulphur Springs Road so that the required 160m of sightline looking east is achieved for Street “A” (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 23); that driveway locations be located, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Traffic Engineering and Operations, and shown on approved engineering drawings (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 52); and, that the middle driveway in the townhouse concept is offset from Street “C” and it should align centreline to centreline with Street “C” or provide 30m distance. This last comment will be addressed at the Site Plan Control stage of development.

**Public Works Department (Strategic Planning)** has advised that the Ancaster Transportation Master Plan Study is underway; that updated Storm Drainage Policy and Criteria and Guidelines for Stormwater Infrastructure should be used; and, that recommendations of the City of Hamilton Stormwater Master Plan for source and conveyance control should be incorporated into the servicing plans. In this regard, updated Storm Drainage policies have been used and Sourcewater Protection staff has been involved in the review of the Hydrogeological study and peer review.

**Public Works Department (Open Space Development Section)** has advised that as no parkland is being provided; Cash-in-Lieu of parkland is required and that streetscape plans and attractive storm water management facilities should be provided. Cash-in-Lieu of parkland has been addressed through Recommendation (a)(iii) of this report, and streetscape plan requirements are addressed through Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Nos. 45 and 46.

**Economic Development Division** has advised that the development of these lands will assist in enhancing the economic vitality of village core business and services.

**Public Works Department (Forestry and Horticulture Section)** has advised that there is a myriad of municipal trees located on the road allowance of Sulphur Springs Road and that the Section is encouraged by the incorporation of a 15m treed buffer strip. Where new roads are proposed, there will be impacts to municipal trees, and the removal of trees is subject to a replacement fee as outlined in the Reforestation Policy - Municipally
owned Lands. Submission, review, and approval of a Tree Management Plan is a requirement within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement and through Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 31. Other conditions deal with tree plantings, compensation, and monitoring of new plantings.

Hamilton Conservation Authority has provided comments pertaining to Storm Water Management and hydrogeology, fisheries, wetlands and woodlands, and on the submitted Environmental Impact Statement, and has advised of a number of conditions of approval that have been highlighted elsewhere in this report.

Bell Canada has requested a standard condition pertaining to the availability of communication/telecommunication infrastructure. This requirement is included within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Hamilton Street Railway has advised that the route #16 Ancaster bus is along Wilson Street, with no planned changes in service, and that street orientation and pedestrian entrances are important. Direct short walking distances between dwellings and transit service are preferable. In this regard, the Owner will be paying their share for the future urbanization of Sulphur Springs Road, which could include future sidewalks on Sulphur Springs Road. Should the east portion of the property be developed in the future, linkages to Wilson Street may also be able to be provided.

Union Gas has advised that as a condition of final approval that the Owner provide any necessary easements and/or agreements required by Union Gas for the provision of gas services for this project. This condition is included within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) has no objection, in principle, to the draft plan of subdivision but has recommended that the recommendations and conclusions in the environmental reports must be to the satisfaction of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG), and the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA,) and that comments from members of the public with concerns of drainage and other water impacts must be addressed. These matters have been appropriately addressed through the approval of the development by ESAIEG and the DFO, and conditions of approval from the HCA.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) has advised that the plan meets DFO’s No Net Loss Policy requirement for the protection of fish habitat. Specifically, the loss of the intermittent channel and the contribution (as indirect fish habitat) is offset and compensated by the realigned and enhanced combined channel which includes the enhanced riparian area and wet meadow area. Additional measures include those which will maintain or improve the thermal regime that contributes to the coldwater fishery target for downstream. A condition of approval has been included to confirm final DFO approval of the proposed development (Special Condition of Draft Plan Approval No. 36).
Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) has approved the proposed fisheries compensation and the Environmental Impact Statement (as revised). Implementation of the fisheries compensation and Environmental Impact Statement are included through various Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval.

Public Consultation

In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, the application was pre-circulated to 185 property owners within 120 metres of the subject property. The applicants have also presented their proposed development at the Ancaster Core Advisory Committee and also directly to the SAVE neighbourhood advisory group. SAVE have also met with city staff. In addition, a Public Notice sign was erected on the property in March 2006. As a result of the pre-circulation, 35 letters from the public, as well as correspondence from SAVE, were received (see Appendices “I” and “J”). A summary of the concerns and responses is provided in the Analysis/Rationale section of this report. Finally, notice of the Public Meeting has been given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

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

Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Shelter, care and satisfying employment are accessible to all Hamiltonians and the public are involved in the definition and development of local solutions. The proposal provides for a development compatible with the character of the area and with the Ancaster Village Core area.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Ecological function and the natural heritage system are protected. Through appropriate conditions of approval, buffering, compensation, and preservation of the Environmentally Significant Area, the development has satisfactorily addressed environmental impacts.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Infrastructure and compact, mixed use development minimize land consumption and servicing costs. The proposed development provides a mix of dwelling types and densities that compliment the low density residential character of the area.

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

:GM
Attachs. (10)
The following text together with Schedule “A” (Schedule “B” - Land Use - Urban Area) and Schedule “B” (Schedule “F” - Specific Policy Area), attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment No. ___ to the Official Plan of the former Town of Ancaster.

Purpose:

The purpose of this Amendment is to redesignate the subject lands from “Institutional” to “Residential” and “Open Space”, and create a new Specific Policy Area ___ to permit a variety of additional uses for the existing heritage buildings on the site.

Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are approximately 41.68 ha, municipally known as 437 Wilson Street, generally located north of Sulphur Springs Road, west and northwest of Wilson Street and the former City of Ancaster Village Core, and south of the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). Part of the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) is included in the subject lands.

Basis:

The proposal can be supported for the following reasons:

- The proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to and implements the “Urban” designation of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

- The proposal conforms to both the existing “Institutional” designation of the Ancaster Official Plan in that residential uses are permitted within this designation, and the proposed “Residential” designation.
• The proposal provides for the protection of the Dundas Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) through the implementation of the appropriate land use designation, the conveyance of the ESA to the Hamilton Conservation Authority and through buffering.

• The proposal provides for the preservation of the existing historic manor house and school building and the Cultural Heritage Landscape, including the existing pond.

• The proposal provides for a range of dwelling types at frontages and densities consistent with the character of the area.

**Actual Changes:**

**Text Changes:**

1. **Section Five: Specific Policy Areas** is hereby amended by adding a new policy 5.7, as shown below:

   5.7. In addition to the uses permitted in Section 4.7 of this Plan, for the lands located northwest of Sulphur Springs Road and Wilson Street, municipally known as 437 Wilson Street East, identified as Specific Policy Area # on Schedule “F”, the following uses shall also be permitted only within the manor building and school building existing on the date of adoption of this amendment: business and professional offices, medical clinics, personal service shops, a hotel, a restaurant (excluding fast food), a funeral home, a commercial school, and places of entertainment or recreation (including a banquet hall and conference centre).

   The additional uses permitted in this policy are subject to a Zoning By-law Amendment and a Site Plan Control Application, where matters including the specifics of the proposed use, traffic, access and parking, impacts to the cultural heritage landscape and built heritage features, landscaping, and engineering and servicing matters shall be addressed.

**Schedule Changes:**

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

3. **Schedule "F" - Specific Policy Area** - is hereby amended by identifying the subject lands as Specific Policy Area and adding a legend entry “Area - refer to Policy 5.7. ”, as shown on the attached Schedule “B” of this Amendment.

**Implementation:**
A Zoning By-law amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan will give effect to this Amendment.

This is Schedule "1" to By-law No. 08-____, passed on the ____ day of ____, 2008.

The City of Hamilton

_______________________       __________________________
Fred Eisenberger           Kevin C. Christenson
Mayor                      Clerk
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. __________

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), Respecting a Portion of Lands Located at 437 Wilson Street East

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap. 14, Sch. C. did incorporate, as of January 1, 2001, the municipality “City of Hamilton”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the successor to certain area municipalities, including the former area municipality known as the “The Corporation of the Town of Ancaster” and is the successor to the former Regional Municipality, namely, “The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, provides that the Zoning By-laws and Official Plans of the former area municipalities and the Official Plan of the former regional municipality continue in force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster) was enacted on the 22nd day of June 1987, and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on the 23rd day of January, 1989;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section ____ of Report 08-____ of the Economic Development and Planning Committee at its meeting held on the ____ day of ____ , 2008, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), be amended as hereinafter provided;

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

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

1. That Schedule "B" of Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing from the Institutional “I” Zone:
(a) to the Residential “R3-582” Zone, the lands comprised in Block “1”;

(b) to the Holding – Residential “H-R3-583” Zone, the lands comprised in Block “2”; and,

(c) to the Residential Multiple “RM3-584” Zone, the lands comprised in Block “3”;

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

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

**R3-582**

That notwithstanding the provisions of Paragraphs (b) and (c) of Subsection 11.3.2 “Regulations” and Paragraphs (c) of Subsection 11.1.2 “Regulations” of Section 11: Residential “R1”, “R2” and “R3” Zones, the following special provisions shall apply to the lands zoned “R4-582”:

**Regulations**

(a) Minimum Lot Frontage 18 metres, except on a corner lot the minimum lot frontage shall be 20 metres.

(b) Maximum Lot Coverage 45 percent.

(c) Minimum Side Yard 1.5 metres, except on a corner lot the minimum side yard abutting a street shall be 3.0 metres.

(d) For a lot abutting Sulphur Springs Road, a minimum setback of 1.5 metres shall be provided and maintained from the Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone.

**H-R3-583**

That notwithstanding Subsection 11.3.1, “Permitted Uses” and the provisions of Paragraphs (b) and (c) of Subsection 11.3.2 “Regulations” and Paragraphs (c) of Subsection 11.1.2 “Regulations” of Section 11: Residential “R1”, “R2” and “R3” Zones, the following special provisions shall apply to the lands zoned “H-R4-583”:

(i) A Storm Water Management Facility and/or pumping station shall be permitted.
(ii) All special provisions of the Residential “R3-582” Zone shall apply.

(b) That the ‘H’ Symbol shall only be removed at such time that:

(i) The Applicant/Owner has satisfied the Director of Development Engineering that the land area designated for a storm water management facility will accommodate the proposed facility, including but not limited to, an adequately sized decanting area adjacent to the forebay.

RM3-584 That notwithstanding Subsection 16.1, “Permitted Uses” and the provisions of Paragraphs (e), (g), (i), (k), (n) of Subsection 16.2 “Regulations” of Section 16: Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone, the following special provisions shall apply to the lands zoned “RM3-584”:

(i) A Multi-Plex Dwelling(s) containing a minimum of 2 dwelling units and a maximum of 12 dwelling units in any configuration shall be permitted.

(ii) Subsection 16.2(k) shall not apply for a use permitted in clause (i) above.

(iii) Subsection 16.2(n) shall not apply.

(iv) Maximum Lot Coverage: 30 percent.

(v) Minimum Rear Yard: 7.5 metres.

(vi) Minimum Side Yard: 6.0 metres.

(vii) A minimum setback of 3.0 metres is required from a public street or private road from the side of a dwelling; a minimum setback of 6.5 metres is required from a private road and 8.5 metres is required from a public street for the front of an attached garage; and, a minimum setback of 4.5 metres is required from a private road and 6.0 metres is required from a public street for the face/front of a dwelling.

(viii) A minimum setback of 7.5 metres shall be provided and maintained from a Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone adjacent to Sulphur Springs Road.

(ix) A minimum setback of 2.5 metres shall be provided and maintained from a Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone adjacent to the east lot line.
3. That the amending By-law be added to Map 1 of Schedule B of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57.

4. That 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 [date] day of [date], 2008

____________________________________  ________________________________
Fred Eisenberger                  Kevin C. Christenson
Mayor                           Clerk
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CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW No. ______

To Amend Zoning By-law 05-200,
Respecting a Portion of Lands Located at 437 Wilson Street East (Ancaster)

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

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

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

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section____ of Report 08-____ of the Economic Development and Planning Committee at its meeting held on the____ day of____, 2008, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as hereinafter provided;

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

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

1. That Maps 1123 and 1174, of Schedule “A” to Zoning By-law 05-200, are amended by incorporating the Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone boundaries for the applicable lands, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”;

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

PASSED and ENACTED this day of , 2008.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________
Fred Eisenberger  Kevin C. Christenson
Mayor  Clerk
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Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval for 25T-200612, “Woodland Manor”, 437 Wilson Street East, Ancaster

1. That prior to servicing, the Owner agrees, in writing, to:

   i) Operate and maintain, in an acceptable manner, the storm water management facility(s) throughout the construction of all stages of draft plan registration or until a time, as established by the Manager of Development Engineering, and monitor such operation and effects thereof;

   ii) Assume full responsibility for the cost to construct, operate and maintain the facility including any changes to conditions of the MOE’s Approval until such time that the Storm Water Management Facility is assumed by the City;

   iii) Provide an operating and maintenance manual, to the satisfaction of the City, for the pond, and agrees to inspect/monitor and maintain the storm pond in accordance with said manual throughout construction including the maintenance period up to assumption of the storm pond by the City;

   (iv) Keep detailed logs concerning performance and required maintenance activities for the pond, including costs for cleaning and removal of sediment etc., to the satisfaction of the City. This information is to be included in the operation and maintenance manual that will be provided to the City by the Owner upon the future assumption of the facility; and,

   (v) Be responsible for the removal of sediment attributed to the development and for verifying the volumetric capacity of the Stormwater Management Facility prior to assumption of the subdivision.

2. That prior to servicing, the Owner has a qualified engineer conduct a geotechnical investigation and study for implementation, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering. The study shall include but not be limited to;

   (i) Assessment of pre-construction conditions for the construction of services within a confined bedrock or aquifer system, to determine properties of the rock and the type and extent of grouting that may be required;

   (ii) Identification of potential impacts and mitigation measures due to construction activities (excavation of basement & foundation, service trenches, gravity type weeping tiles and sanitary sewer) below the groundwater table and confined bedrock;
(iii) That if a confined bedrock or aquifer system is encountered during the construction of basements and services, mitigation measures shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of a geotechnical engineer;

(iv) Identification of karstified bedrock if it exists, and bedrock groundwater flow movement;

(v) The type of pond lining required;

(vi) Installation of a ground water monitoring system to monitor development impacts; and,

(vii) Recommendations of underground construction procedures and material details due to ground water interference, such as but limited to clay plugs, pressure pipe and waterproof manholes.

3. That prior to servicing, the Owner shall include in the engineering design for the draft plan lands installation of a minimum 1.5 metre high chain link fence along the side and rear yards of all lots which side and rear yards abut the storm water management pond (Block 64) to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

4. That prior to servicing the Owner submits a Servicing Report confirming the adequacy of the existing 200mm forcemain on Mansfield Drive, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering. It is further agreed that any and all upgrades to the existing forcemain shall be at the sole expense of the Owner.

5. That prior to preliminary grading, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering, the Owner shall include in the engineering design for the draft plan lands a design for any proposed retaining walls whereby all walls are constructed:

   (i) With concrete or stone;

   (ii) Entirely on private property, including but not limited to any geo grid or restraint system;

   (iii) Such that they prevent drainage from flowing over the wall;

   (iv) Such that each property future owner may maintain or repair their wall independent of the wall on the adjacent property;

   (v) Outside of any tree planting zone identified in the Tree Compensation Strategy (Dougan & Associates, October 2, 2008) whereby the wall foundation or restraint system may be compromised;
6. That prior to servicing, the Owner provides a groundwater contingency plan to the City of Hamilton to ensure that an appropriate mitigation strategy is available to be implemented; should an aquifer be breached during excavation; groundwater is encountered during any construction within the subdivision, including but not limited to house construction; or sump pumps are found to be continuously running. The plan shall form part of a Hydrogeological Report to the City, prepared by a qualified professional, to assess the impacts, provide recommendations to mitigate the groundwater impacts and undertake the works as recommended including monitoring, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering and the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

7. That prior to servicing, the Owner shall include in the engineering design for the draft plan lands provisions for a watermain on Sulphur Springs Road to be looped from Mansfield Drive to Street “A” to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

8. That prior to servicing, the Owner confirms that conveyance of the major overland flows can be achieved over Street “B”. If this conveyance cannot be achieved, then the Owner agrees to include in the engineering design for the draft plan lands an overland flow route that meets City of Hamilton and Hamilton Conservation Authority specifications.

9. That prior to registration, the Owner relocates the existing sanitary sewer pumping station and submit a design to the City for review and approval to the satisfaction of Director of Development Engineering. The submitted design shall include but not limited to the following:

   (i) Landscaping and architectural features consistent with the City’s design guidelines for pumping stations and overall urban design guidelines for the draft plan;

   (ii) A location for the proposed sewage pumping station that shall be readily accessible for maintenance and rehabilitation, not be located within a SWM block, and acceptable to the Director of Water/Wastewater;

   (iii) A parcel size to be a minimum 20.0m x 30.0m and configured to accommodate all necessary components including a provisional footprint for an odour control biofilter, acceptable to the Director of Water/Wastewater;

   (iv) A proposed station designed to service the ultimate service area as defined by the City; and,

   (v) Decommissioning of the old sanitary pumping station, shall adhere to Class EA and MOE requirements, at the sole expense of the Owner, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.
The Owner shall further agree to provide funds for Engineering Peer Review and Design Support of the City’s preferred consultant, and agrees, in writing, to construct, at the Owner’s expense, such approved design to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

10. That prior to registration, the Owner provides confirmation from an Ontario Land Surveyor that Street “B” aligns centreline to centreline with Mansfield Drive, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

11. That prior to registration, the Owner shall, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering, provide sufficient background information to verify that the Stormwater Management Block will be sized to accommodate the Stormwater Management facility designed in accordance with Ministry of Environment and City guidelines. The Owner shall submit a detailed report prepared by a qualified engineer to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering that demonstrates how the proposed storm water management (SWM) facility will achieve SWM quality and quantity control criteria as specified by (i) the City of Hamilton’s Storm Drainage Policy, (ii) the City of Hamilton’s Criteria for Stormwater Infrastructure Design and (iii) the findings and recommendations of the receiving watercourse sensitivity analysis based on flood and erosion hazards.

