Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, all consultations within the city are being held virtually to protect the health and safety of Hamilton residents and staff.
WATERDOWN COMMUNITY NODE SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
PHASE THREE VIRTUAL CONSULTATION – JUNE 2021
PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT

ABOUT THIS REPORT
The purpose of the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study is to develop a long-term land use plan for the central area of Waterdown. As part of the implementation of the study, a Zoning Review was completed to identify changes that are needed to implement the directions of the secondary plan study.

Virtual commenting for the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Zoning Review included the opportunity to review online materials and provide input online from September 23 to October 14.

This report provides a summary of the verbatim public input from the commenting period. All feedback is being considered by City Staff in the finalization of the zoning changes. The final changes are anticipated to be submitted to City Council for approval concurrently with the Secondary Plan in late 2021.
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1. VIRTUAL CONSULTATION DETAILS

The Zoning Review consultation was held virtually. Individuals were able to participate by reviewing the Zoning information online on the project website from September 23 to October 14, 2021. Materials were available at engage.hamilton.ca/waterdownnode 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Participants were asked to submit their written comments on the materials online at engage.hamilton.ca/waterdownnode or via email to waterdownnodeplanning@hamilton.ca.

Online consultation materials included an overview of the changes on the project website, a map showing the location of the changes and the materials noted below.

Materials related to changes to the Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law 90-145-Z included:
- A presentation illustrating proposed changes;
- A chart outlining each proposed change and the rationale for each change; and,
- A draft of the amending Zoning By-law.

Materials related to changes to the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law 05-200 included:
- A presentation illustrating proposed changes;
- A chart outlining each proposed change and the rationale for each change; and,
- A draft of the amending Zoning By-law.

The overview on the website included the following information:

The Secondary Plan being finalized as part of the study will contain policies about land uses, heritage conservation, heights, densities and design to provide guidance for changes that may occur in the central area of Waterdown over the next 20 to 30 years. Policies such as these are implemented in part by applying requirements to the zoning by-law regulations for an area. The zoning by-law requirements are more detailed than the policies and set out specific regulations for development such as height measurements, setback requirements and other lot standards. When an application for new development or an addition to an existing building is submitted to the City, it must comply with the requirements and regulations of the zoning by-law.

The intent of the proposed zoning changes is to ensure that the zoning is consistent with the policies proposed in the Secondary Plan.

For lands in existing residential neighbourhoods, a key concern raised by residents was ensuring that new homes fit with the existing character of the area when additions or demolitions of existing homes to build new homes take place. The zoning review has looked at the existing standards in this area and proposed some changes to help ensure that new development is a good fit with what exists in the neighbourhood.
For commercial areas, there are changes being made to the zoning to add more lands to the "Pedestrian Focused" commercial zoning, and to eliminate some permissions for certain car-oriented uses like gas stations at the corner of Hamilton Street and Dundas Street. In the historic commercial area along Dundas Street, east of Hamilton Street, there are also several changes proposed, to apply a three storey limit to building heights and to set some standards that are intended to make sure that new buildings are a good fit with the heritage character of this area. Other changes to the commercial zoning include some building design standards for larger buildings and greenspace requirements for buildings with residential units.

Changes to lands zoned for medium and high density residential uses are not part of the scope of the review and will be reviewed at a future date as part of the City-wide Residential Zones project.

From September 23 to October 14, the website was visited 233 times and 27 individuals responded by providing their views on the Zoning Review materials through the Engage Hamilton comment submission box. Thirteen individuals provided responses by email.

2. GENERAL THEMES AND KEY MESSAGES HEARD

There continues to be significant community interest in the central Waterdown community. Residents are engaged about the future of their community and there has been a high degree of public engagement through previous consultations held during the project.

The City is committed to ensuring that there is full transparency in reporting on what was heard to ensure that the public feedback received is widely known and considered in the development of the Zoning changes. All feedback is being considered by City Staff. Feedback reports and meeting notes from all consultations are made available on the project website.