12. That prior to registration, the final plan of subdivision shows Street “B” as a 20.12m right-of-way, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

13. That prior to registration, the final plan of subdivision include a block showing sufficient lands to be dedicated to the City of Hamilton as public highway, by the Owner’s certificate on the plan, to establish the Sulphur Springs Road road allowance at 66 feet (20.12m), to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

14. That prior to registration, a 9.0 metre by 9.0 metre daylight triangle be established on the final plan of subdivision at the widened intersection of Street “B” and Sulphur Springs Road, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

15. That prior to registration, a 9.0m easement for storm water conveyance shall be established on the final plan of subdivision between lots 29 and 30, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

16. That prior to registration, the Owners pays their proportionate share for the future urbanization of Sulphur Springs Road for the full frontage of the draft plan lands adjacent to Sulphur Springs Road, based on the City’s “New Roads Servicing Rate” in effect at the time of payment, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.
17. That prior to registration, the Owner pays all outstanding servicing costs to the City of Hamilton for the existing sanitary sewer on Sulphur Springs Road, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

18. That prior to registration, the Owner shall include in the engineering design a system for the conveyance of cold water base flows to the creek which satisfies the requirements of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), City of Hamilton and the Hamilton Conservation Authority, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

19. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, that no building permits in this development shall be issued until the Pumping Station is commissioned, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

20. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, to phase the subdivision, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering, in a manner that a maximum 100 dwelling units proceed to registration until a second access is provided.

21. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, to monitor the stormwater management pond and surface stream flows for a period of 2 years following full build-out to confirm the effectiveness of the facility outlet and implement remedial design improvements or maintenance measures to rectify the performance deficiencies, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

22. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, to construct concrete sidewalks in the locations listed below:

   Street A - south side; full length; and,
   Street B - both sides; full length from Sulphur Springs Road to Street C.

23. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, to reconstruct the centreline profile of Sulphur Springs Road so that the required 160m of sightline looking east is achieved for Street “A”, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering. All costs to design and reconstruct the change in road profile will be at the expense of the applicant.

24. That prior to registration, the required upgrades to the intersection of Rousseaux Street and Wilson Street shall be implemented. The Owner’s proportionate share shall be based on 30% of the project costs to an upset limit of $100,000 (to be indexed annually), to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

25. That prior to servicing, the Owner prepares and agrees to implement a landscaping plan for the Storm Water Management facility on Block “64” which must be consistent with approved Urban Design Guidelines, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority, the Director of Planning, and Director of Development Engineering.
26. That prior to registration, the Owner demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority, that all major flows, including external drainage, can be conveyed safely, and that all provincial, municipal and HCA policies and standards are met.

27. That prior to registration, that a detailed and quantitative surface and groundwater balance is required, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

28. That prior to registration, that the Owner submits a floodline analysis study that recognizes the enclosure of the westerly and southerly tributaries and the construction of a new combined channel; and that all new development be located outside the Regulatory floodplain associated with Sulphur Creek, all to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

29. That prior to registration, a comprehensive Habitat Preservation and Compensation Plan be prepared and implemented to demonstrate that any negative impacts on the features and ecological functions of the significant woodland and the significant wetland are replicated or compensated for on site, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Director of Planning.

30. That prior to servicing, the Owner shall submit a Vegetation Monitoring and Management Plan to ensure the success of the tree preservation, compensation and rehabilitation works outlined in the Habitat Preservation and Compensation Plan, all to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Director of Planning.

31. That prior to grading, a Tree Protection Plan be prepared and implemented that outlines how the proposed retained trees will be protected from development activities prior to and during construction and/or grading activities, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Director of Planning.

32. That prior to registration, the applicant provides sufficient information to demonstrate that all proposed outdoor lighting located adjacent to the ESA (Block “66”), ESA buffer lands (Block “67”) and wetland compensation block (Block “65”), be configured or appropriately shielded to prevent the intrusion of light into these habitat areas, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

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

34. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, to install chain link fencing, or other acceptable type, at the rear of Lots 38-42, which abut Block “67” (the ESA buffer lands), to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.
35. That prior to preliminary grading, the Owner receives a permit from the Hamilton Conservation Authority under its Development, Interference with Wetlands, and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation 161/06 under Ontario Regulation 97/04 prior to the initiation of any watercourse alterations, and/or construction and grading works within the Authority’s regulated areas.

36. That prior to preliminary grading, the Owner receives any approvals required under the Federal Fisheries Act from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans prior to any watercourse alterations, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

37. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees, in writing, to convey the ESA block (Block “66”), the wetland compensation Block (Block “65”) and the ESA buffer block (Block “67”) to the Hamilton Conservation Authority at no charge.

38. That prior to registration, the applicant agrees, in writing, that restrictive covenants be placed on title for Blocks 68, 69, 70 and 71. The restrictive covenant shall advise the property owners that these blocks are zoned Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone for the purpose of a treed buffer area; that no structures are permitted to be constructed in this area; and, that no grading, vegetation removal, or other alterations to the lands subject to the restrictive covenant are permitted unless authorized by the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the City of Hamilton, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Director of Planning.

39. That prior to registration, the Owner designates the Cultural Heritage Landscape (retained lands) under the Ontario Heritage Act in order to appropriately manage change to the heritage resource in the future, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

40. That prior to registration, the Owner enters into a heritage conservation easement with the City of Hamilton on the retained lands in order to appropriately manage change to the heritage resource in the future, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

41. That prior to registration, the Owner agrees to provide a minimum 1.5 metre high chain link fence along the west side of Lots 10-13 and Lots 28-38, inclusive, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

42. That prior to registration, the Owner provides, at their own expense, Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines, prepared by a qualified architect or urban designer (referred to as the “Design Architect”), and that the Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines shall be included as an appendix to the Subdivision Agreement, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.
43. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, that a “Control Architect”, independent of the “Design Architect” firm or individual, shall be retained, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, and whose function shall be:

(i) To ensure, amongst other matters, the appropriate development of each lot with respect to siting, built form, materials, colours and landscaping in compliance with the approved Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines; and,

(ii) To certify, through stamping and signing, all drawings for the development of each lot and/or block subject to the Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines prior to the issuance of any building permit(s).

The Owner also acknowledges, in writing, that the City of Hamilton may undertake periodic reviews of certified drawings to ensure compliance with the Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines. Where inadequate compliance is evident, the City of Hamilton may cease to accept certified drawings by the Control Architect, and the owner shall retain another Control Architect, satisfactory to the Director of Planning.

44. That **prior to registration**, the Owner shall submit detailing proposed designs for review and agree to construct at their cost, all required design features including but not limited to the decorative wall along Sulphur Springs Road (behind the 15m buffer); entrance features (including landscaping, signage and any proposed structures); landscaped features and/or structures within the roundabout; entry islands; and, lookout features over the storm water management pond and/or wetland compensation block, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority, Director of Planning, Director of Development Engineering, Director of Capital Planning and Implementation and Manager of Traffic Engineering and Operations (Public Works Department), as applicable.

45. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees to provide and implement, at the Owner’s expense, a Streetscape Plan detailing enhanced boulevard landscaping treatment, fencing and street lighting for the required streets, and shall include details of the proposed enhanced paving materials to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Director of Development Engineering, Director of Capital Planning and Implementation and Manager of Traffic Engineering and Operations (Public Works Department), as applicable.

46. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, that for any design feature or streetscape enhancement proposed as part of Conditions 44 and 45 that are not agreed to be maintained and/or owned by the City of Hamilton, that alternative arrangements for long term maintenance be arranged. This could include, but not be limited to, one time payments for maintenance, a perpetual maintenance fund, the use of a Common-Element Condominium, or other such financial arrangement.
Approval of such arrangements is to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Director of Development Engineering, Director of Capital Planning and Implementation and Manager of Traffic Engineering and Operations (Public Works Department), as applicable.

47. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, to satisfy the Hamilton Conservation Authority with regards to arrangements for long-term maintenance of any design feature being constructed, at the Owner’s expense, on lands to be conveyed to the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

48. That **prior to registration**, the Owner receives clearance or approval from the Ministry of Natural Resources for the removal of any Butternut Trees as required under O.Reg. 242/08 of the *Endangered Species Act, 2007*, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, and should approval not be forthcoming from the Ministry of Natural Resources that the Draft Plan be revised so as not to impact the tree(s) to be preserved and protected, to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Natural Resources, Hamilton Conservation Authority, and Director of Planning.

49. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, to receive final approval of all details of works within the wetland compensation block (Block “65”) and implement all required works as identified in the “Woodland Manor Fisheries Compensation Plan and Supplementary Environmental Report Response to Agency Comments”, dated June 9, 2008, as approved by ESAIG on July 17, 2008, including any other works within the Block as detailed in the “Scoped Environmental Impact Study Addendum”, dated July 2007, and the “Scoped Environmental Impact Study”, dated April 2006, that form part of the ESAIG approval, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority, Director of Planning, and Director of Development Engineering.

50. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, to receive final approval of a tree planting plan to address additional tree plantings on private property within the proposed lots, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Director of Planning.

51. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, that Lot 10 be developed together with Block 68; that Lot 9 be developed together with Block 69; and, that Block 63 be development together with Block 71, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

52. That **prior to servicing**, the Owner shall include in the engineering design for the draft plan lands, the details of all driveway locations, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering and the Manager of Traffic Engineering and Operations.
53. That **prior to registration**, the Owner shall have the City of Hamilton obtain Council approval to have the Woodland Manor Pump Station lands transferred to the Owner in accordance with the Procedural By-law for the Sale of Land, being By-law 04-499, provided the said pumping station contained within has been decommissioned, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

54. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, that all retaining walls greater than 1m in height be certified and built by a qualified structural engineer (preferably the engineer that sealed the design plans and calculations), to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

55. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, that any upgrades to the existing culverts crossing Sulphur Springs Road will be at the sole expense of the Owner, and to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.

56. That **prior to registration**, the Owner agrees, in writing, to monitor surface stream temperatures and flows for a period of 2 years following full build-out to confirm that requirements for maintaining the creek function has been achieved and to implement remedial design improvements or maintenance measures to rectify any performance deficiencies, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Engineering.
Planning and Economic Development Committee
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. MacDonald:

After living in the City of Hamilton (Wards 3, 6 & 8) for over 65 years, my wife and I decided to move to the Village of Ancaster just over four years ago. We chose to live the rest of our retirement years in a beautifully designed townhouse complex that is within walking distance of all the amenities on the main street. We were also attracted by the historic village environment and slower pace of life that Ancaster offers.

In light of the proposed development of the Mount Mary property by Planning and Engineering Initiatives Ltd. (PEIL), we are having second thoughts about wanting to live in Ancaster and Hamilton. We understand the City's need for additional property taxes and property development within existing City boundaries. We are also trying to be realistic about encroaching urban growth and the resulting changes that development will bring to Ancaster's unique heritage and village-like character. We hope that, through your leadership, our City's Planning and Economic Development Committee can influence and shape future development in Ancaster that will preserve its heritage and prevent potentially massive traffic problems that will be devastating for our community.

We share the vision and concerns of the Save Ancaster Village Environment (SAVE) group as expressed in the August 2007 report, titled "Guiding Recommendations & Principles for the Development of the Woodlands Subdivision Ancaster Ontario" and the most recent Update Report, titled "The Changing Face of Ancaster and the Preservation of Our Historic Village".

We believe it is critical that comprehensive planning for the imminent development of the under-utilized Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board's property and the prospective sale and development of the Postal Station on Wilson Street, be considered before the proposed re-zoning and residential development of the property owned by The Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate at 437 Wilson Street East is approved.

We respectfully urge you and your Committee to give serious consideration to the concerns expressed by Ancaster residents through SAVE.

Sincerely,
Robert and Ruth Philip
August 29, 2007

The City of Hamilton,
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Attn: Mr Greg Macdonald
Senior Planner

Dear Mr Macdonald:

re: Woodland Manor OPA-06-17/25T-200612

It seems that much has happened since we met in Ancaster’s Old City Hall when you presented a plan for the development of Sulphur Springs Road. That was at the time when the Woodland Manor development was in its infancy. Since then plans for Sulphur Springs Road have been announced and they appear to meet all the concerns we discussed at that time. We should like to express our gratitude for listening to us and thank you for the outcome.

Then, on August 18, 2006, we received a preliminary circulation of the application for an official plan amendment for the proposed Woodland Manor development. At that time, we wrote to you expressing concern about the implications for the additional traffic on Sulphur Springs Road and preserving the nature of the Mount Mary lands where the Woodland Manor development is to occur. Since then very little appears to have been reported. The proposed public meeting on the project has yet to be scheduled. Fortunately the SAVE Committee has been busy and their report on Woodland Manor was distributed earlier this month.

We were gratified to read that SAVE shares our above-mentioned concerns, and has gone a lot further. Working from a set of six guiding principles, SAVE has identified major considerations and made some recommendations that we suggest provide a check-list against which the Woodland Manor proposal should be assessed. From our reading, the present Woodland Manor proposal falls short, and really should be changed quite substantially before it merits approval.

We defer to the SAVE committee’s report on preserving the nature of the Mount Mary lands and their other observations and recommendations. At the risk of sounding repetitious, we should like to continue addressing the traffic on Sulphur Springs Road.
The present proposal calls for two entrances to the development: (1) on Sulphur Springs Road across from Mansfield Drive through the space currently occupied by a pumping station, (no-one ever seems to mention the pumping station) and (2) further down Sulphur Springs Road at the western extremity of the proposed development. This means that most of the construction traffic, and on completion, most of the traffic in and out of the development will likely travel up Sulphur Springs Road to Wilson Street and then either north towards Rousseaux Street, or south-west towards the interchange with Highway 403. This will occur until such times as Phase 2 as presently proposed is completed. Most people will likely agree that the roads mentioned, even with the remediation you are planning, are not suitable for carrying the heavy vehicles and the increased number of the vehicles that would result.

Those who disagree would almost certainly be proved wrong - when it would be too late to make changes in a cost-effective manner. Consequently, our recommendation is that the development be planned in its entirety at the start, and that the infrastructure for the two phases contemplated by the developers be put in place before any housing construction begins. This means that the access road onto Wilson Street (currently scheduled for Phase 2) be part of the Phase 1 construction. Further, this access should be aligned with Rousseaux Street in order to make a cross-road at that point. The alternative of using the existing driveway into Mount Mary would be awkward since the two junctions are very close together. The effect of these recommendations would be to make the second (western) access road onto Sulphur Springs Road unnecessary, and place the majority of the new traffic directly onto Rousseaux Street, where much of it is probably going anyway.

Further, it is likely that applications will be made to develop the Board of Education property between Wilson Street and Queen Street in the not-too-distant future, so the City’s overall plan for this part of Ancaster should take this contingency into consideration as well.

In conclusion, we see the Woodland Manor development on the Mount Mary property as an opportunity with the potential for great benefits for the Village of Ancaster. It can be designed and built to enhance the special characteristics of the old village, to revitalise the old Town Centre, and bring greater prosperity to the community. The development will inevitably stress the existing infrastructure. The challenge is to develop a plan with a long-term perspective and sufficient thought, care, and creativity, to minimise the potentially damaging effects and to take advantage of the great opportunities that are presented. In our assessment, the developers’ present plan does not meet these criteria, and we encourage you to consult with the SAVE group to come up with comprehensive planning guidelines in preparation for the next stage of consultation.

Yours, etc.

Kenneth Clapperton, 90 Sulphur Springs Road, Ancaster, L9G 1L8, and Adrian J Tumber, 179 Mansfield Drive, Ancaster, L9G 4G3

Mr Lloyd Ferguson, Councillor, Ward 12
Mr Hope Gibson, Save Ancaster Village Environment
RE: ORA-06-17/25T200612

Lloyd and Greg;

We reside and have our business (Creations Gallery) at 436 Wilson St. E. directly opposite the gates to Mount Mary. We have been in this location for over 22 years. We are concerned about some of the ramifications of the development as proposed.

Does this development address the plans for future development of the Village Core and the historic significance of Ancaster? Will the architecture and landscaping reflect and carry on the unique appearance of Ancaster?

We are concerned that the mature trees, rolling topography and waterways not be compromised. The property is a jewel and should be enhanced with housing for families with children, empty nesters, retirees, and newlyweds. The green space should be accessible with bike and pedestrian paths and views of the escarpment to all of Ancaster's citizens.

Not the least of our concerns is the increase in vehicular traffic on Wilson St. We know how much traffic uses Wilson already and how difficult it can be to turn into and out of our parking lot. The present volume of traffic seems to be at its limit with vehicles backed up to the next block much of the day. Total traffic chaos would ensue if the Mount Mary driveway became a street.

There are other properties (Canada Post, Ball, School Board and Dalley) adjacent to Wilson St. which will be developed in the near future and would add even more traffic.

We need a comprehensive plan of the entire Village Core to prevent a huge traffic problem from developing. Extending Rousseaux St. to access these properties with Rousseaux turning and running approximately parallel to Wilson would reduce some of the volume. Turning the Mount Mary driveway into a bicycle and pedestrian pathway would enhance the village and help reduce the traffic.

A comprehensive plan needs to be developed before approval of the First Phase of Development of Woodland Subdivision is given. The Rousseaux extension should be in place before construction begins to avoid construction traffic ruining Wilson St and the businesses in the Village Core.

David and Linda Faulkner
436 Wilson St. E. Ancaster
Greg MacDonald, Senior City Planner, Hamilton

I have recently had an opportunity to review some proposed development issues regarding the development of the Mount Mary Lands in Ancaster (file: OPA-06-17/25T-200612). It is my observation that there are many legitimate concerns unresolved and needing to be addressed such as:

Traffic issues including vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access to adjoining conservation lands as well as to the village core, long term development plan for the town of Ancaster; including relating this development to a number of adjoining lands coming up for sale, buffer along bordering historic Shaw & Young properties on the west side of proposed development, historic architectural controls &/hydrological issues to name a few.