Figure 2 is a high-level synthesis prepared on the key messages heard through the online commenting on the Zoning Review. The verbatim input from the virtual commenting is included in the report appendices as follows:

- Appendix 1: Comments received through Engage Hamilton
- Appendix 2: Comments received by Email

It is important that this synthesis of key messages heard be read in conjunction with the verbatim detailed comments found in Appendices 1 and 2.
### Figure 2 – High-level Overview of Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall comments</td>
<td>Some comments were not in favour of any growth or new development as traffic and population density were already seen to be very problematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for the overall intent of the residential zoning changes was noted by multiple respondents. Comments noted that it is important to ensure that certain areas are kept with original character. Comments expressed a desire to prevent large executive style homes that change the look and feel of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a desire for the zoning amendments to assist with preventing developments that are not felt to be appropriate for the area. Examples of developments that were not supported included the former Connon Nurseries site (outside of study area) and other higher density developments outside of the study area, as well as several new developments and single detached dwellings within the study area. The property at 118 Main Street North was referenced in several comments as a new dwelling that does not conform to the visual theme, building materials, and height of the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining mature trees</td>
<td>Support for restrictions on mature tree removals was expressed in multiple comments. Mature trees should be protected when new development takes place. They add privacy and contribute to the core’s identity. Trees removed should be replaced by comparable trees in size and density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Zoning: Some of the changes to the institutional zoning were seen to be important, particularly a maximum two storey height. Additional requirements such as density limits and restrictions on townhouses were suggested</td>
<td>The two-storey height for infill residential on institutional sites was identified as important and was supported. Other considerations suggested regulating the distance required between property lines in backyards and new buildings (rear yards), establishing a maximum density requirement to limit the number of units that could be permitted as infill on institutional sites, and restricting uses to not allow for townhouses. It was asked how the (Secondary) Plan takes into account the parking needs of housing that may be built on institutional land in the future. A parking requirement of two spaces per unit was suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential development at 306 Parkside Drive</td>
<td>There continue to be concerns about the potential impacts of development at 306 Parkside Drive, both traffic impacts and impacts to existing residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zoning: Comments regarding heights and parking</td>
<td>Commercial zoning comments noted that height limits are needed and architectural design also needs to be taken into consideration to ensure development that fits with historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amendments to the parking standards were noted as a positive amendment, however additional suggestions were made regarding how the standard might be adjusted for office and personal service uses to better reflect parking needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zoning: Zoning changes for 3 properties on 50, 54, and 56 Barton Street</td>
<td>Objections were raised by two landowners regarding the proposed changes in zoning for the lands at 50, 54, and 56 Barton Street. It was noted that these homes have no historical value and that there are already high density developments on lands near the property. High density permissions for the lands were requested to allow for the future development of apartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zoning: Providing housing options and flexibility</td>
<td>It was noted that housing needs are significant, and homeowners need flexibility to meet housing needs because more families are living intergenerational within dwellings, children are living at home longer, and wages do not match housing costs. This requires flexibility to meet the needs of the homeowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One comment noted that the area needs to be to responsive to its community members, not simply to those who which to buy &quot;a small town feel&quot;. Certain zoning changes such as lowering height allowances, restricting driveway widths and only allowing attached single garages were felt to oppose the goal allowing families to make affordable changes to their current homes in order to maximize space to support family needs. Parking was raised as a problem and restricting a homeowner's ability to provide parking on their property was not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for allowing secondary dwelling units to increase housing choice and supply was noted in several comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zoning: Height limits</td>
<td>Agreement was noted for setting height limits as part of the residential zoning scope, to maintain character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How height is measured was noted as an important function of building sympathetically to the neighbourhood. Staff were requested to take into consideration the effect of roofline massing. A new definition of height was suggested that would establish height to the roof peak, rather than the midpoint as currently provided; or, potentially the height should be measured to the peak for a 2 storey dwelling, but for single and 1.5 storey buildings it can be measured from the midline to better accommodate future dormers. It was also recommended to staff that a height definition that restricts flat roofs to 9m and allows peaked roofs at 10 or 10.5m would encourage greater variety of built form in the future, as well as incorporating permissions for additional height for architectural details as of right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zoning: Massing</td>
<td>It was recommended that staff consider using a residential floor area/lot area regulation similar to Oakville and Mississauga to control building massing. It was also suggested that staff consider the use of varying side yard setbacks/lot frontage ratios used in Mississauga’s older communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zoning: Lot Coverage</td>
<td>A comment suggested that consideration be given to limiting accessory building coverage to 5% of the lot area maximum beyond the proposed restriction of 25% or 35% total lot coverage to help support those requiring more storage which cannot be accommodated in a garage, and to support enclosed areas for pool equipment to mitigate noise on abutting lots. Consideration should also be given to requirements for covered vs. uncovered decks since they do not have the same visual or drainage impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zoning: Rear Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>A question was submitted asking whether an assessment been done as to whether the proposed approach would limit a property’s ability to achieve other aspects of the zoning regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was requested that staff consider the height of a structure that projects beyond the rear walls of abutting dwellings or consider greater setbacks to both the main floor and upper levels to step the building further away from the lot line, where it projects beyond the rear wall of the abutting dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Zoning: Some specific concerns were raised about proposed regulations for driveway widths, restrictions on the shapes of driveways, on garage sizes, on garage door widths; and on balcony restrictions</strong></td>
<td>Multiple comments suggested that certain proposed requirements were too restrictive, or that they were unnecessarily limiting the flexibility of landowners. Some opinions were that certain standards about driveways, garages and balconies should not be regulated by the zoning by-law. Specific requirements noted as being too restrictive were prohibiting T-shaped and circular driveways, width limits for garages and driveways, and prohibitions of balconies above the first floor. A comment stated that a single car garage requirement is too restrictive. Residents should be able to have 2 car garages and 2 car driveways as there is a need for this parking and on-street parking is already well-used. Reducing garage space for the sake of &quot;visibility/appearance&quot; was not supported. A concern with the restriction on having one wide garage door instead of two regular width doors was also noted. Questions were also asked about how the new standards would be applied to existing homes, particularly where an existing garage or driveway design is non-compliant with the proposed standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Zoning: The historical orientation of residential lots on School Street creates a unique garage condition</strong></td>
<td>A submission was received which noted that due to the historical orientation of homes abutting School Street, garages here are oriented differently and located between homes and the street. Revisions to the proposed standards to remove the garage location and driveway standards were requested for these lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Issues: There continue to be concerns about traffic issues in the community and the impact of development on existing traffic issues</td>
<td>It was expressed that development permissions in the area should be limited due to the density of already existing development and existing traffic levels. Concerns were raised about transportation infrastructure being inadequate for future development. Specific traffic issues on Dundas Street and Parkside Drive were described, as well as overall traffic levels during peak travel times. One comment requested that Dundas Street be converted to 4 lanes by removing on-street parking, to address traffic and congestion issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>It was noted that adequate bike paths are needed to support commercial uses in the core, in addition to zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional questions and concerns were raised about other elements of the Secondary Plan Study, developments outside of the study area, or about lands in the study area not subject to zoning changes.</td>
<td>Other areas mentioned in the comments include potential development at the southern end of Berry Hill Avenue, and the design of Memorial Park. Comments from a resident and the Mill Street Heritage Committee noted a desire to complete a study to possibly expand the existing Heritage Conservation District on Mill Street and/or create a new Heritage Conservation District to help guide changes in the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. NEXT STEPS

Following the virtual consultation, City Staff are moving into the final and last phase of the study which includes preparing the Staff report and recommendations for presentation to Planning Committee and Council for approval. This is expected to occur within the next 3 to 4 months.
Appendix 1 – Comments received through Engage Hamilton

Through Engage Hamilton, the City’s online public engagement platform, the public was able to submit general written comments on the Zoning Review Materials. The following are the comments received. For the following, specific names and addresses provided have been omitted from this report. Each represents an individual’s comments. The following comments are verbatim.

Provide your feedback on the Draft Zoning Information:

1. Could someone explain to me the change at the bottom of Berry hill Ave and Dundas? It looks like it’s proposed a change to allow a 6 story building versus like the current industrial. It’s already a very busy intersection my kids cross every day. Adding an apartment building would be not right and would adversely affect traffic and the skyline, neighbourhood.

2. One of the biggest concerns in the neighbourhood is around density and traffic issues in the core. A density requirement must be considered for these industrial sites as the neighbourhood can’t accommodate further traffic around Parkside and Main Street. Looking at the possibility that 40 residences could be build in at St James united church means 80 additional vehicles on that one site plus guest parking. Density in the core is of key importance.

3. What are the requirements around maintaining mature trees within industrial and residential sites? With any development comes the risk of trees being cut down which adds significant privacy and maintains the core’s identity. All mature trees must be replaced if they are to be cut down for development.

4. I don’t see mention of preserving old and mature trees in the community node. There is risk that the institutional sites will remove very mature trees in order to develop. Please ensure mature trees should remain and at the very least replaced by comparable trees in size and maturity.

5. I believe that Waterdown has so much potential but we need to grow carefully and plan this out. Construction and growth needs to allow for people to still commute within Waterdown as businesses are suffering as a result of the inability to travel.