It would seem premature to consider granting any severances with respect to this parcel of land until issues have been conscientiously planned for in a way that would serve the best interests of Ancaster as a community.

For the purposes of this letter I wish to discuss specifically hydrological issues and historic architecture.

(1) Hydrological Issues

I am concerned spring and/or ground water at the north end of Mansfield Drive is presently being dumped into the sanitary sewers? If not where is it going? In my September 12, 2007 letter to David Johnston; of which you received a copy, I suggested a need for comprehensive hydrological study of the area directly adjacent to and uphill of the proposed land for development.

A significant amount of running water is audible through sewer grates in the middle of Mansfield Drive 24 hrs a day and is evidenced by sump pumps running continually in adjacent basements. I would like to know how significant the amount of water is? How it gets there? Where does it end up? Is this ground and/or spring water wrongly being dumped into the sanitary sewers? One can only surmise that the significant volume of water that is being pumped into the storm water or sanitary system by these sump pumps is only a fraction of the water that is underground and is trying to make its way north to the escarpment. Has a conscientious effort been made to understand the hydrological issues here and are there plans in place to deal with any underground aquifers should they be discovered?
If Woodland Manor Subdivision is proposing to move the water station at the end of Mansfield Drive and relocate existing wetlands adjacent to it, are they prepared to undertake to look after water issues including the surrounding areas that feed into the area of proposed development. Can it be assured that natural water courses above and below ground will not be inadvertently rerouted or inappropriately misdirected away from its intended destination of the escarpment and conservation land. Furthermore does the information gleaned from the hydrological study include the water issues at the northern end of Mansfield Drive. Can we be assured that any present problems with ground water, that may be inappropriately misdirected down the sewer system, will be addressed and corrected.

My experience shows that the underground springs are hard to detect and often go undetected until construction. This was the case with both Linda Shaw and myself with the construction of new homes built on Sulphur Springs Road adjacent to our driveways. These new homes have had a significant impact on our springs, creeks, wells and possibly the water table. I would like to due my utmost to ensure this does not happen again, on a larger scale, on the Mount Mary lands; as a result of this development.

These experiences point to a need for:

1. **More thorough investigation** to discover underground aquifers prior to excavation, especially in areas of high incidence of these water features.
2. **A developed plan** as to how underground aquifers are handled if found.
3. **Stricter supervision during excavation.** If springs are found during excavation, plans as to how they should be dealt with must be in place and enforced. Steps must be taken to ensure water tables are not altered and the destination of water flows are maintained.

Most importantly I would like to ensure that existing natural water ways, either exposed or underground, are not inadvertently rerouted from current flow routes supplying water to natural water features in the conservation area.

If the Conservation Authority has not presented its recommendations, I think steps should be taken immediately to ensure the Mansfield Drive hydrology and any related ground and spring water problems involving the present sewer system be addressed. It would make sense that plans to rectify this situation should be considered in conjunction with the drainage and ground water management of the proposed site for development.
(2) **Historic architecture**

From a preliminary review of the architectural drawings it would appear that the houses are to be a version of the contemporary subdivision style used by this developer in the Meadowlands development, with the addition of arch and monument features integrated into landscape features.

While there will always be an intense subjective debate about what is architecturally beautiful I strongly believe we need to focus on traditional styling that is in keeping with the general character of the village area. While a modern eclectic style may be appropriate in the modern setting of the Meadowlands, a development of this size in a modern style, in the village area, would significantly dilute the historic character and charm of the village and significantly detract from its’ unique historic character. This is the last significant parcel of land that can be developed so close to the village core. Every effort should be made to ensure the architecture is suitable and appropriate.

Severance and or rezoning should not be entertained until these issues are dealt with as a whole. Historic architectural control guidelines should be required to ensure the quality of this development.

**Conclusions**

While I see development of the land around the village core as a necessary and positive activity, development should not compromise and dilute the unique historic character of the Ancaster village core. There must be a thorough understanding of hydrological issues including the surrounding areas that feed into this property. It is my personal view that this developer does not fully understand the impact this development will have on the character of the immediate community and the environment. Consequently, it is my current view that every effort should be made to prevent the progress of this development as it currently stands unless the developer agrees to undertake to address legitimate concerns. This is a significant and beautiful piece of property. It derives much of its special qualities based on its location, in the core of Ancaster and adjacent to the conservation. Its’ development should be contingent on having respect for preserving the special qualities of both the Village of Ancaster and the Conservation.

Yours truly

Karen Wilkins

At this time I would like to request copies of: 1/The Environmental Impact Study
2/Heritage Resources Study
3/Archaeological Study
4/Hydrological Study

Could you please indicate where and how I might be able obtain or view these reports. Your assistance in getting this information is appreciated.
Appendix "I" to Report No. PED08306 (Page 8 of 64)

Please make the right choice for this unique community!

George & Donna Louth  
71 Sulphur Springs Road, Unit # 32  
Ancaster, Ontario  
L9G 5C1

2007 10 29

Mr. Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner  
City of Hamilton Planning & Economic Development  
Hamilton City Hall  
71 Main St. W.  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Re: Mount Mary Development Proposal

Dear Mr. Mac Donald

Recently, we were updated on the proposed changes to the Mount Mary Development. We have also learned of further development possibilities along Wilson Street that will impact negatively on the community and traffic volume/flow, if allowed to go ahead without comprehensive coordinated planning.

The Mount Mary development plan falls considerably short of presenting a comprehensive and innovative development plan for our community.

We are aware of the efforts put forth by the Save Committee as well as other community representatives who have worked on sub-committees over the years to maintain the integrity of the community. Developers do not respect this but merely see the dollar value attached to their development. A clear example of their disregard is evident in the approach taken by Helmut Strobel and the Wilson Street condo plans.

All we ask is that you responsibly adopt a comprehensive plan for our community before the Mount Mary application is approved. An effective solution to the expected traffic congestion that will effect not only residents, but also businesses, must be established before anything is given approval to go ahead. Meadowlands is a living example of too much traffic in a small area.

An ill-conceived plan or no plan at all will have a negative effect on you as a city planner, us as residents and community businesses. Piecemeal planning is no planning.

As well, with the approval of this development, I foresee more traffic on the road and longer waits during peak traffic hours, particularly for those turning onto Wilson Street from Sulphur Springs Road. I would ask for a thorough review of traffic implications and traffic calming remedies.

Closely, as a neighbourhood there will be many adaptations required on our part should the development as currently proposed be approved. At this time, I am asking for a number of reasonable concessions from the developers, including the request for review of impacts to the natural environment and privacy and property considerations.

Further, I submit that the City has a clear obligation to assist the community in exhorting the developer to consider nine fewer lots along Sulphur Springs Road.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Shaw
July 30, 2007

Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main St. West
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5
FAX: 905 546-4202

Regarding File: Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-290612:

Dear Mr. MacDonald,

I am writing with regard to the above-noted file as a follow up to my letter of October 7, 2006 in which I outlined my concerns regarding the above application for development.

I stated in that letter that the proposed subdivision abuts the full eastern edge of my property. As such, I am affected directly as a neighbour to the proposed development. I have received no reply addressing my concerns regarding the impact of the development on my property, specifically to my concern regarding the natural flow of water. I am taking this opportunity to outline this issue in more detail with the hope that I can receive assurances that a thorough understanding of the sensitive environmental water flow issues have been thoroughly investigated, acknowledged and planned for. I do not wish to have this dealt with in a retroactive manner with the commencement of grading, this is a threshold issue and must be addressed prior to consideration of land use approvals.

I feel that this is an important issue because since moving to this property in 1995 I personally have noticed and been impacted by progressive changes to the water flow. In the first few summers here we were able to cut an area of grass with a tractor to the south of my house. Within a few years this area was too wet to cut and prompted us to excavate it to create a pond in 1999. I noticed as well at the time that the area just to the east of this area had slowly become wetter which was evident by numerous mature trees uprooting and falling over.

There are as well many examples of underwater springs here. My well sits on a spring, also the excavation of the pond unearthed springs. My basement shows evidence of a subterranean spring under the foundation. When the two houses on Sulphur Springs Road to the south of my property were built there were complications to the digging of the foundations because in both instances they unearthed springs.

The drainage concerns associated with the area are noteworthy as the lands proposed for development currently provide the natural drainage outlet. For this reason I am concerned with flooding not just from surface water but with interference to subsurface water drainage which is more complex and less apparent. I am concerned not just with flooding but with the more subtle aspects of water drainage. I have made a significant investment over the years in tree planting and landscaping and have experienced first hand how even a small amount of change to water levels affects trees and vegetation. I mention as well here that having a septic bed and changes to water flow is a worry and raises the potential for public health concerns.

I have outlined my concerns here in detail with the request that more information be forthcoming and that I can be assured that the issues are understood and the technical issues have been resolved before the consideration of land use approvals. I would appreciate receiving your written acknowledgement of this letter, as well as, your comments on the issues I have raised.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Linda Shaw
October 10, 2006

The City of Hamilton,
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Attn: Mr. Greg Macdonald
Senior Planner

Dear Mr. Macdonald

re: Woodland Manor OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Last April, Trudie and Adrian Tumber attended a meeting at the old Ancaster Town Hall at which Mr. Greg Moore held a public meeting on City's reconstruction plans for Sulphur Springs Road. The road was described as having a special status due to its streetscape and the plans for the road were to take this into account, while making it safer for motorists and pedestrians. Concerns to be addressed in the plan were the traffic volume, the speed of vehicles, the narrow road and the problems they create for constructing a sidewalk to provide safe passage for the many pedestrians who use the road - either to walk up to Wilson Street, or as the route they used for running or walking as part of their exercise programs. Special note was made of the elderly residents at the Ryerson property and the sight-lines at the crest of the hill at the Fieldhouse Museum. Implementing the plan was delayed because of the Canadian Open and the Woodland Manor proposals being made for the Mount Mary lands.

We (Ken Clapperton and Adrian Tumber) own property on Sulphur Springs Road and we attended a meeting at Mount Mary at which the Mayor was present. We have since received further details of the planned development from your office. We have discussed these plans and have some reservations and suggestions that we should like to bring to your attention:

1) Traffic on Sulphur Springs Road.

We find it hard to believe the developers' contention that their traffic studies suggest there will be little effect in terms of traffic volumes when the proposed development of over 200 family units is complete. The traffic on this road has increased noticeably since the much smaller Foxridge Drive was completed - perhaps due to the new residences or to more through traffic. We predict that unless major changes are made - either to the Woodland Manor plan to use only Sulphur Springs Road to access that development - or to the road itself, traffic noise and volume, and the
resulting congestion on Sulphur Springs Road will rise to unacceptable levels. Plan changes could include reducing the number of units in the development, and/or routing traffic from the development directly onto Wilson Street. Mount Mary already has such an access road and apparently they do not wish to have it (or some other roadway) used for this purpose. Alternatively the City might abandon the notion that Sulphur Springs Road has a streetscape that is worthy of maintaining, appropriate lands on each side of the road, cut the down the trees, demolish the building at the intersection with Wilson Street and make it more like Rosseau Street. It is this kind of option that would really upset those of us who want to maintain Ancaster as a community with a special distinctive character.

2 Tree Preservation
We believe that clearing land in preparation for building a subdivision is rarely appropriate. Any plan for clear-cutting any areas in the Mount Mary property should be strenuously resisted. These comments apply to the whole development, but, as we are sure you will recognise, we are especially concerned that the developers be required to justify every tree that they plan to remove in the vicinity of Sulphur Springs Road.

We trust that you will take into account our concerns and those of the other citizens living in this area when making your assessment of the matters related to this project that come to your attention.

Yours, etc.

Kenneth Clapperton, 90 Sulphur Springs Road, Ancaster, L9G 1L8

Adrian J Tumber, 179 Mansfield Drive, Ancaster, L9G 4G3

cc Save Ancaster Village Environment
Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton
Planning Economic Development Department
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

File #OPA-06-17/25t-200612

Dear Sir:

Thank you for this opportunity to express concerns with regards to the proposed development of the lands of Mount Mary Academy at 437 Wilson Street East, Ancaster.

As an abutting land owner to both the Wilson Street proposed entrance as well as the proposed Sulphur Springs Road entrances, I have concerns as to the safety factor as well as the congestion that already exists in Ancaster, due to the lack of proper roadway infrastructures.

The traffic here in the morning and evening rush hours is overburdened as it is, without adding to the situation. Sulphur Springs Road is a nightmare in the mornings and will only get worse, with more auto traffic.

This situation will eventually cause more accidents and could eventually lead to a fatality or a serious injury, especially on Sulphur Springs Road, as the roadway is so narrow now that it creates havoc for any walking traffic.

I would appreciate being kept apprised of the developments of this proposal.

Regards

Arlene Outlaw
908 Montgomery Drive
Ancaster, Ontario

10/10/2006
Mr. Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner  
City of Hamilton  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
71 main Street West  
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

Ancaster, October 25, 2006  
34-71 Sulphur Springs Road  
Ancaster ON L9G 5C1

Dear Greg,

Re: Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Thank you for advising us that the City has received an application from the owners of the Mount Mary Immaculate Retreat Centre to change the zoning from "Institutional" to "Residential" and to create a plan of subdivision on the southwest portion of the subject lands.

Your letter, dated August 18, 2006 makes reference to a Preliminary Circulation, and therefore we will only address a number of major concerns and suggestions.

General

The Mount Mary Immaculate Retreat Centre is a "jewel" in the heart of Ancaster and is one of the most scenic landscapes in the Dundas Valley. To develop most of the lands into residential units would not be in the best interests of the Community.

The City should negotiate with the owners to acquire part of the property (e.g. the former Wynnstay villa and surroundings) for the benefit of the general public. One excellent example of this is the successful development of the former Nicholson Estate by the City of Burlington, now called the Paletta Estate on Lakeshore Road.

Phase I of the proposed plan is not exciting, lacks vision and is a standard development plan which maximizes the land for building lots and causes the removal of most of the trees and vegetation. We are not against development however, the development should add real beauty and benefit to the community.
Traffic Impact

We were not impressed with the Traffic Impact Study carried out by G. Aston, Transportation Engineering. We understand that the Study has been referred back to the developer and that the developer has commissioned a new and comprehensive study to be carried out by Stantec Consulting Ltd. Stantec Consulting Ltd. will not only have to consider the impact the proposed development of the Mount Mary property will have on the adjacent roadways, but also the impact other properties will have when they re-develop, e.g. the Board of Education lands on Wilson Street and Queen Street.

Stantec Consulting Ltd. carried out a "Comprehensive Transportation Study" for the Town of Ancaster. This study was submitted to the New City of Hamilton in November 2001 and the purpose was to develop an overall transportation plan to guide staff and Council when making their respective recommendations and decisions involving the community of Ancaster. Stantec Consulting Ltd. will have to refer to this comprehensive report when carrying out their Traffic Impact Study for the Woodland Manor Development.

Page E5.6 of this comprehensive study refers to "Special Character Road Management". Please have the Consultant consider the inclusion of this paragraph in their report. This paragraph starts out with the following:

“The Ancaster community includes a number of roadways that, because of their structural, visual and historic characteristics, are intended to remain open for public use, but be maintained at levels consistent with surrounding conditions.”

During the week, especially during rush hour, there is much traffic congestion on Sulphur Springs Road and Wilson Street. Adjacent residential streets like Church, Lodor and Academy, receive a lot of through traffic. We trust that the City will implement traffic calming devices before the Woodland Manor development will take place, to ensure that these residential streets will operate as residential streets.

We highly recommend that new traffic counts be obtained to ensure that the information is recent and reliable. We look forward to the opportunity to read and review the new Traffic Impact Study as soon as it is available.
Environment

The streetscape of Sulphur Springs Road is unique and should be retained. We therefore recommend that an internal service road be constructed parallel to Sulphur Springs Road behind the existing tree line and only one access road to be constructed. This connection should be opposite Mansfield Drive.

We recommend that the second exit of this development be of Wilson Street in a location which has the least negative impact on Wilson Street and the Wilson/ Rousseau/Old Dundas Road intersection. It is our opinion that if the Wilson connection is at the same location as the main entrance to Mount Mary, serious traffic problems will occur.

The Developer, in conjunction with City staff, should consider the possibility of connecting the internal roadway to the Wilson/ Rousseau/ Old Dundas Road intersection. It is our opinion that the proposed roadway at Wilson Street is too close to the main intersection at Rousseaux Street, which is a few hundred meters to the north.

Since the northerly portion of the lands are designated Escarpment Natural Area and the boundary generally corresponds to the limits of the Dumas Valley ESA, we would like to see adequate public access to the Escarpment by the provision of parking areas, walkways and pedestrian trails. These provisions are also a requirement of the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

There is no reference to setting aside lands for a municipal park (active or passive). Is the City expecting cash in lieu?

This application creates a great opportunity for the City to have the Developer dedicate park lands which can than be incorporated with the concept of public access to the Escarpment. We understand that the Park Dedication is over and above what has to be retained as ESA lands, buffer zones and flood plains.

We would like the Developer to include in his plan a buffer zone along the east side of the Phase I proposal. This zone should include the existing mature trees and new plantings to enhance the privacy between the proposed development and 71 Sulphur Springs Road.
Heritage

The former Wynnstay Estate is a planned cultural heritage landscape and we understand that the property is of Provincial as well as of National value. For this reason it warrants protection of its most significant features under the various Municipal Plans and Provincial Acts. We trust that the Developer as well as the City will do everything in their power to preserve the significant heritage and landscape sites for generations to come.

Yours Truly,

Mathieu R.J. Koevoets, P.Eng.  Grace A.J. Koevoets
Dear Mr. Macdonald:

Thank you for promptly responding to my request for the above mentioned file. I am requesting to be on the list for notification of any activity happening in this proposed project.

I would like to say at this time, that as a neighbour of the above mentioned property, I am very much opposed to this huge residential development which will greatly negatively impact the beauty and sustainability of the Conservation environment and the very essence of the rural flavour of Ancaster.

The hiking trail along this land has always been a charming boon to the many neighbours and citizens who hike it every day, all year.

The streets adjoining this property are already overly congested and any further strain on them would make the traffic situation completely unmanageable.

When the trail was moved closer to Ontario Street a while ago, we had no notification or warning that this was going to happen and only learned about it when it was a fait accompli. This was grossly unfair and in view of this we would like to be kept aware of this ill-advised project as it progresses in the hope that it will be reconsidered by the Planning Committee, the Traffic Committee and the Conservation Authority.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Bella Muller
482 Ontario Street
Ancaster, Ont. L9G3E1
Dear Greg Macdonald

Concerning The Woodland Manor Development, Ancaster
File No. OPA-06-17/257-200612

We are home owners situated at 140 Sulphur Springs Rd. in Ancaster, Ontario.

This is not a letter of opposition to the Woodland Manor proposal. There are many aspects of this proposal which are commendable. Rather this is a submission to hopefully improve this development plan with the aim to preserve what is a historic Ontario village.

Ancaster has a historic significance dating back well before Hamilton existed, as is illustrated by the Ontario historic plaque to the "Bloody Assizes of 1637" situated on Wilson Street, when the village was the judicial seat for this area of Upper Canada. The core of old Ancaster is situated on Wilson Street between Rousseau and Halsen Streets. This street front is populated by some of the oldest commercial and residential buildings of the area, many dating back to the 1850s and earlier. The Woodland Manor development will have a major impact on historic Ancaster. We must be careful to ensure this heritage is not destroyed or trampled by development.

Sulphur Springs Road also has historic significance. It was a major rural farm route to Ancaster for regional commerce and agriculture. One only has to drive this road's tree lined route to appreciate its heritage, which is captured on many of the canvases of the region's most notable painter Frank Panabaker. Development not carefully planned will destroy the uniqueness of Ancaster, a uniqueness which creates its desirability as a community.

It is from this perspective that we make these comments and recommendations for your consideration.

Our concerns may be organized under several headings: Preservation of Historic Ancaster, Household Density, Traffic Congestion, Preservation of Sulphur Springs Road and Future Plans for the "Open Spaces". We would like to talk to each of these points but point out that they are all interconnected in their significance on the future of Ancaster.
PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC ANCASTER

We realize that progress with its development and growth is essential. We however implore you to not let development trample our heritage, for if lost what is unique becomes common, history turned to dust and quality of community depleted. The underlining motivation which should guide our actions should be preservation of what makes this community unique.

HOUSEHOLD DENSITY

Our concerns are rooted in the increased household density Woodland Manor will bring to this fragile core of Ancaster. This development must be executed in such a way to preserve Ancaster’s uniqueness.

We have concerns for the services available to support such a development. This proposal rezones land use for the entire 437 Wilson Street property - Phase 1 and 11. We request that rezoning only be extended to Phase 1 and the developer be required to resubmit for rezoning for Phase 11 after the completion of Phase 1. This would allow a period of assessment as to the effects of Phase 1 on Ancaster and the quality of the developer’s project execution.

Not to give the city planners the opportunity to assess the effects of Phase 1 on infrastructure could bind the city to accept development well in excess of the current infrastructure to sustain.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Lots 1 - 73 (the 73 single lots proposed) will alone bring probably well over 100 additional automobiles and this does not count the vehicles generated by the ‘multi-family residential’ use of Block 112.

One need only stand at the corners of Wilson Street and Sulphur Springs Road during the 8:00 to 10:00 am or the 4:00 to 7:00 pm periods to witness the current traffic congestion. At times cars are lined back up Sulphur Springs Road past Mansfield Drive or down Wilson Street almost to Rousseau.

Phase 1 of this development will have only one exit direction for vehicles onto Sulphur Spring Road. Most new developments of this type, in the Ancaster area, enjoy exit points in several directions allowing a less concentrated dispersal of car traffic. However due to the positioning of this development hemmed in by the escarpment to the north and private property to the west, it is only to the south - Sulphur Springs Road - where the developers have allowed for traffic access. This will place an unmanageable burden upon Sulphur Springs Road.

We suggest the following:
1) that the developer be required to extend road access out to Wilson Street as part of Phase 1. This will provide a second direction in which to disperse traffic.
2) that the developer only be allowed one access point to Sulphur Springs Road managed by a stop light. This would allow the orderly traffic flow from Woodland Manor onto Sulphur Springs Road.
PRESERVATION OF SULPHUR SPRINGS ROAD

As mentioned in our opening remarks Sulphur Springs Road is part of Ancaster’s heritage. It is also the access to the protected Dundas Valley Conservation lands. It is a unique tree lined road and part of the village heritage and atmosphere.

In the developer’s plans they envisage 10 individual house lots with direct driveway access on to Sulphur Springs Rd. This would have two negative results 1) the destruction of this heritage road, and 2) the danger of vehicles entering and exiting driveways on what has already become a very busy street.

Our recommendation is that the developer be required to:
1) preserve a green, tree lined buffer zone between the development and Sulphur Spring Road. This buffer zone would run from the Town Manors (71 Sulphur Spring Rd.) to the driveways of 159 & 163 Sulphur Spring Rd. and down this lane side of the development to the Escarpment edge.
2) that all the housing lot driveways face onto the roads within the Woodlands Manor development and not on to Sulphur Springs Rd.

FUTURE PLANS FOR THE ‘OPEN SPACES’ OR ‘ADDITIONAL LANDS’

We applaud this zoning application’s designation of what they refer to as ‘Open Spaces’ or ‘Additional Lands’ as conservation. This is truly a magnificent element for it preserves those lands situated directly next to the Niagara Escarpment. We would only request that these sections of land be firmly designated within the region’s conservation lands. This would place these land parcels beyond any temptation for development. We suggest that these lands be donated to the Dundas Valley Conservation Authority for management. This would be a true testament to the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate’s commitment to the preservation of Ancaster.

SUMMARY ON PAGE 4
SUMMARY

We would like to summarize our points for the preservation of Ancaster.

1) That the developer only be given rezoning for Phase 1. After the completion of this phase the region's planners may assess the success and burdens on the infrastructure in their consideration for the application for Phase 11.

2) That the developer be only given one road access point to Sulphur Spring Road at Mansfield Drive managed by a light. This would cut back congestion on Sulphur Springs Rd.

3) That the developer be required to provide roadway access, through what is planned as Phase 11, to Wilson St. This would allow two directions of access and departure for the development.

4) That a green, tree lined buffer zone be maintained between the development and Sulphur Springs Rd. This would help to preserve the Road's heritage.

5) That all house lot driveway access be from roads within Woodland Manor and not from Sulphur Springs Rd. This too would reduce congestion on Sulphur Springs and maintain its heritage status.

6) That the planned 'Open Spaces' or 'Additional Lands' along the escarpment be granted full conservation status and donated to the Dundas Conservation Authority for management and preservation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Hope Gibson
January 11, 2007

e-mail:

Mr. Greg Macdonald
City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Macdonald:

Re: The Woodland Manor Development, Ancaster
File No. OPA-06-17/25T-200612
Mount Mary Academy Lands, Ancaster

I am writing this letter in my personal capacity and also on behalf of numerous neighbours on Church Street, Lodor Street and Academy Street in Ancaster.

I live at 373 Lodor Street in Ancaster.

The residents of Church, Lodor and Academy Streets are experiencing an ever-growing traffic volume on these purely residential streets.

Traffic volume in our neighbourhood has been the subject of studies by the Town of Ancaster in the past and, as a resident, I participated in one study consultation a number of years ago.

The amalgamation of the Town of Ancaster into the City of Hamilton and the opening of the Lincoln Alexander Expressway have taken place since the last traffic studies were completed. Traffic volumes have continued to increase.

I am sure you are well aware that the opening of the “Linc” has resulted in a large volume of traffic making its way to the corner of Rousseaux (Mohawk) and Wilson
Mr. Greg Macdonald  

January 11, 2007

Streets. Turning traffic and the resulting delays cause traffic to spill off and onto Academy and Lodor Streets, with the intention of rejoining Wilson at the Church Street traffic light.

Another problem pertains to the traffic at the corner of Wilson and Church Streets. Traffic proceeding north on Wilson often “spills” off at Church Street and on down Lodor and off at Academy in order to reach Rousseaux (Mohawk) faster rather than following the major route down Wilson to the Rousseaux corner and then turning right onto Rousseaux. In the same vein, traffic often short-cuts off to the town centre parking lot, through the parking lot to Lodor Street and on down to Rousseaux.

The third problem involves traffic on Sulphur Springs Road as it approaches the intersection at the Wilson Street stoplight. A lot of traffic that is east-bound does not turn left onto Wilson and then right at Rousseaux. Instead, a lot of traffic crosses directly across Wilson onto Church Street and onto Lodor and on down to Rousseaux. This is a very noticeable problem during rush hours.

I am sure that the City of Hamilton Planning Department is aware of these problems by now.

I am writing this letter as a result of the proposed development of the Mount Mary property which stretches from Sulphur Springs Road through to Wilson Street.

The development of the Mount Mary lands will increase the traffic problems that we are experiencing in our residential neighbourhood, and I request that the City Planning Authorities keep in mind that there is “collateral damage” to surrounding neighbourhoods as a result of such a significant development, which will inevitably increase the traffic flow everywhere in the Ancaster Village.

Basically, we are not opposed to the development of the lands, provided that due consideration is given to the many factors that will affect our community. Simply increasing the overall density should not be the goal, even if that is what the Province thinks we should do. The planning steps should be carefully taken so as not to ruin the fine village amenities that we already have.

I am a member of S.A.V.E. (Save Ancaster Village Environment) and I will not repeat their concerns and suggestions here, but simply state that we support them.

I will limit myself to our traffic concerns because of the problems in our specific neighbourhood. I am not a traffic expert, and I hope that your Planning Department will have experts to help in our situation.
There are two obvious factors to consider.

The first is to reduce the number of vehicles that might be added to the traffic flow by the new development. This could involve restricting the density of the new development. We all know that upscale family units bring an extra number of vehicles. We cannot adequately control the number of vehicles per family unit but we can control the number of family units in the new development by restricting the number of dwellings. For each dwelling unit reduction, we would reduce the number of potential vehicles by at least two and probably a bit more.

The second factor is to “bleed” the traffic away from the troubled areas.

Would it be possible to design the street pattern to take traffic from the southwest corner of the development on Sulphur Springs directly through to the northeasterly corner of the development and directly onto Wilson Street at or near the Rousseaux corner? This could be done with a proper street pattern. Is it possible to have the outlet at Wilson Street come through at Rousseaux Street so that a proper intersection is created? This would go a long way to solve a lot of the problems.

I understand that improvements are scheduled for Sulphur Springs Road from Mansfield Drive to Wilson. Could a left-turn lane be put in so as to encourage people to turn left onto Wilson and not go straight onto Church?

Is it possible to improve the passage of vehicles on Wilson Street between Church and Rousseaux? The recent suggestion of eliminating all drive-throughs might help if this should happen at the Tim Horton’s. Also, could Wilson Street be widened to use more of the pavement with less parking?

Can the flow at Wilson and Rousseaux be improved so as to reduce the traffic back-up by improving the stoplight system? Especially for people going west on Rousseaux and wanting to turn south onto Wilson Street? A road directly into the Mount Mary property would make a difference.

Are there ways to further impede or calm the traffic flow on Church, Lodor and Academy Streets? Perhaps by allowing parking on both sides, removing the left-turn lane at Rousseaux and Academy? Could speed bumps, etc. be used in the residential streets?

Here are two specific ideas which would help, although very modestly, but every bit helps.
Put a fence or gate in the municipal parking lot behind the town centre to stop "through" traffic moving from Wilson Street to Lodor Street. Those wishing to park could come to the lot from either direction but a gate would stop through traffic.

The taxi company that services Ancaster uses the town centre lot and the tennis club parking lot for parking. The taxi company uses the Academy/Lodor shortcut continuously from that lot, and perhaps they could be ordered to use the municipal parking lot on Wilson Street as a holding area. This would reduce a bit of the traffic.

I do not pretend to be a traffic expert, but I am able to see that we have an ever-increasing problem, and substantial new development in the village area will only exacerbate the problems. You have the experts in your department and we need help from them.

Yours truly,

Thomas A. Hickey

TAH:sas

cc: Councillor Lloyd Ferguson
    City of Hamilton
    71 Main Street West
    Hamilton, Ontario
    L8P 4Y5

cc: Mr. Ed Switenky, Acting Manager,
    Traffic Engineering and Operations
    Public Works Department
    Suite 320
    77 James Street North
    Hamilton, Ontario
    L8R 2K3
Jan 10 2007

Mr Greg MacDonald,
Senior Planner,
City of Hamilton,
Planning and Economic Department

File # Woodland Manor Application
OPA-06-17/25T-200612

A Vision for Ancaster

I walked out of the meeting (June? 06) that introduced to the neighboring residences as an Exciting Redevelopment Plans of the Mount Mary Retreat Center, one of Ancaster’s most unique properties. If you ever get a chance to walk through it, there rolling hills and a park like setting with acres of manicured lawns and mature trees. There is a stream feeding a tranquil fish filled pond that winds through to NEC protected woods eventually cascades down the escarpment with a large natural sitting stone that faces back to view the falls its a unique and peaceful setting. The description of the development as “exciting” and calling it Woodland Manor brings to mind a special and different approach to land development. The developers really do have a chance to do something special to one of Ontario’s most unique pieces of land. Aside from the planners chatter of how they will ingeniously manage the streams from all the extra roof and road run off, the clear cutting of the land and the crammed houses and squared off streets is no different from any other maximized for profit land development. If I had arrived late for the presentation I could easily mistaken the housing plan layout for one to be put into an open flat field anywhere in the outskirts of greater Hamilton. When the building is done this stretch of Sulphur Springs Road will be an open flat field with houses crammed to roof top jumping density and a few token tree at the edge to the road to sell us all on their efforts of tree preservation. There should be a tree inventory done as there are many unique trees that need to be preserved. There is one tree by phase one with a trunk circumference of 28 feet! I researched an Ontario tree registry and found that this tree exceeds the largest recorded tree in this Registry by many feet. This could then very well be Ontario’s largest trunk diameter tree. This tree needs a special preservation plan that guarantees its total protection during and after the development is done. There is a 500 foot cross on the back hill formed by a double row of mature Pine Trees, it can easily be spotted from an airplane or satellite view. There are other trees of importance just look at the huge mature Copper Beech tree inside the stone gateway off Wilson Street. Will it be cut down too wider the road at the gate that they want to move? Look at the development at Sulphur Springs and Lovers Lane. Not many trees, as promised, were left after that development was completed.

This new development does not bring any excitement or woodland planning to the area. It was no vision and is laid out for what the developers think is the maximum for profit development they can push passed the committees and the citizens of the community. If
the nuns really want to develop and do what is right for the preservation of their very special lands and live in peace with the citizens of the community then they should listen to this vision of development very closely and question the developers money motivated plan. Sulphur Springs Road is a very special asset to the region. It has a unique character. Homeowners have invested and build up scale because of its special treed and winding setting. The people that walk it, jog it, cycle it, and tour it in cars and motorcycles. Vintage, Classic and Sports Car Club tours either start or finish on Sulphur Springs Road. Then why clear-cut the property when it could be an asset that compliments the character and adds to the uniqueness and value to the community of Ancaster.

My vision, if development must be, is to first, and most important, leave a depth of approximately 100 feet of trees, that exist along Sulphur Springs, as an untouched buffer and a treed buffer along the private lane on the west side. This will show that community character not money rules in the planning. Secondly the lots should average on size of perhaps one half acre with some larger lots at the back, and thus fitting in with the sizing and character of the surrounding properties. Third, there should only be one road entrance onto Sulphur Springs Road at Mansfield and no additional house driveways onto Sulphur Springs Rd. With added driveways, left and right turning vehicles would gridlock the already back up of traffic on Sulphur Springs from the Wilson stop light. The roads in the new development should wind and follow the lay of the land and avoiding the mature trees where possible. The extreme density of the proposed town houses will take away from the character of the area. If they must be the density should be the same as the neighboring town houses. Some green space should also be left in the town house cite to allow the abundant wildlife to connect to the valley. The added traffic and dangerous road issues could largely be tempered by leaving the stone gate as is, possibly for private Nunnery use only, and constructing a major road to the Wilson street / Rousseaux street intersection. Make this intersection into a standard intersection, that could clearly handle the added car traffic. A road at the gate halfway up the steep hill would be a dangerous nightmare on a snowy winters day and even worse if it needed a stop light for the added traffic. The stone gates are of a unique character and very much a part of what makes Ancaster special. Moving and relocating them back and furthur apart loosens their character and I believe they are part of Ancasters heritage and must be preserved untouched.

Here is another vision of what could possibly be done on this special piece of land. On the larger lots at the back, each Major Builder in the region would build a show case house all side by side to show off their best “show case houses” (good advertising for all). These houses would become a well-publicized open house tour of a “Street of Dreams”. This concept has been used in other areas in Canada with great success. Ancaster will get homebuyers from the wider GTA. It will keep people from buying up large rural acreage because there are no larger lot settings that developers offer them in the municipality. It will put Ancaster on the map as being special. People will eagerly buy into this natural setting concept. The rest of the homes in the development will all sell as “special up scale” because of the attention give to preserving these special lands. This will make Ancaster a leader in a caring conscientious heritage preserving community. Our planning concept will stand out and the new development will make Sulphur Springs Road an even better road and a more harmonious community to live in.
The adjoining neighbours will be more accepting to development and the nuns will have
done the right thing for the community.
This land is worth the special attention. Ask the nuns for a tour. You will be left
breathless by its beauty. When the bulldozers come in, it will be gone forever.