While we want to put in a commercial area we need to ensure height limits are put in as well as architecture design taken into consideration. Putting in. Hi slings that don’t match the historic environment of Waterdown leaves for a disjointed and divided community.

We say spend it here but unfortunately Waterdown has very few basic shops with bike paths to get to. This needs to be taken into consideration.

6. It is unfortunate that the new zones are 47 and 74. Its very confusing, and I am unsure if it is actually correct in the Draft new Zoning By-law? I was trying to find the zoning references to schedule A3, and I don't see them.
7. I support the changes. However, there is no mention of tearing down existing houses in this area and replacing with large "executive" style homes. To what extent will this continue to occur? At least 2 situations in last few years between Mill and Main, with 1 on Church street pending. These "executive" homes remove trees, and create cement based back yards with swimming pools etc that are changing the look and feel of the neighbourhood. If replacing homes is permitted, understood new construction will need to conform with new guidelines; but I support restrictions on tree removal (particularly old/large trees that add character); and some type of mandatory notification to neighbours when significant constructions projects occur (ie, house teardown, etc).

8. It strikes me that the proposal to prohibit T-shaped and circular driveways is overreach - I cannot see what business it is of the city to dictate the shape of driveways. Similarly, I oppose the width limits on garages and the prohibition of balconies above the first floor. That would make many homes non-compliant - admittedly they are not in the study area but they exist all over our town and are a nice amenity that should not be kept from people in the study area. What is the rationale for any of these proposed changes? They seem like the whims of a planner with no empirical support.

9. I love that you will be ensuring the Waterdown keeps certain areas with the original character. it is important that not just anyone can come in and build, it takes away from what the village is supposed to be. I agree with keeping heights in scope too, so important. I was from Aldershot in Burlington, and I feel like that area's vision is lost, there are some areas that they did well with the look of the buildings and others where this modern feel was brought in that doesn't match the community. If there are open seats that I could volunteer on this committee, I would love to be contacted. I live in Flamborough now.

10. Every effort MUST be made to slow the growth of traffic and congestion through Waterdown. Traffic and population density are already overwhelming.

11. The updates regarding maintaining a 2 story limit on industrial sites is appreciated and important for the area. Has consideration over the distance required between property lines in backyards and new buildings been considered? The core currently has backyards facing each other so there is adequate distance between buildings. Will limits between backyards be consistent for new development?

12. The majority of the ideas I appreciate. I am familiar with planning processes in the City of Burlington, and in general, I appreciate the efforts to retain heritage designation & appearance for Waterdown as well as a focus on medium/low density as opposed to going to 20 storeys (like Burlington's push for high density).

With that said, I am confused and unappreciative of the by-law with the requirements for garage doors. The rest of the by-law did not strike me as odd or over-reaching, but the garage door (attached and detached, and single car) seem, quite frankly, stupid and like an overreach. From what I can understand, the areas being impacted by this by-law change are largely already residential, and the vast majority of Waterdown drives. Waterdown already has an issue with a lot of street parking on its residential streets, so further limiting garages seems short-sighted. The street I live on is primarily 2 car
driveways with 2 car garages, and there is still an excessive amount of street-parking despite this. Reducing garage space for the sake of "visibility/appearance" seems silly. Unless the people living in those neighbourhoods are disgusted by garage doors, this feels like an unnecessary addition to an otherwise okay by-law proposal.

13. Hello,  
The plan seems to address reasonable amount of issues within the historic core of the village. Hopefully they will lead to noticeable improvements. On the critique note, it is hard to miss the general mood of the endeavor: prohibit, restrict and demand, mostly by laying all of the burdens of changes on us residents while no attempt is made on the part of the city to give back to us from our own taxes.

Particularly, I'm talking about the bottleneck the city created on Dundas between First street and Hamilton street: historic or no, this part of Dundas street MUST be converted to a 4-laner by removing the street parking along both sides. Yes, I understand this will be unpopular measure for many but it is IMPERATIVE to remove the bottleneck: most, if not all, commercial establishments in this part of Dundas have their own customer parking in the back and thus the street parking, while convenient, is an unsustainable luxury and waste of moving space.

I hope someone will listen to these feedbacks. Best regards and wishing you success.

14. The traffic on Parkside now is overwhelming. When the bypass goes in place and enters Parkside before the railway tracks the traffic will be backed up to hwy 6. A bridge is needed over the tracks??????