Bert Rufenach
160 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster On. L9G 4T7
Appendix "I" to Report No. PED08306 (Page 29 of 64)

RECEIVED
AUG 30 2006

20 Rousseaux Street
Ancaster, ON L9G 2W5
29 August, 2006

Greg Macdonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Macdonald

Re: File OPA-06-1725T-200612
Woodland Manor Phase I

I have reviewed the package dated August 18, 2006 which outlines in detail the first phase of this project, and shows the area that will comprise Phase II.

Our property is the first property on Rousseaux, effectively located on the corner of Rousseaux Street and Wilson Street.

Our opposition to this proposed development is not to the development itself, which looks like most other subdivisions in Ancaster, but to its effect on a community that cannot handle the traffic it now endures.

We moved to this property in 1999, and seldom if ever had serious difficulty get out of our driveway. The volume of traffic on Rousseaux seems to have mushroomed in the past two or three years. It is at the point where during the day it often takes several minutes to exit. It seems to be the timing. It can clear one way, then a wave of cars appears from the other direction. The volume of cars coming around the corner from Wilson Street in both directions is sometimes absolutely amazing.

This is not surprising as Rousseaux has become the route to the Linc and the 403 for both Ancaster and Dundas. It was not likely intended as a regional arterial road, but that is what it is. There has also been a lot of development in the Ancaster core. It’s a house here, a house there, infill townhouse projects, and so on. Each adds a few more cars to an already overcrowded infrastructure.
This proposal is not a house here and a house there, but an intensive project. The package does not state how many multi-family units will be built but it is probably safe to say with the 73 singles and the multi family block the first phase will add 100 families or so to the core. The second phase looks bigger, so it is safe to say the total will be 200 families or more. Most bring 2 cars each because there is no other way to get around in Ancaster. In addition, the possibility of re-use of the existing buildings for residential or commercial purposes is stated. The existing buildings, as residential, would be very dense use of the land, and commercial use would bring traffic that is not in proportion to the land allocated for it as traffic will be attracted.

As you consider this project, please consider carefully the traffic infrastructure in the Ancaster core, and ensure that any additional traffic is accommodated. It is not acceptable to simply say there is capacity for whatever this brings. From a practical viewpoint there simply is no capacity. If there are no changes to the road infrastructure, this project simply should not be permitted to proceed. Those changes, I realize, will not be met with open arms by those who live on Sulphur Springs or Fiddlers Green or Wilson or Rousseaux, but it is something that needs to be faced if this project proceeds. The City should be honest and look at this in total including what changes would be forced on the rest of the community. It is not just those of us that live immediately adjacent to the subject lands that are affected.

There is adequate land elsewhere in Ancaster to accommodate this number of housing units, indeed even a multiple of this number, without adding any significant pressure to the roads in the village core. This is not a question of whether the community should have more housing or more commercial, but rather where that housing is. This project forces traffic on to Sulphur Springs, Fiddlers Green, Wilson Street and Rousseaux, none of which have the capacity. Provide the capacity, or deny this project.

I understand the religious order that owns this land is simply trying to do what any owner of a large parcel of land would do—maximize its value. It is unfortunate for them others did this before them, because the development that has gone on has really stressed the Ancaster main streets. This really is a matter of timing because the roads in the village core are largely as they were before all this development started, and it is at the point the road infrastructure needs to catch up before any more development occurs.

Sincerely

Jim MacLeod
Councillor Lloyd Ferguson, Ward 12  
Hamilton City Hall 
71 Main Street West 
Hamilton, Ontario 
L8P 4Y5 

Ancaster, September 13th 2007 

Re: Development of Woodland Manor on the Mount Mary property 

Dear Councillor Ferguson, 

I do understand that with the increase of population in Hamilton new developments are necessary. Ancaster, is obviously a chosen place for such developments. I am, however, concerned by developers who are interested only in their profit thus neglecting the environmental aspects and the negative impacts that such developments are inflicting to the town of Ancaster. 

The development of Woodland Manor on the Mount Mary property will be detrimental to Ancaster if environmental and traffic problems are not taken very seriously in consideration. 

I have received the report of SAVE entitled « Guiding Recommendations and Principles for the Development of the Woodland Manor Subdivision ». This document stipulates clearly that SAVE is not against this development, however, indicates several aspects which should be taken seriously in considerations. 

I fully support the proposal of SAVE recommending two entrances to the development: One from a prolongation of Rousseaux Street and NOT from Wilson Street. And the one planned on Sulphur Spring Road. The existing access on Wilson Street should become a pedestrian entrance. This proposal makes a lot of sense and will minimize the repercussion of increased traffic on Wilson Street in the middle of the Town due to the development of Woodland Manor. 

I am also supporting the environmental proposal made by SAVE. Developers seem to ignore the benefit of trees. In the Woodland Manor development it is essential that as many as possible trees be preserved. The proposal of SAVE to maintain a buffer zone with trees on the south and west side of the development is excellent. I also support the idea to integrate as much as possible the houses into nature, diversify their architecture and constructing them in stone and bricks so typical of Ancaster.
Mr. Councillor, I am urging you to convey to the Planning Departments of the City of Hamilton the SAVE Guiding Recommendations for the Development of the Woodland Manor Subdivision, indicating how sound these recommendations are.

I truly hope that the Planning Departments will take very seriously these recommendations.

Respectfully yours

Gérard T. Simon

Copies to: 1) Mr. Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner, City of Hamilton
2) SAVE
Dear Mr. Macdonald:

I am writing to you because I am very concerned about the plans for the proposed development called "Woodland Manor". I would hope that the name chosen would show that the woodlands are important in the overall planning. I believe that Hamilton could do the right thing by the environment to require that more of the woodland space be preserved. Losing such a large wooded space will affect birdlife, animal life and human life. Air quality is improved by the abundance of trees in this area. The developers should be required to conserve as many trees as possible in their plan. Also by reducing the number of homes planned and perhaps increasing the size of the lots, a great number of trees could be saved.

The high density of homes in this proposed development will have a huge impact on the traffic on Sulphur Springs Rd. The traffic will impact air quality as well because at peak times vehicles are sitting from Wilson St. back to Mansfield Drive with engines running as they wait for the light. At a recent meeting, the neighbors were told there was not a traffic problem. I urge you to visit the site yourself at 8am any weekday. I see it daily as I walk my dog across the road in Fieldcoote. An alternative exit from the development should be considered.

Sulphur Springs has always been a very special road with historic importance. It is known for its beauty and it would be the right thing to protect something so special to our area. Any widening of the road would alter the historical country atmosphere of the road.

We have resided in Ancaster for 35 years. In that time we have seen many developments. Some have been well planned with the environment and the quality of life citizens pay high taxes to enjoy. I would hope that you will look very carefully at these plans and not just with an eye to how much money can be made in future taxes, but at allowing neighbors and citizens of Ancaster to have input into how the lands are developed. Perhaps a nature sanctuary of sorts could be allotted so that the abundance of frogs and songbirds and wildlife could continue to make this area a very special place. Land could be set aside as conservation land and connect to the existing conservation area. Perhaps bike paths could be built through the area so that all citizens would have access to this very special area.

The Towne Manors were built so that the density of units was kept to 30. The housing units to be built backing onto our property could have a similar reduced density and also a natural buffer to separate the two developments from each other would help us maintain our privacy and treed areas.

Most sincerely,

Barbara J. Bodner
Unit 29,
71 Sulphur Springs Rd.
Ancaster, Ont. L9G 5C1
Aug 28/06

Planning Dept

Dear Sirs,

we are at Layman Gate off 52nd Street off Spring Rd, Anacostia. Let us here saying only thing is about the Traffic we have now it's Red + yellow adding more Traffic we are all against here. Lot of us are still driving. They come up that small hill + there is hole looking to your Left Side to see Traffic coming before you Pull Out. only thing we don't want is more traffic. we think something needs to be done. before you let them build more homes in that area. (Woodland Manor at 437 Wilson St. East Anacostia)

I know it's not your Dept. it's Traffic Dept. So please take it to that Dept. 

There are 30 of us here.

Thanking you,

Roy Greasley
Mr. Greg Macdonald, Senior Planner,  
City of Hamilton, Planning and Economic Department,  
Development and Real Estate Division (West),  
71 Main St West  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Re: File # Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Mr. Macdonald,

Like many of my neighbours, I am concerned with the likely effect of this development on the Ancaster village environment, if it is carried out as currently proposed. Residents of the Sulphur Springs Road area, as well as many on the other side of Wilson Street (Church, Academy, etc.) are already experiencing significant traffic congestion in the “rush hour” period. These streets are simply not designed to handle the current volume of traffic safely, let alone the increase that would result from this development. An alternative outlet to Wilson Street or to Dundas-Ancaster Road comes to mind as a possibility, although the current long line of traffic on Wilson at 5 PM, turning left onto Rousseaux already presents a significant bottleneck.

With the explosive residential growth occurring in other parts of Ancaster, it would be more appropriate to dedicate most of the area in question to public use, preserving the forest and wildlife habitat, while allowing for walking trails. Residential development should be consistent with the character of the surrounding environment. The current plan is likely to lead to another clear-cut subdivision, such as has been built in the Meadowlands area.

I strongly urge the city to insist that these issues be adequately dealt with before a modified plan is approved.

Sincerely,

Patrick J. Ryan
October 2, 2006

City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton, ON  
L8P 4Y5

Dear Sirs:

RE: Preliminary Circulation, Application for Approval of Official Plan Amendment  
Application OPA-06-17 and Subdivision Application 25T-200612, “Woodland  
Manor Phase 1”, 437 Wilson Street East, Ancaster, Ward 12

We have the following comments and/or suggestions:

Official Plan Amendment (OPA-06-17)

We suggest that the Secondary Plan for the subject lands include “High Density Residential”  
additionally; this land is adjacent to the Village Area - it is the last large property within close  
walking/riding distance to the shops, restaurants, church and professional offices of the village of  
Ancaster. There is a need for low-rise apartment/condo style accommodation for seniors and  
young people. A low rise with underground parking, surrounded by green space is a needed  
addition.

Subdivision (25T-200612)

We suggest that all lots in the plan of subdivision which border on Sulphur Springs Road have  
driveways only from inside the subdivision - no driveways should have access from Sulphur  
Springs Road.

We suggest that there only be one access road from Sulphur Springs Road and the second be off  
Wilson Street through the “additional lands” in accord with Phase II of the development and as  
contemplated by the Street ending of Block 115 - Reserve.

We suggest that walking and bike-riding easements across the “Additional Lands” be included to  
connect the development directly to the Village Area.

We suggest that any Storm Water Management Plan make provisions for and manage the inflow  
of water from the Ryerson Seniors Home which crosses the Brown Property and from the outlet  
from Mansfield Drive.

Yours truly,

Bob & Karen Wilkins
Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton
Planning Economic Development Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main St. West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P-4Y5

File #OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Sir:
Thank you for your letter inviting comments from the affected area citizens of Ancaster. We are residents of Ancaster for 20 plus years and have witnessed the phenomenal growth of our area. With that thought in mind we wish to direct our concerns over the proposal from the Sisters of Mt. Mary. My wife and I are not engineers in transportation, design or the environment but we do foresee many negative issues with the proposed development.

Today, Sulphur Springs Road is an absolute bottleneck most mornings and some evenings. The traffic use on it today is certainly more than this narrow road was ever designed to carry. When Wilson Street is plugged with traffic which it usually is in both directions few vehicles can escape from Sulphur Springs Road when the light is green. There is no place to go? Some motorists drive through to Church Street and terrorize that area with their speed due to the driver’s frustration with the lack of traffic movement. This area is also not built to handle this type of traffic and children could be at risk. We also have serious concerns about Emergency Services reaching our home in a reasonable time if it is required. The proposed development as we see it will only exacerbate an already out of control traffic situation.

The proposal also wants to add more driveways fronting Sulphur Springs Road. It is a near death trap trying to get out of our current laneways, how will it be with the additional new home sites averaging 2 vehicles per home. The thought frightens us. We are not against development but the density of the new development should be kept to numbers that reflect the surrounding area density for the proposed development. We also are concerned about the possible destruction and removal of trees on these lands. There are a number of large trees which are important to our environment today and our children’s futures, and, it is our responsibility to preserve their existence. The property proposed for development is much more than bush and scrub brush as the developer had suggested at the Mt. Mary meeting.

We could go on for many pages, but I am sure you get our message? The development is basically too big for our “shoe”, and repaving Sulphur Springs Road is not the cure.

Thank you.

Isabel and Gary Cormack
17-71 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster, Ontario L9G 5C1
George & Donna Louth  
Box 845  
Orillia, Ontario L3V 6K8

2006 10 01

Mr. Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner  
Planning & Economic Dept.  
Development and Real Estate Division(West)  
71 Main St. W.  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Re: File # Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Mr. MacDonald

As new residents to Ancaster in the Towne Manor complex on Sulphur Springs Road, we are opposed to the development of the Mount Mary Immaculate site as it currently is being presented.

Concerns and Oppositions:

1. We are opposed to the current proposal based on the lack of planning and public notice for the traffic management and road maintenance.

When we first moved to the complex on Sulphur Springs a letter was written regarding the unsafe conditions on the road for vehicles and pedestrians. To date, nothing has happened. The letter has gone unanswered and plans have not been made public other than to say that the road work has been postponed.

Without the proposed development, the morning traffic trying to enter Wilson Street from Sulphur Springs is backed up beyond the entrance to our complex. How can this road accommodate more traffic? In addition, we can probably expect more school buses that will slow traffic down even more and require more space for maneuvering.

Concerned citizens from surrounding streets are seeing noticeable traffic on their once quiet streets. The flow of traffic onto Wilson from Sulphur Springs is now using neighbourhood side streets, as well as the access road next to the Fieldcote Center.

With the current flow of traffic and expected increase from the Mount Mary development, emergency vehicles will find this area very difficult, if not impossible, to navigate.

Developments also mean more pedestrians. The Mount Mary development will definitely bring a larger concentration of pedestrians, many of whom will be children. What consideration has been given to managing the safe flow of children/pedestrians as they make their way to school or just live in the area.
We request that the final approval be put on hold until the needs of the current and future traffic on Sulphur Springs be determined and that road development be put in place prior to the site development. We also request that construction vehicles access the site from na entrance other than Sulphur Springs Road.

2. We are opposed to the current proposal based on the apparent lack of planning for the environmentally sensitive areas and the overall lack of green space in the site plan.

Unlike the other Ancaster/Meadowlands developments where clear cutting of the land has been allowed clear cutting is the norm, the existing Sulphur Springs homes have been able to maintain a high degree of natural woodland areas and wildlife. The integrity of the Carolinian forest should not be lost to development. The proposal is on the edge of the Bruce Trail as well as the conservation areas for which Greater Hamilton is known. Ancaster is a heritage community that should be preserving not only heritage buildings but also its natural heritage areas – forests, watersheds, vegetation and wildlife.

We request that a site plan be revamped to incorporate a sensitivity to the uniqueness of the forested areas and wildlife.

3. We are opposed to the current proposal based on the overall site design.

The site plan lacks creativity. Site gardens, naturalized areas, treed landscaping, walking areas, ponds and buffers to neighbouring properties are absent from the design. It appears that priority has been given to density with no respect for the natural area, general ambiance of the street or the community at large.

We request that the site developers be required to establish nature areas, walking paths, park like settings and tree buffers between the current townhouse complex at 71 Sulphur Springs Road and other residential property as well as between the road and proposed development, prior to final approval.

4. We are opposed to the current proposal based on the proposed density and architectural design of the site.

The site layout lacks overall imagination in the placement of the buildings. Phase One seems to be designed with a subdivision “Meadowlands” approach for high density. If so, our first concern regarding the ability of the local roads to accommodate this increased flow becomes even more important. It further emphasizes the intent to negate the unique characteristics of the Sulphur Springs area.

Architecturally, will the designs be in keeping with the unique character of the neighbourhood and surrounding environment?

We request that the Senior Planner’s office mandate the exterior design, character and size of the attached and detached residences in an effort to reflect the unique character of the surrounding area and environment and that the number of stand alone and attached homes be reduced to reflect and enhance the community’s nature.
5. We are opposed to the current proposal based on the density and impact on the need to accommodate a sizable number of children in local schools.

Growth in Ancaster already has required the building of new schools. Can these private and public schools accommodate the increased student population?

*We request, in conjunction with the revamping of the number of structures allowed in the site, that the child-per-house-population be determined and the subsequent impact on the schools be identified for planning purposes.*

In general, we are opposed to the development in its present form. It destroys the integrity of the immediate community and stretches the function of Sulphur Springs Road as an access beyond its capability. We are hard pressed to find the positive side to the proposal in its current form.

In the last year, due to the illness of our councillor, Murray Ferguson, Ancaster constituents have not had a representative elected by the local residents. We respectfully request that decisions related to the Mount Mary development be delayed until after the forthcoming elections in order that Ancaster can be represented by an elected official from our area.

At early meetings related to the Sulphur Springs Road re-construction, it was made known that the road committee was not aware of the Mount Mary proposal. We respectfully request that any decisions related to Mount Mary be made in conjunction with all department having responsibility for the area, such as the utilities, road works, housing development, school board and conservation authority.

*We respectfully request that as your department reviews the density, design and traffic flow concerns related to the Mount Mary development that you will respect the integrity of the Sulphur Springs community while making your decisions.*

We look forward to your response and hope that the integrity of this community can be maintained in all future developments.

Respectfully submitted

George & Donna Louth
Owners - Unit # 32
71 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster

c. Towne Manor Directors
Wentworth Standard Condominium Corp. # 354
SAVE Committee

Attached: letter to Murray Ferguson re: Sulphur Springs Road
Dear Mr. MacDonald,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed development at the area commonly known as Mount Mary Immaculate in Ancaster. I understand that an application has been made to the City of Hamilton to change the property zoning from institutional to residential. The File application is Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612.

This document reflects my objection to the proposal as it stands.

1. Traffic congestion safety to the residents and visitors of our living space, will be seriously compromised under the present application as it stands. Irrespective of the data generated by the traffic study undertaken by the developer, we the residents who live on Sulphur Springs Road can use real time experiences to dispute this study. We often see long lines of traffic waiting patiently for the lights at Sulphur Springs and Wilson Street in the morning when people are going to work. The motorists that lose patience often try to by-pass Wilson Street and cut through side streets to avoid the wait. These streets are undivided, narrow and often have children walking to school at this time of the morning. This current problem will only be exacerbated by the proposed two exit and entry roads from Sulphur Springs Road as submitted by the application.

2. The Phase 1 density with the construction of fifty to sixty townhouses on five acres will not be in keeping with our own Towne Manor Homes living space. Our site has six units per acre which allows room for more trees, and offers an enhanced standard of living for the residents that live here. The application plan with ten units per acre will be unable to offer this to their residents. It is disturbing that this will take away from the character of Sulphur Springs Road. One of the last streets in Ancaster that still retains its heritage and beauty, because we don’t have high density housing as viewed from the street. We are very sensitive to this issue, and for many of the residents that live here was the determining factor in purchasing units in Towne Manors. Further, we paid a premium price for our homes because of this, and are fearful that our significant financial investments (our homes) could be eroded with a lesser value, multi density town house development built on the other side of our boundary fence.
3. There is, or was a plan to install sidewalks on a good part of Sulphur Springs Road. We were all thrilled and excited to read the notices generated by the City of Hamilton to this effect. After witnessing the surveying and associated planning that went into the sidewalk construction we were so disappointed to see it come to a halt. There is an obvious need for this for the immediate safety of the local residents who live here. Many of us take our lives in our hands when walking on Sulphur Springs Road to the town proper. This in part is because of the lack of a sidewalk, but also because of the increased traffic load witnessed over the last few years. Together with the higher rate of speed that some motorists travel at above the posted speed limit signs, we really need the sidewalk to be completed. By approving this application in its present form I am afraid the sidewalk will never get done. This is because later on it will evidently be clear to the City of Hamilton, that the narrow design of Sulphur Springs combined with the increased traffic flow will prohibit the sidewalk being used properly by the residents that live here.

I am not against the development of our neighbor’s property. The Sisters of Mount Mary have very little income stream to live from, and their overheads to maintain their huge acreage is significant. I am asking you to work with the SAVE committee, (Save Ancaster Village Environment) toward a result that all the residents can live with.

Sincerely,

George and Elizabeth Chandler.

[Signature]

[Signature]
Kerr and Allison Gibson
164 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster, Ontario L9G 4T7

September 30, 2006

RECEIVED

Mr. Greg Macdonald;
Senior Planner;
City of Hamilton,
Planning and Economic Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West),
71 Main Street West,
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y8

Dear Sir: re: Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

We are writing to support recommendations for alterations to the planned development that would overcome the most serious objections to the plan as presented.

While we are not enthusiastic about a development of this size in our neighbourhood, we recognize that some development of the property is probably inevitable. It should not be approved, however, without modification.

Our cousin and neighbour, Hope Gibson has identified six changes to the development proposal with all of which we agree and that we believe go a long way to satisfying most of the major objections to the application as presented.

The following summarizes the amendments that should be required:

1. Rezoning approval should be restricted at this time to Phase 1. Consideration of Phase 11 should be deferred until the impact of Phase 1 on the community can be assessed.

2. The Phase 1 development should be allowed only one road access to Sulphur Springs Road. This would be best located opposite Mansfield Drive, and should be managed by a traffic light.

3. The Phase 1 development should be amended to include roadway access to Wilson Street.

4. A green buffer zone could be established along the southern and western limits of the proposed Phase 1 development, and it should be required that existing trees should be preserved in this zone.
5. Driveways of lots adjacent to Sulphur Springs Road should exit on roads within the development rather than directly on to Sulphur Springs Road.

6. The planned “Open Spaces” or “Additional Lands” adjacent to the escarpment be granted full conservation status and be donated to the Dundas Conservation Authority for preservation and management.

With these amendments, we believe the most serious objections to the proposed development would be largely overcome: that is with respect to traffic congestion, and its impact on the rural character of Sulphur Springs Road.

Respectfully submitted

Alison Gibson
Kerr Gibson
September 28, 2006

City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Department, Development and Real Estate Division (West)
Attn: Mr. G. MacDonald, Senior Planner
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Re File: Woodland Manor application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Mr. MacDonald;

Generally, I am quite supportive of proper residential and commercial growth in a town or city.

If the proposed development file #: Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612 will allow future residents of this complex to use Mount Mary’s present front entrance on Wilson St., there will be some serious motor vehicle accidents. At the best of times it is very difficult to turn left, that would be towards Rousseaux St. or Dundas. In poor weather conditions it is quite dangerous especially at peak road travel times. I have had to caution all my patients to turn right when leaving 425 Wilson St., and proceed up Wilson St. to a side street that leads back to Rousseaux St. The new development if built could possibly entertain an entrance but not an exit for residents onto Wilson St. or certainly for safety reasons prohibit a left hand turn when exiting.

Sincerely,

A. D. Smyth, D.C.
October 2, 2006

Mr. Greg Macdonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton Planning & Economic Development Department
Development & Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ont. L8P 4Y5

Re: Woodland Manor Application
File # OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Mr. Macdonald:

I am a resident of the Towne Manors condominium complex adjacent to the lands comprising the Woodland Manor real estate development. I am definitely not in opposition to this project.

My concerns relate to the possibility of an environmental impact detrimental to the Ancaster community as a whole and the threat a project of this size could have to this historic village and to its very heritage.

As you know, Wilson Street is lined with many buildings of historic importance and Sulphur Springs Road is also of historic significance. Today this tree lined road is a welcomed relief from the traffic and congestion of surrounding major highways. Unfortunately, this route, as well as Wilson Street, has been discovered as an alternative, and automobile and truck traffic has increased significantly. Any addition to the volume of daily traffic will certainly be hazardous to all concerned.

The density presently proposed for Woodland Manor will increase the traffic flow and, unless controlled, be dangerous to all residents. Only one entrance to the development on Sulphur Springs Road with a traffic light at Mansfield and one entrance off of Wilson Street might help to alleviate some of the congestion.

We have been blessed with this marvelous green space which if indiscriminately encroached upon will only result in the destruction of the uniqueness of the community.
How will the tree clearing be monitored? Will trees be preserved in areas not already designated as protected green space? Trees have become a luxury. When large canopies are eliminated, undergrowth is destroyed and with it go any rare or endangered species, nesting sites and breeding and forage areas will disappear forcing wildlife to search for other spaces to survive. Are wetlands fully protected allowing for aquatic life to flourish?

The proposed Woodland Manor site is in actuality only a part of a much larger area which encompasses Phase II and the Hamilton-Wentworth District Schoolboard property—all which could be developed in the future. I would like to suggest that the re-zoning of Phase II be addressed at a later date thereby allowing the planning authorities to fully assess the impact of Phase I on the area as a whole and the village in particular.

Please be assured that I am not against the Woodland Manor proposal. I hope that you will take under consideration my concerns which I believe, if addressed, will enhance the value of this development.

Sincerely,

Eugenia McCaw
14-71 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster, Ontario L9G 5C1

September 27, 2006

Mr. Greg Macdonald, Senior Planner,
City of Hamilton, Planning and Economic Department,
Development and Real Estate Division (West),
71 Main St. West,
Hamilton Ontario L8P 4Y5
File Number Woodland Manor Application: OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Mr. Macdonald:

I am writing to you about the Woodland Manor application as a resident in the neighborhood.

When downsizing from our home on Brookview Court last year, we chose to stay in Ancaster rather than move to less expensive options in nearby communities because of the natural beauty of the Sulphur Springs area and the proximity for walking errands in the village of Ancaster. When we moved to Ancaster initially 18 years ago, we were concerned that Sulphur Springs Road would lose its country atmosphere. We have been impressed with the way the natural setting has largely been maintained despite the building that has occurred along the road over these years.

I strongly support the activities of the SAVE Committee and hope that you will listen to our shared concerns about traffic and safety, environment, sustainable design, and architectural design and density.

Sincerely,

Ellen B. Ryan, Ph.D.

cc. G. R. Fraser, Chair, SAVE Committee
28-71 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster, Ontario
L9C 5C1

September 28, 2006

Mr. Greg Macdonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning and Economic Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

RE: Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Sir

After viewing the circularized plans for the proposed development, I would offer the following comments:

A. Traffic

Allowing the traffic to exit onto Sulphur Springs Road would compound the existing problem of traffic movement at rush hours, and would require major reconstruction of Sulphur Springs Road to allow for turn lanes and sidewalks for pedestrian traffic. Any remediation would require the removal of mature trees, retention of natural berms and the build up of low lands, and would completely change the character of the roadway.

An alternative solution to alleviate some of the aforementioned problems would be to construct the future roadway in Phase 11 to redirect the traffic to exit onto Wilson Street.

B. Draft Plan

No provision has been made for a neighbourhood park. There is no existing park within a reasonable distance. Perhaps the plan could be reconfigured to include a small park to serve the neighbourhood residents.
Little imagination has been shown in the proposed layout, long straight roadways allows for speed buildup, traffic calming features should be considered to alleviate this problem.

Lots fronting on Sulphur Springs Road will only add to the traffic problems. Perhaps a secondary road should be considered to allow the traffic to exit onto the proposed roadways and would also allow some natural features to remain.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Robert S. Shelley
Resident

Residence:
E-mail:
Fax:
Mr. S. Macdonald, Sr. Planner
City of Hamilton
Development & Real Estate Division (Fast)
7 Main St. West

Dear Mr. Macdonald,

The file # Hardwood Manor ESA-06-1725T-2006

Many Ancaster residents, to whom I have spoken, are convinced that our concern re the development of the "jewel of Ancaster" will fall on deaf ears. Why? Because they feel that the large, city-based corporation under which we are governed, has little care for our village-based neighbourhood. I sincerely hope they are wrong.

Should I conclude that the traffic report predicts "no problem" for congestion in the village core during business hours, when there is congestion already, before 300 or so boxes are thrown into the mix?

Should I conclude that the density level of the proposed four-storey complex is much more than the Towne Manor complex, where I live?
Should I be concerned that there is little provision to retain and preserve the forest-like surroundings which we love and nurture?

Should I be concerned that the present site plan does nothing to appeal to its neighbours? There is no provision for park-like gardens or paths, tree buffers, or walkways.

To answer my questions - Yes! I should be and I am concerned.

Please placate my concern. Work with our "voice in the wilderness" - SAVE Committee, so that we can work together with a resulting positive influence on our village-like environment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Mr. Robert Walters, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager of West Section  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Dear Sir:

Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17 and 2ST-200612

Thank you for advising us that applications have been received for an Official Plan Amendment and a Draft Plan of Subdivision for the property located at 437 Wilson Street East. We realize that this property is in the Urban Development Area and will be developed. We are not against development of this property, but feel that the draft plan is neither innovative, creative nor sustainable. We welcome the opportunity to play a role in the planning and development process. We have already volunteered to participate in a public campaign to encourage residents to have a say in the planning decisions that are going to affect their community. Discussions and feedback to-date, indicate that financial and community support will be forthcoming.

We are not in favour of the proposed Official Plan Amendment as requested by the developer. We concur with the proposed change for Phase I from “Institutional” to “Residential”. We feel that the easterly portion of the property containing the existing institutional uses should remain “Institutional”. Until a detailed plan for development of the complete property is submitted, the full impact of the development cannot be realized. Future development of the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board property on Wilson Street must also be factored into the decision-making process.

We have the following concerns about the impact of the proposed subdivision on the southwest portion of the subject lands:

- **Traffic and safety**: Sulphur Springs Road is already congested, as is Wilson Street, particularly when there is a backup of traffic on the Lincoln Alexander Expressway and Highway 403. Narrow residential streets like Church, Lodor and Academy are already experiencing increased cut-through traffic by motorists trying to by-pass Wilson Street. We have concerns about traffic volume, congestion, speed and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists and access of emergency vehicles.

- **Environment**: This sanctuary is part of an environmentally significant area. We would like to see a tree preservation plan and some of the forest habitat preserved for the wildlife. The tree-scape of Sulphur Springs Road should be retained. Preservation of on-site vegetation and water-conserving landscaping should be considered a priority. The area should not be clear-cut like the development on the west side of Southcote Road, north of Garner Road.
Mr. Robert Walters

September 7, 2006

- Sustainable Design: The site plan lacks creativity and does nothing to enhance or maintain the quality and sustainability of the surrounding environment. It does not appear to provide garden and park-like spaces, tree buffers, access service lanes, traffic loops or roundabouts, pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, etc. Through site plan controls, City planners should shape the environmental quality and appearance of the proposed subdivision so it will continue to be a valuable asset that compliments the village's character and adds to rather than detracts from the uniqueness and value to the Ancaster community.

- Architectural Design and Density: Stage 1 density resulting from construction of 50 to 60 townhouses on five acres is not in keeping with the design of the adjacent townhouse development. The proposed 73 single-detached houses are so densely spaced, that the development could become just another subdivision like the Meadowlands. The City's official plan should consider the exterior design of the buildings. This would allow for consideration of the character, scale and appearance of the proposed buildings in relation to the surrounding environment.

We want to be proud of our City and, through the leadership of our elected officials and planning staff, see Hamilton in the forefront of developing one of the most accountable, transparent and progressive land-use planning systems in the Province. We look forward to receiving a copy of the staff report prior to the public meeting to be held by the Planning and Economic Development Committee of City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Philip

Ruth A. Philip

Copies to: Members of the Save Ancaster Village Environment (SAVE)
PEIL Planning & Engineering Initiatives Ltd.
DEAR MR. MACDONALD,

AS A RESIDENT OF THE CONDOMINIUM CORPORATION NO. 354 (TOWNE MANORS OF ANCASTER) - ADJACENT TO THE PROPOSED WOODLAND MANOR APPLICATION, I AM BRINGING TO YOUR ATTENTION SOME CONCERNS RELATIVE TO THIS APPLICATION.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AND DENSITY

CONCERN HERE IS THE CURRENT PLAN TO CONSTRUCT TOWN HOUSES IN A VERY DENSE MANNER, RELATIVE TO THE ADJACENT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT (TOWNE MANORS). THIS COULD IMPACT SIGNIFICANTLY ON THE CHARACTER AND VALUE OF OUR RESIDENCE AND THOSE OF OUR NEIGHBORS. THE CURRENT PLAN APPEARS TO LACK PARKLANDS, TREE BUFFERS, PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS, BICYCLE PATHS, ETC. THAT WOULD MEET THE STANDARDS IN PLACE IN THIS GENERAL AREA.
TRAFFIC

As you may already be aware, Sulphur Springs Rd is already congested. In addition, the narrowness and sightlines of Sulphur Springs Rd are currently a safety concern. The addition of additional entrance(s) would compound this situation.

ENVIRONMENT

The proposed development is planned for a unique environmentally area, with major wooded areas and a sanctuary for wildlife. The retention of appropriate areas of natural habitation would address this major issue somewhat, while sustaining real estate values in the area.

GENERAL

As recent residents of Ancaster, we have been very pleased with the general condition of this area—It was the main reason we chose to relocate here just three years ago.

We would like to think that new developments would sustain, even enhance, the unique character of Ancaster Village.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Haller
September 26, 2006

Mr. Greg Macdonald, Senior Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning and Economic Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Re: File # Woodland Manor Application OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Mr. Macdonald,

As someone living close to this proposed development, My wife and I would like to express some concerns about the plan as we presently know it.

The major concerns are as follows:

1. Traffic and Safety: As told to us by the planner Mr. Arians, this development will increase traffic on Sulphur Springs Road by approximately twenty five percent. This will increase the danger on a narrow road that is already at certain times of the day very busy. This traffic increase will undoubtedly carry over to Wilson Stret and the residential streets of Church, Lodor and Academy whose residents are already finding traffic at dangerously high levels. These traffic increases will create a dangerous situation and contributte to the deterioration of a quiet semi-rural neighbourhood.

2. Environment: This sanctuary is part of an environmentally significant area. There needs to be a tree preservation plan and forest habitat preserved for the wildlife. The treescape along Sulphur Springs Road should be preserved also. Preservation of on-site vegetation and water conserving landscaping should be considered a priority. The area must under no circumstances be clear cut like other Ancaster developments.

3. Design: The plan does not contain elements such as park-like spaces, tree buffers, pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, etc, to contributte to the aesthetics of the area and to maintain the existing character of the neighbourhood. The city needs to insure through site plan controls that this plan complements the village's character and adds uniqueness and value to the Ancaster community.
4. Design and Density: The proposed density is totally out of character to this part of the Ancaster community in both the detached homes and the townhomes. It is important that the city ensures that the development will have design features that will contribute to the unique character of the area rather than be just a bunch of new homes. It is apparent from my tax increases that this area of Ancaster is considered as very desirable in its current form and it is important that this desirability be retained and not affected negatively by a development seeking only to maximize returns.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

David W. Buckley
10-71 Sulphur Springs Road
Ancaster, Ontario
L9G 5C1
Dear Mr. MacDonald,

Woodland Manor is an unique 102 acre property of hills, woods and streams in a park-like setting with its southern border of mature woodlands on the edge of the Niagara escarpment. Maintenance of its unique character became entrusted to the Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculata when its Order acquired the property some 60 years ago. The Sisters have been caring curators of this trust. However times change and the Sisters now plan to create a housing development on a major part of the land.

My wife and I own and live at 159 Sulphur Springs Rd. Our property is approximately 17 acres in size. It adjoins the northwestern part of the Woodland Manor property. We are very interested in the changes that our neighbours plan for their land.

We have read a copy of the 4 page letter sent to you by Mr. Hope Gibson and Mr. Robert Gibson of 140 Sulphur Springs Rd. on the subject of the proposed Woodland Manor Development. We fully support all of its comments and recommendations.