15. Waterdown doesn't need to be expanded. We are suppose to be a village not a city!

16. On Page 10 of the residential document summary it is stated "Detached double car garages to a max door width of 3 metres each". Does this preclude use of a single 16 foot wide door on a detached double car garage? Many garages, including mine are configured with one wide door rather than two regular width ones.

17. I live on Kelly street in Waterdown and I am concerned that their will be an increase in traffic on Kelly street as it has been a dead end street. I would like some assurances as to what is to me made of the access path (road) that has always been chained off from 306 Parkside Drive to Kelly Street. Will there be a permanent obstacle placed on this path (road) as to ensure no additional traffic on this street. This needs to be addressed.

18. Waterdown's infrastructure cannot handle it. Traffic is a nightmare coming in and out of town. On top of that our roads are always the last to get plowed in the winter, services up here do not reflect what we pay in taxes.

19. Just no. No to the overreaching of city planning on home and what home owners can do. I would love to know if those involved in this only have one car garages and driveways. I doubt it. No one was concerned about the "heritage look of Waterdown" when all those
massive vertical communities went up (and are still going up) along dundas, but now you all are concerned?

20. Leave it as it is! No more building in the fire

21. Our names are Cindy and Mark Edwards and we are 50% owners of 56 Barton Street, along with our daughter and son in law. Below we have copied a letter submitted by our neighbour at 50 Barton Street. We are in complete agreement with the contents of this letter.

The proposed re-zoning along Barton Street from Flamboro to Hamilton Streets is unfair. Other than the three homes on the street, the rest is already high density. This rezoning would negatively impact our property value! You have let this high density happen along this short stretch of Barton Street. Changing the zoning for such a small area now is unacceptable.

The following is the letter written by our neighbour:
I live on Barton street, between Flamborough and Hamilton street, and this street block is already a high density area as development has already occurred beside my home and across from my home. This proposed zoning restriction would be (blatantly) discriminatory not only to me but the 3 remaining property owners on Barton St. who are situated beside (and across from) high density buildings. Please, I would invite you to come and take a visual look, this section of the city block already has been completely developed and there only remains 4 residential properties which have not been developed.

The proposed zoning scope should not involve the residential homes on Barton Street (between Flamborough St and Hamilton St):

These homes have no historical value
A precedent has already been set by the city of Hamilton, and a high density area of Waterdown has already been created.
Adjacent to the properties on Barton Street is a 10 story apartment dwelling
Across the street is a 7 story residential apartment building.
And within 100 yards (corner of Hamilton St and Hwy 5) another 5 or 6 story apartment unit is currently being built
People who cannot afford homes need apartments to live in, this meets the greater demand of society, and any future apartment units (on Barton St.) would be within one block of the existing transit route which goes down Hwy 5.
The homes I am referring to are 40 to 80 years old. My home is 60+ years old. Your proposed changes to zoning will negatively impact by creating (market) limits on what I can do with my property and who might buy it (reducing the value of my property). Someone looking to build a home on my property will not look favourably investing in a property which is so close to existing high rises
A potential buyer of my home would not look favourably at investing the significant amount of money required to update my home due to its proximity to high rises/high density units. I look forward to seeing a change in your proposal, which allows my property to remained zoned for high density development.

We too would like to be notified of receipt of our letter.
Thank you.

22. "For lands in existing residential neighbourhoods, a key concern raised by residents was ensuring that new homes fit with the existing character of the area when additions or demolitions of existing homes to build new homes take place. The zoning review has looked at the existing standards in this area and proposed some changes to help ensure that new development is a good fit with what exists in the neighbourhood."

The homogenous vanity of this statement overlooks the fact that housing facts do no look like prior. More families are living intergenerational within dwellings, whether by choice or by financial restrictions; children are living at home longer due to inability to afford/secure housing elsewhere; wages do not match housing costs - all of these options require flexibility to meet the needs of the homeowners, not additional restrictions.

So by making zoning changes such as LOWERING the height allowances, restrictions driveway widths and only allowing attached SINGLE garages, you're not allowing families to make affordable options to their current homes in order to support their family needs. It's classist and ignorant of families trying to maximizes their spaces without being forced into house poverty. The driveway width that was set at a percentage of the property width made more sense than an arbitrary 6M rule. 6M on a 35 foot lot is very different from 6M on a 100f wide lot. Parking is already a problem and now to restrict homeowner's ability to access parking on their property is overreach and a stretch.

The real issue is the constant and ever-present sprawl of high-rises and developments that surround the node, which ever with the great aversion of the community to the developers' plans in which the OBA did nothing to stop. Now you want to impose restrictive zoning amendments to compensate. It's disappointing. The "node" of Waterdown needs to be to responsive to it's community members, not simply to those who which to buy "a small town feel".