The comment’s which follow are made by us in our additions to the Gibson Gibson letter which have not been seen by them.

The density of traffic on Sulphur Springs Road, with consequent pedestrian and bicycle safety, is a major concern of all Aescanor residents. The Planning Department
has visually limited access to Southeaster Road in the
nearby Meadowlands development on the east side of
Southeaster Road south of its bridge over Highway 403.
Houses bordering Southeaster face into the development with
no individual access to Southeaster. This is similar to the
recommendation of Neoso Gibson for the Woodland Manor
development at Sulphur Springs Rd, Southeaster and
Sulphur Springs Road have similar characteristics.

Appendix B of your letter dated 13 Aug 86, shows a
large tract of land on the northern end of the proposed
Woodland Manor development where a proposed Official Plan
Amendment would change the zoning designation from
'institutional' to 'open space and conservation'. This tract
contains the Woodlakes bordering the edge of the Niagara
decarpment. Much of it is 'Environmentally Significant'.
This land should be maintained permanently in its natural
state in keeping with the efforts of the Province (which have
international support) to preserve the Niagara escarpment.
The purpose in the Neoso Gibson submission is that this
land should be dedicated to the Hamilton Conservation Authority
to manage and maintain for the use and enjoyment of all
Citizens. To do this would be a wonderful public
spiritual act on the part of the Sisters. A cabin in
similar appropriate manner on the property could exceed
the generosity of the Sisters for future generations to use.

Sincerely,

F. Joyce Young

(F. Joyce Young)  RECEIVED  159 Sulphur Springs Rd
Oct 6 6 2006  Ancaster, ON L9G 4T7

W. N. Young
Councillor Lloyd Ferguson, ward 12  
Hamiton City Hall  
17 Main St W  
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5  

To: Mr. Greg MacDonald, Senior Planner  
City of Hamilton Planning & Economic Development  
Hamilton City Hall  
17 Main St W  
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5  

Dear Sirs:

My wife and I are long term residents of Ancaster. We are writing to say that we both strongly support the position of SAVE with respect to the development planned for the Quay property owned by the Sisters of Mercy, Mary immaculatae on Wilson St in the core of Ancaster.

One of the unique attractions of Ancaster is its beautiful location on the Niagara Escarpment with the Dundas Valley Conservation Area to its North and the Niagara Escarpment to its West. This location presents problems for planners of the Quay property where the extra traffic from this development can only have access to its South or East into roads already crowded.

SAVE advocates a comprehensive approach to this planning problem to include all the H.L. Mary developments and adjacent lands in it that are now largely idle and would likely be subject to development applications in the near future. This seems sensible and logical rather than adopting a piecemeal approach to each development separately as an application is made. To do otherwise would be doing a great disservice to Ancaster citizens who will live with the results in future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

W.H. Young  
154 Stephen Street Rd  
Ancaster, ON L9G 4T7
October 10, 2006

Mr. Greg MacDonald
Senior Planner
City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Department
Development and Real Estate Division (West)
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Quote: FILE # Woodland Manor Application
OPA-06-17/25T-200612

Dear Sir:

On behalf of Wentworth Condominium Corporation #353 (a six unit condominium complex situated at 371 Wilson Street East), we would like to go on record as being in agreement with the enclosed letter dated September 22, 2006, from “Save Ancaster Village Environment (SAVE) (A concerned citizens group monitoring local property development).”

WSCC # 353 is strongly opposed to the City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department’s granting approval for a property re-zone application to change property owned by the Sisters Servants of Mount Mary Immaculate from “institutional” to “residential”.

Further to the concerns stated in the letter from “Save Ancaster Village Environment (SAVE) (A concerned citizens group monitoring local property development’s)”, we wish to add: “We do not want another Meadowlands”.

To be specific:

Traffic and Safety:

A MANDATORY TRAFFIC STUDY SHOULD BE CONDUCTED PRIOR TO ANY DECISION MAKING

Sulphur Springs Road and Wilson Street are already being utilized to their maximum capacity, especially when there is a backup of traffic on the Linc and Highway 403. Residents and Guests of WSCC # 353 have the utmost difficulty safely entering and exiting the property at 371 Wilson Street East during peak hours.

The narrow residential streets (for example: Church, Lodor and Academy) are already taxed trying to manage the overflow of traffic by motorists attempting to by-pass Wilson Street.
Appendix "I" to Report No. PED08306 (Page 63 of 64)

Page 2.

There are concerns about noise and traffic volume, congestion, exhaust emissions, speed and safety of pedestrians and cyclists and access for emergency vehicles.

**Environment:**

*A MANDATORY ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY AND CANADIAN WILDLIFE FEDERATION STUDY AND HEARINGS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF RE-ZONING.*

WSCC # 353 unit owners are very concerned with the lack of consideration for the environment. During the developmental stages of our complex, we (the unit owners) experienced a repeated lack of concern for the environment by the Developers. In particular a disregard for the health of mature trees on the property. The end result was that WSCC # 353 was forced to remove numerous trees due to destruction of their root systems. Economically, the cost of $12,500.00 was borne by the unit owners because there was no policing of the developer.

This sanctuary is part of an environmentally significant area. There should be a tree preservation plan (for every tree removed a new tree should be planted) and some of the forest habitat preserved for the wildlife (ref.: Canadian Wildlife Federation – 3509 Michael Cowpland Drive, Kanata, Ontario K2M 2W1). The tree-scape of Sulphur Springs Road should be retained. Preservation of on-site vegetation and water-conserving landscape should be considered a priority. This area must not be clear cut like the development on the west side of Southcote Road, north of Garner Road.”

Inclusive of any environment study, the health of all existing streams, waterfalls and watersheds located in the settlement should be of major concern.

Lastly, if this change is granted to the Sister Servants of Mount Mary Immaculate to allow for a two stage development of 111 single unit dwellings and approximately 110 townhouses and a latter category consisting of single detached, semi detached, fourplex and other multiple forms unto townhouse densities within condominium tenure, there is concern that Ancaster does not have enough educational facilities to accommodate the influx of student bodies.

In conclusion, based on WSCC # 353 six unit owner’s experiences from August 2002 to present, we are definitely not in favor of supporting the re-zoning request made by the Sister Servants of Mount Mary Immaculate.
If you have any questions, please contact WSCC #353

Sincerely yours,

Diane Murray
For the Board of Directors
Wentworth Standard
Condominium Corporation #353

[Signature]

attachment
attachment
Executive Summary - SAVE Committee & Background

The SAVE Committee retained Brook McIlroy Inc. to provide urban design advice regarding the development proposal for the Mount Mary Property (subject lands). The 102 acre property is a diverse landscape originally settled in 1918, when the property was transformed from woods, farmland and scrub into a planned cultural heritage landscape (Built Heritage Assessment, Draft Chapple Heritage Services). The proposed Woodland Manor Subdivision is the subject of considerable interest for the SAVE Committee, a group of local Ancaster residents who wish to act in the best interests of the Ancaster community to ensure that the highest quality of residential development is planned for the lands. SAVE views the property with its unique built and natural heritage as the last significant land parcel remaining close to the Village centre and therefore what results from development will have a significant and probably irreversible effect on Ancaster.

SAVE has held meetings throughout 2007 with the developer, Ward 12 Councillor Lloyd Ferguson, the Ancaster Community Council and other representative segments of our Ancaster community. Our report has been submitted to the City of Hamilton Planning Departments and distributed to Ancaster residents. We have received acknowledgement that our concerns are justified and widespread throughout the community.

SAVE has identified additional land parcels adjacent to the Village Core that are currently under-utilised and ripe for development. Without a Comprehensive Plan for appropriate development we fear for the future of Ancaster.

This is a supporting document for SAVE’s publication “Guiding Recommendations & Principles for the Development of the Woodland Manor Subdivision Ancaster, Ontario” prepared in the Summer of 2007.
Ancaster Community Plan

In December 2005 the Ancaster Community Council endorsed this plan submitted by the ACC's Planning Subcommittee. This report was also endorsed by a wide range of Ancaster's community associations ranging from the Rotary Club, the Historical Society to the Village Core Advisory Committee. This report reflects a wide body of Ancaster community opinion. We wish to share excerpts of this report:

"The Ancaster Community Council recommends the use of the "Heritage Community Concept" in dealing with issues and revisions of all planning documents that have an effect on the Ancaster community." (p. 7)

"A heritage community concept shall encourage small human scale/heritage style commercial, residential and industrial buildings.... all residential developments shall reflect this heritage community concept. Building materials, designs, landscaping and colors shall reflect this heritage concept." (p. 12)

Provincial Policy Statement (2005)

The Ontario Government issued this Policy Statement under the authority of the Planning Act to guide various levels of municipal and regional governments in their planning activity. These are excerpts of the 2005 Policy Statement:

"The new policies fulfill the government's commitment to providing strong, clear policy direction on land-use planning to promote strong communities, a clean and healthy environment, and a strong economy." (p. 1)

"The Provincial Policy Statement supports a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach to planning..." (p. 3)

"2.6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology - 2.6.1 Significant build heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.... Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by adjacent development or site alteration." (p. 8 - 9)
Ancaster's History & Heritage

Some unique historical facts about Ancaster:

- The “Ancaster” village name was selected by Lt. Governor John Graves Simcoe.
- The first settlers arrived in 1789, United Empire Loyalists.
- Ancaster was first surveyed in 1793.
- Ancaster village officially dates from 1791. Wilson St. was named for James Wilson who built the first grist and saw mill.
- For the first 30 years Ancaster was the largest and most important community within 40 miles.
- In May 1814 the Union Hotel in Ancaster was the site of the treason trials of those disloyal to the Crown during the War of 1812.
- Ancaster is Ontario’s third oldest registered community, only preceded by Kingston and Newark (now named Niagara-on-the-Lake).

Images of Wilson Street streetscape.
Ancaster's Unique Qualities

Ancaster has many unique qualities, such as:

- A pedestrian-oriented village environment and heritage.
- Numerous examples of early Canadian stone architecture.
- An eclectic mix of architectural styles.
- Mature trees and landscaping.

"Our challenge is to manage progress to preserve the past."

Only Hope - Preservation through Comprehensive Planning

Comprehensive Planning looks at development potential of the Village Core and the lands adjacent to map out principles and policies which guide development to sustain and support Ancaster's Village heritage, environment and future.

Sympathetic Development is supportive of:

1. Our Heritage;
2. Our Village Environment;
3. The Wilson Street Village Core;
4. Preservation of the Escarpment & Access to it; and
5. Minimal disruption to vegetation and topography.

Managing development's challenges:

1. Ancaster's Current Situation:
   - Now part of a regional municipality;
   - The province has mandated higher densities to relieve pressures on the greenbelt.
   - Ancaster is becoming a preferred bedroom community.

2. Underdeveloped Land Parcels at the Village Core
   - Land values are rising and pressure building on land utilization.
   - The Village Core has significant land parcels underutilized.

3. Traffic Capacity - Developing Gridlock
   - The Village Core's major intersections are at or beyond capacity.

4. The consequence of failure - the burdens of development with very few benefits - the enemy piecemeal development.
The Problems with Insensitive Development

Large tract development that is inappropriate for the context can lead to:

1. Loss of Ancaster's uniqueness, village environment and erosion of our heritage.

2. Conflicting architectural styles.

3. Traffic gridlock on arterial roads and Wilson Street.

4. Degeneration of Ancaster into just another suburban development.
Ancaster at the Crossroads - A Possible Future

1. Our unique opportunity - Ensure Ancaster’s Future; and
2. With a Comprehensive Planning Approach we can mitigate the burdens of development, manage the consequences, and channel the benefits to preserve our heritage for the future.

Comprehensive Planning - Laying Ground Rules for Development:

i. Preservation of the Wilson Street streetscape and heritage buildings;

ii. Preservation of the Sulphur Springs Road rural characteristics;
iii. Compatible architecture of new structures in scale and design which complements our Heritage buildings;

iv. Landscaping to preserve natural vegetation species and topography;

v. Providing pedestrian and bicycle pathways through new neighbourhoods connecting with the Wilson Street core, Sulphur Springs Road, and the Dundas Conservation Trail system (see Map A - Conceptual Plan); and

vi. Requiring developers to coordinate their plans to provide for pedestrian paths, interconnecting roadways to reduce dependence on Wilson Street, direct access to the Wilson Street and Rousseaux Street junction.
Map A - Conceptual Plan
To Conclude - What does SAVE want?

The goals of the expanded City of Hamilton are built on the "city of many communities' concept". The City of Hamilton goal 2a refers to "quality community services, honoring community identity and varying needs and circumstances." This concept is consistent with Hamilton's Vision 2020, which states "Neighborhoods have strong local identity. Residents actively participate in community life, to a large extent, controlling the pace and design of change." This Vision was endorsed by the Hamilton City Council - "Council is committed to Vision 2020 and will partner with Action 2020 in the implementation of its strategies." (City of Hamilton Goal 2c).

What SAVE wants:

* Commitment to the objectives stated in the Ancaster Community Plan, development based on a comprehensive plan to ensure the future of the Ancaster Village Core, its history and environment;

* The recognition of Ancaster's unique characteristics and the implementation of policies based on this recognition;

* For the Ancaster community to insist on comprehensive planning and an end to inappropriate development; and

* The principles supported by the Ancaster Community Plan (2005), and supported by the professed goals of Hamilton City Council and recognized by the Government of Ontario in their Provincial Policy Statement to be applied to future developments in Ancaster. If Ancaster, as Ontario's third oldest community, does not qualify for these considerations what does that say of these various levels of government, their Policy Statements, Goals, and Visions?

Ancaster, for better or worse, is now part of the City of Hamilton. We must ensure our voice is recognized and we must participate in the decisions involving the future of our community.
Guiding Principles and Objectives
The Woodland Development - Ancaster

Ancaster's Village Heritage - Preservation

- Preservation of the Village environment
- Preservation of the historic characteristics and structures of Ancaster
- Preservation and promotion of the Village Core - Wilson Street
- Preservation of the historic characteristics of Sulphur Springs Road
- Preservation of the heritage buildings of the old Dalley Estate - Wynnstay

Promotion of Comprehensive Development Planning

- Encourage planning and development which takes a comprehensive approach - which looks at integrating with and complementing Ancaster's village environment and heritage - which address the challenges of growth and development with long range solutions and does not proceed in isolation from the rest of the community
- Specifically - planning and development of the Subject Lands (Woodland) must proceed as a whole and not in separate phases.

Sympathetic Development Supportive of Ancaster's Village Environment

- Promote landscaping and architecture compatible with the Village heritage
- Promote pedestrian and bicycle pathway accesses from the development to the Village Core. The old Dalley/Mt. Mary driveway is a perfect corridor for this purpose.

Sulphur Springs Road - Preservation

- Only one road access into the development from Sulphur Springs Road - insistence on the development of the second access from the Wilson/Rousseaux junction
- Insistence that all driveways within Woodlands access only roads within the development
- Insistence that a tree lined buffer zone be maintained between the development and Sulphur Springs Road and adjacent properties.

Preservation of the Additional Lands in their natural state

- Ensuring that the lands adjacent to the escarpment be protected and administered by the Conservation Authority
- Provide adequate public access to these protected lands and the Dundas Valley paths

Traffic Management - Comprehensive Planning

- Development of a northern access to Woodlands through the Wilson/Rousseaux junction
- Only one road access from Sulphur Spring Road at Mansfield Drive
- Encourage construction traffic to use the Wilson/Rousseaux access to avoid further congestion and impact along Wilson Street and Sulphur Springs Road.
1.0 Introduction

The SAVE Committee has retained Brook McIlroy Inc. to provide urban design advice regarding the development proposal for the Mount Mary Property (subject lands). The 102 acre property is a diverse landscape originally settled in 1918, when the property was transformed from woods, farmland and scrub into a planned cultural heritage landscape (Built Heritage Assessment, Draft Chapel Heritage Services). The proposed Woodland Manor Subdivision is the subject of considerable interest for the SAVE Committee, a group of local Ancaster residents who wish to act in the best interests of the Ancaster community to ensure that the highest quality of residential development is planned for the lands. SAVE views the property with its unique built and natural heritage as the last significant land parcel remaining close to the Village centre and therefore what results from development will have a significant and probably irreversible effect on Ancaster.

In addition to meetings with the SAVE Committee, a meeting was held on March 21st, 2007 with Ward 12 Councillor Lloyd Ferguson and John Ariens of PEIL Planning and Engineering Initiatives Ltd (PEIL). PEIL has been retained by the Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate to determine the long term residential development of the lands. The SAVE Committee has reviewed copies of documentation filed with the City of Hamilton regarding the planning, traffic, servicing, built heritage and archaeological assessment of the Mt. Mary Property.

A preliminary concept plan (April, 2006) for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 lands was provided, however a subsequent concept plan has been prepared for the Phase 1 Lands only and was presented for discussion purposes only at the meeting on March 21st, 2007. As the committee does not have a current Concept Plan from which to provide specific comments, the focus of this report is to provide guiding recommendations and to address the key elements of the planning and development framework that will lead to appropriate and high quality development within the Mt. Mary Property, its neighbouring properties and the Village Core.
The SAVE Committee has expressed a number of objectives for the development of the subject lands which focus on the importance of creating a well designed and integrated residential development within the Village of Ancaster that fits well with the existing community and the unique natural and heritage characteristics of the site including its mature landscape, varied topography and the built heritage associated within the Mount Mary Retreat Centre (formerly Wynnstay Estate) and the surrounding Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). The following summarizes the SAVE Committee’s major concerns:

- Ancaster’s natural and cultural heritage should be preserved. (Section 2.1)
- Ancaster’s village scale and environment should be maintained and extended within new low-rise development. (Section 2.6)
- Automobile traffic should be controlled to support a strong pedestrian realm. (Section 2.3)
- The Woodland Manor development should support and strengthen a sustainable retail base in the Village Core. (Section 2.3)
- New development should retain and integrate existing landscape and topography to the greatest extent possible. (Section 2.7)
- The heritage buildings of the former Wynnstay Estate (old Dalley Estate) should be protected through appropriate adaptive reuse and renovation. (Section 2.1)
- The ESA surrounding the site should be preserved and protected through appropriate development setbacks and buffer treatments. (Section 2.1)
- The development of the Mount Mary Property should only be undertaken with comprehensive planning for the future of the entire property. Resolution for the challenges of development: traffic congestion, heritage preservation, preservation of green space, appropriately scaled development and development of pedestrian pathways accessing the Village Core, are only accommodated through comprehensive planning. (Section 2.5)

Wilson Street is marked by original (St. John’s Anglican Church) and new buildings that are carefully designed to fit with the character and quality of the Village Core.
2.0 Key Development Directions

2.1 Preservation of Ancaster’s Natural and Cultural Heritage

Protection of the heritage buildings of the Mount Mary Retreat Centre property will be a critical aspect of redevelopment. The historic character, scale, architectural quality and integrated landscape setting should provide a place specific and positive influence to the design of the proposed subdivision. The maintenance of landscape buffers along property boundaries will contribute to protection of the ESA Area to the north, retain the landscape character of the area, and provide visual and acoustic privacy between adjacent properties and public roads. The 32 acre Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) is identified within the northern property limits. These lands should be granted full conservation status and donated to the Dundas Conservation Authority for management and preservation.

a. During the March 21, 2007 meeting, the Developer expressed a willingness to provide a landscaped, tree-lined buffer zone along Sulphur Springs Road. Tree-lined buffer zones should also be provided along boundaries with properties to the east and west of the development. All other bordering property edges should be examined for opportunities to provide similar landscaped setbacks. Landscaped buffers should include opportunities for bird watching, walking trails and special views.

b. The built heritage associated within the campus of buildings and heritage sensitive areas within the Mount Mary Retreat Centre provide an important architectural context and history for the site. A stone entrance gate at Wilson Street and winding entrance drive connects several accessory buildings (houses and garages), the brick school building and the Main House located on the hill crest was designed in the French Revival style. Opportunities to create a similar reciprocal relationship between building and site are a primary objective for the proposed residential development.
c. The site should provide adequate public access to the Dundas Valley Escarpment Natural Area (Dundas Valley ESA) by providing parking areas, walkways and pedestrian trails.

d. The unique historic characteristics of Sulphur Springs Road including the rural street without curb and gutter and wooded edges should be preserved while improving pedestrian access between the subject lands to the village.

e. Street design should be balanced to provide effective traffic management and to preserve the natural and cultural heritage assets of Ancaster, its established neighbourhoods and the subject lands.

Wynnstay Estate.

Houses on Wynnstay Estate.

The Sisters of St. Mary School Building.
2.2 Traffic and Circulation

Traffic Impact Study Report Summaries:

Two Traffic Reports have been prepared for the subject lands. The Stantec Study “Woodland Manor Subdivision, Ancaster-Wilson Street Traffic Impact Study”, April 2007 analyses the traffic generated by Phase 1 of the proposed Woodland Manor residential subdivision and its impact on Wilson Street. The study addresses the implications of the development on several signalized intersections throughout Ancaster. The Geoffrey Aston Transportation Engineering Traffic Impact Study, Revised April 2007 looks at the impacts of Phase 1 and 2 of the proposed Woodland Manor subdivision on the immediately abutting streets. The findings of the traffic studies conclude that:

- The Wilson Street corridor is generally congested particularly in the AM peak hour northbound and at the Rousseaux Street intersection. Phase 1 of the Woodland Manor traffic can be accommodated within the Wilson Street corridor without a significant change in the level of service, critical movements and travel speeds. Future studies are required to examine the Wilson/Rousseaux intersection to address capacity constraints that exist there and will continue over the next 20 years.
- The intersection at Wilson Street and Rousseaux Street currently operates poorly during AM and PM peak hour. Geometric improvements to the intersection were tested and determined not to be effective including double left turn lanes on Rousseaux and on Wilson southbound. The potential for a modern roundabout was tested and determined to be effective, however would have a greater impact on adjacent properties with a diameter of 55 metres. The poor level of service at Wilson and Rousseaux Street contributes to the overall low operating speed northbound along the corridor.
- Sight lines on Sulphur Springs Road were examined from the Mansfield Drive intersection and a second alternate intersection 140 metres to the west. The City of Hamilton is planning to reconstruct Sulphur Springs Road and will modify the profile to improve sight lines at both these intersections.
- The intersection at Wilson Street and Sulphur Springs Road currently operates at a very good level of service in the AM peak hour and an excellent level of service at the PM peak hour. Estimates for Phase 1 and 2 site generated traffic added in 2018 are for satisfactory level of service in the AM peak hour and a good level of service for the PM peak hour (2018 is the proposed date for Phase 2).

- Phase 1 development will result in only minor impact on Wilson Street and Sulphur Springs Road. No physical improvements to the roadways are warranted as a result of the increase in traffic generated by the development.
- The proposed access locations with the exception of the west entrance to the subdivision from Sulphur Springs Road are well situated and should cause little or no adverse impact on the existing traffic.
- The westerly entrance from Sulphur Springs Road should be reconstructed and the elevation lowered to provide acceptable sight lines to the intersection.
- The road allowance for the entrance on to Wilson Street constructed during Phase 2 should be at the south side of the property to ensure that adequate sight distance is attained. The Old Dalley/ Mount Mary driveway is the proposed access for Phase 2.
SAVE Committee Observations:

These studies do recognize the reality that Wilson Street is currently nearing capacity. Phase 1 of the Woodland development calls for 86 single family and 44 townhouse units, totaling 130 new residences (Stantec Study). Many of these households will have two or more vehicles. It is not an exaggeration to expect more than 200 additional private vehicles with only Phase 1. (The total new residential units envisaged by Phase 1 & 2 exceeds 200. This is potentially 400 additional private vehicles.)

These studies state that the current road system can "accommodate" and that there will be only "minor impact", but major road improvements will be required for Sulphur Springs Road. There is no discussion of the logical route these vehicles will take during the busy AM & PM periods. To avoid the "congestion" on Wilson Street SAVF fears it will be through the neighbourhoods to the south, east and west.

The SAVE Committee is also greatly concerned with the added congestion of construction vehicles, during the project's build, who only have access along Wilson Street and down Sulphur Springs Road. Several years of such congestion could irreversibly damage businesses in the Village Core.

While access to Wilson Street for Phase 1 is not currently envisage, it will be a significant factor for Phase 2. One does not need to be an experienced traffic planner to realize that the use of the current Mt. Mary driveway as an access for the development to Wilson Street would be a significant error. Residential traffic entering and exiting the development would be confronted with heavy traffic with which to merge. Turning across traffic would be almost impossible during the busy AM & PM drive periods.

What is missing from these studies and the development plan is a comprehensive strategy for traffic management.

Further Traffic Considerations:

The issue of traffic access to the proposed development is critical particularly with regard to the increase of traffic volume on Sulphur Springs Road and Wilson Street. The new development will generate heavy truck traffic during construction. The Committee believes that two points of site access are necessary to provide adequate access.

Recommended locations include one at a signalled access to Sulphur Springs Road at Mansfield Drive, and a second at the intersection of Wilson Street and Rousseaus Road.

Full rezoning for the Phase 1 and 2 Lands will allow for opportunities to address vehicular access between the proposed residential community, the Village Core and adjacent neighbourhoods.

a. All residential lots within the development should be accessed by driveways which are internal to the development to minimize driveway interruptions on Sulphur Springs Road, and to control construction traffic.

b. Construction traffic should be accessed from Wilson Street to minimize traffic on Sulphur Springs Road during construction.

c. An access to the subject lands from the Rousseaus and Wilson junction is subject to further traffic impact study and is dependant on the purchase of a road through private property. Access through this property must ensure that the resultant land parcel(s) is not unduly compromised. The advantage of this location includes less disruption to the Village Core, less dependence on Sulphur Springs Road for access and more direct access to Highway 403 and west Hamilton from Wilson Street. Further, there will less of a tendency for traffic to take shortcuts through residential areas.

Traffic congestion on Wilson Street.
Wilson & Rousseaux Junction

SAVE is very concerned for the village environment and the retail community if the development's construction and residential traffic were added to an already congested Wilson Street.

SAVE also notes that currently residential traffic funnelling along Sulphur Springs Road, specially in the AM period, will avoid the Wilson Street congestion by passing through the Lodor/Academy Street neighbourhood on this way to Rousseaux and the 403. This causes additional stress to this established community. This temptation will be increased if the only access and departure point for the Woodland's additional 200 vehicles is along Sulphur Springs Road.

The City is asked to:

a. Evaluate the improved traffic management possibility at the Rousseaux and Wilson junction if a complete north – south, east – west, light managed junction existed. SAVE suggests that this junction consists of Wilson Street—north-south—and Rousseaux east with a Woodland access west. The Old Dundas—Ancaster Road could be made a dead-end past Ontario St with access to Wilson Street along Montgomery Drive.

b. Such a junction would allow construction traffic direct access to the development without traveling along Wilson Street and down Sulphur Springs Road.

c. When Woodland residential traffic commences it would have much more direct access to Hamilton by Wilson Street and Rousseaux to the 403.

d. The necessity for two access points on Sulphur Springs Road would be eliminated allowing for only one at Sulphur Springs and Mansfield Drive. This would reduce pressure on Sulphur Springs Road and surrounding neighbourhoods.
2.3 A Pedestrian Oriented Community

The creation of a pedestrian oriented versus suburban, car-oriented residential development is required to fit with the scale and character of the existing Village Core. Consideration of mixed housing types will attract a variety of residents of all ages. Housing types may include singles, townhouses or multi-unit 'manor housing' to increase residential density in close proximity to the Village Core.

a. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be provided throughout the development and from the development to the Village Core. These connections should be available along both proposed vehicular access driveways and may be provided as non-vehicular routes provided that they are clearly visible, well maintained and safe.

b. Block sizes and lot patterns should accommodate short walking distances and interconnection within the development.

c. Curving streets and deliberate variations in the design of blocks and streets should be provided around natural elements such as wooded areas, ponds and topography to maintain site contours and natural features, enhance views and achieve a place-specific character within the proposed neighbourhood.

d. A consistent and identifiable neighbourhood image should be created through additional amenities including landscape treatments, street furnishings, paving materials, lighting and signs.

e. The provision of continuous sidewalks on Sulphur Springs Road is required to provide safe walking and cycling between the proposed development and the Village Core.

f. The Old Dalley/Mount Mary Drive and gates should be preserved as a pedestrian pathway connecting the development to the Village Core.
2.4 Development Integrated with the Town

The irregularly shaped subject property has narrow frontage on Sulphur Springs Road and principal entry from Wilson Street, the Village’s main thoroughfare. Wilson Street continues to evolve as the Village’s historic centre and main street with small shops, restaurants and the Village’s Municipal Offices and Library. Currently Ancaster’s layout, scale and setting tend to discourage pedestrian movement to the Village Core and neighbouring areas. There is an opportunity to develop a pedestrian and cycling network between the proposed development, Village Core and adjacent neighbourhoods.

2.5 A Comprehensive Concept Plan

The rezoning of both the Phase 1 and 2 Lands will require that a concept plan outlining proposed site planning including site circulation and dual access points, stormwater management and servicing, landscape and open space treatments, lot patterns, housing types and development statistics are provided. A comprehensive zoning and Concept Plan will indicate visual and physical connections between new development, the Village Core and the subject lands. The comprehensive plan must ensure that:

a. It demonstrates the full development phasing of the subject lands including the total number and distribution of unit types, the road network, open space, landscape buffers and lands proposed for conservation.

b. Appropriate and consistent development for long-term build out and will ensure that traffic is well managed during construction.

c. Development is supportive of Ancaster’s village environment, natural and cultural heritage and adheres to the City of Hamilton’s sustainable development policies including Vision 20/20, Hamilton’s Sustainable Community Initiative. The report describes community development that includes a system of connected and protected natural areas, a new transportation system, a different form to the urban area and a diversified and environmentally friendly economy.

New development can be set within the existing landscape setting. Above Kleinberg, Ontario and Kentlands, Maryland.
2.6 Appropriately Scaled Development

The development should be compatible with the scale and form of Ancaster buildings. The following characteristics of established residences and neighbourhoods in Ancaster should be considered:

a. Street and block configurations should respond to existing natural features and topography. Where feasible, mature trees should be integrated into development through the siting of buildings, blocks, streets and infrastructure.

b. A variety of building types and setbacks is a defining feature of Ancaster’s established neighbourhoods and residences. This variety provides visual interest and a sense of informality that is an important attribute of ‘village’ or small town character. A mix of housing types should allow for variations in residential density within a low rise building form.

c. Residences should interface with open spaces and natural features to as great an extent as possible. Where a road or public access is not feasible and these features must be fronted on by private properties, generally a minimum of 50% of the linear open space frontage should be bounded by a public right of way, parkland, lane or pedestrian walkway.

d. Residences adjacent to wooded areas and mature specimen trees is strongly encouraged to maximize the retention of these natural features through measures such as a woodlot or tree buffer zone and other appropriate setbacks recommended by the Conservation Authority.

Ancaster housing within a mature landscaped setting.

Wychwood Park in Toronto provides an example of a neighbourhood that has been well-integrated into existing natural features such as topography and mature trees.
2.7 High Quality Architecture in a Landscaped Setting

Ancaster’s built legacy is rich in type and form. Many residential and commercial properties within the Village exhibit pride in their surrounding natural heritage through beautiful landscaped gardens. The Mount Mary Retreat Centre has a history of continuous ownership and uses that have maintained much of the woodland and natural site features. The estate buildings including the main house are well integrated with the natural landscape and topography and are constructed generally with steep roof pitches and high quality materials such as brick and stone. A comprehensive development approach will ensure that adaptive reuse of the heritage buildings will be reviewed.

Given that the proposed development is likely to occur over a relatively short period of time, it is critical that the new buildings respect and complement the vernacular character of the existing Village. No one vernacular or architectural style is dominant in Ancaster and as such a mix of housing forms is encouraged to not only extend the Town’s diverse architectural character, but also to assist in meeting the demand for diverse housing needs: seniors, multiple dwelling units, townhouses, singles etc. While styles, materials and details differ throughout the Village, a general similarity exists in the architectural massing and shape of low rise buildings (typically one to three storeys).

New construction will fit best within the site and the Village through similar considerations of building height and massing, architectural quality and material applied. Specifically, new residential development should consider:

a. Sympathetic architectural design that complements existing high quality housing within the Village Core.

b. Low rise building forms, generally one to three storeys except where topography or site conditions may permit additional height.

c. Residences should be encouraged to have height variations, but not to extremes. For example the transition between building heights should be no more than one storey.

d. Residential design must integrate a balanced house and garage design. For example where the garage is attached to the dwelling, the garage width should be proportioned to allow for habitable rooms on the ground floor.

e. The architectural language of new construction may attempt to emulate past styles, or provide contemporary expressions which are compatible with the scale, massing and details of existing high quality buildings in Ancaster.

f. A consistent quality of building materials and finishes should reflect a high level of craftsmanship. Stone, brick and wood are recommended as primary construction materials in keeping with local village architecture.

Stone is a material that is used in many of the local buildings in Ancaster.

Multiple car garages should be screened from view or located away from the primary house facade.
3.0 Summary

- SAVE promotes comprehensive concept development and traffic circulation approach to ensure preservation of existing natural and cultural site attributes a well-integrated residential neighbourhood and mitigation of increased traffic congestion on the surrounding community.

- SAVE promotes the preservation of landscape and topography within the subject lands and the bordering ESA to the greatest extent feasible. A treed buffer zone is required as a minimum along the Sulphur Springs frontage, along the western border adjacent to the existing private driveway and along the border of neighbouring properties to the east. The unique natural setting should be a defining feature of the new neighbourhood.

- SAVE promotes the preservation and adaptive reuse of all existing former Wynnstay Estate buildings and structures and encourages that their low scale, architectural quality and character be a guiding influence in the design of proposed homes.

- SAVE promotes a pedestrian-oriented approach to the design of the subdivision to promote environmental sustainability, physical health and walking and cycling between proposed homes and the Village Core.

- SAVE considers access to the Woodland development from the Wilson and Rousseaux junction essential. This would be the major entry to the development for traffic from west Hamilton and the 403 via Rousseaux. Traffic burdens to the surrounding neighbourhoods and the Village Core would be substantially reduced. While this would require negotiations to obtain right of way, SAVE believes the benefits to the Village and the development are substantial.
4.0 woodland manor – project revision

The SAVE Committee realizes it is asking the Developer and The Sister Servants of Mary Immaculate to reevaluate their development schedule. To fulfill many of the objectives put forth by these Guiding Recommendations – proper traffic management (Wilson & Rousseaux junction and access), preservation of Sulphur Springs Road, pedestrian access to the Village centre (Wilson Street retail & service community), the encouragement of appropriately scaled development and the preservation of the Village Core – the development of the Subject Lands must be planned and proceed in a comprehensive manor and not in a two phase approach.

The SAVE Committee notes that there are several other pockets of under utilized land (the school board property – pedestrian access from Wilson Street and vehicle access from Queen Street/Sulphur Springs Road – as an example) which are ripe for future development. As these lands come on stream additional challenges and vehicle traffic will be added to the Village Core. Comprehensive planning for these eventualities is mandatory.

The Subject Lands addressed by the current rezoning application are at the heart of the historic Village of Ancaster. We are asking that a greater vision be applied to the Woodland development.

SAVE opposes piece-meal development. SAVE opposes the Woodland development if it is to proceed in two phases as submitted. The resolutions for the current plan's deficiencies are only found through a comprehensive approach as championed by these Guiding Recommendations. SAVE supports development based on these guiding principles.
Map A - Conceptual Plan