And as always, despite this project being underway for 2 years, it's disappointing to wait until just prior to final approval to ask for community input. It feel disingenuous and wishful that most people, already beaten down from the pandemic, will not object.

To be honest, instead of vanity zoning tasks, you should be looking to broaden the zoning to allow detached in-law suites, carriage houses, plumbing to sheds. This would contribute to options for housing, such as they did in Vancouver, instead of worrying about further the pretense of small town-ness.
23. My name is Andy MacLaren, Chair of the Waterdown Mill Street Heritage Committee, which consists of approx. 44 local community members. I am writing you on behalf of our committee which met virtually Tuesday Night to discuss the proposal. We would like to thank the city for all the work that has gone into the Waterdown Node Secondary Plan. As a whole, we are pleased with the zoning changes that have been proposed in the draft. One of the items that we are disappointed with is that the study to possibly expand and/or create a new heritage district in the area was removed from the Waterdown Node Secondary Plan process which would have given the area an extra layer of protection.

24. My name is Andy MacLaren and I live at 43 Mill Street N. in Waterdown. I would like to say that my wife and myself agree with the proposed zoning changes that are stated in the draft document however we are disappointed that the study to possibly expand and/or create a new Heritage District was removed from the process which would have given the area an extra layer of protection. Thank You.

25. It is unclear from amendments if there will be more housing that is not based on cars ie. parking lots and driveways. Mixed use housing with small restaurants and shops on the ground floor above 3 storey condos offer a higher quality of life while being less carbon intensive.

26. To Melanie Pham…input on the Waterdown Secondary Node Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this very important plan.

1. There are many large mature trees that border the existing designated institutional properties. These trees form a visible barrier between neighbourhood homes and institutional properties, and are a significant part of the character of our neighbourhood.
   - How does the plan protect existing trees?
   - Were there zoning or variance approvals given to protect the existing trees, when the housing properties were developed around the institutional areas?

2. How will the plan take in to account the additional parking needs of housing that may occupy institutional land in the future? Our area of Waterdown already has an issue with lack of parking and adding more housing in the area. Examples of current parking issues include Kelly Street and Main Street, and both areas could be impacted by 306 Parkside property development.
   - Could the bylaws include increasing the number of parking spaces required for each family unit to two spaces?

3. There has been some housing development, I believe 118 Main Street North, that is very much outside the visual theme, building materials, and height of the neighbourhood.
- what is the process to review, discuss, and appeal decisions on variance requests?
  - what department/people within the City are charged with monitoring new developments to ensure it complies with bylaws?

27. These proposed changes are extremely welcomed our family. Recent new builds in the community have been houses that are extremely large and inappropriate for the neighbourhood or completely out of place, like 118 Main Street North.

I believe that the proposed plan is well thought out and will allow the heritage section of Waterdown to maintain its character. Our neighbour is a favourite for walkers and, as a member of the Flamborough Horticultural Society, a highlight of garden walking tours held during the summer months.
Appendix 2 – Comments received by Email

1. Forgive the well founded skepticism that many Waterdown residents feel whenever these public "consultations" are tabled. I've been involved in numerous Stakeholder Advisory Committees and countless public meetings that seldom result in common sense or the will of the residents being taken into considerations beyond marking off the checklist that requires public consultation as part of the development process.

1/ Protecting heritage areas by allowing only new homes that fit into the surrounding architecture and character? Look no further than the modern monstrosities that were recently approved on Main St North, totally out of character for the neighbourhood. The "historic Village of Waterdown" is a farce, frankly.

2/ Stay within the character/zoning restrictions of the surrounding neighbourhood? The recent redevelopment of the former Connon's Nursery site on Dundas Street illustrates the pure lunacy of allowing ~80 three story condos such that there are no yards, insufficient parking and poor access onto the very worst gridlocked driving in the entire town. Yes, zoning evidently allows and the City opposed it but it doesn't help the outcome which not a single resident of the hundreds who attended public meetings, wanted. Worse, the developer bald faced lied while showing a few pictures taken ONE DAY as evidence there was no traffic issues on Dundas Street while hundreds of residents jeered with their own decades of the opposite experience ignored. Made no difference.

And other than some "traffic calming" measures (code for impede the flow of traffic), virtually nothing has been done to alleviate the gridlock on Dundas Street often stretching back to Evans during the afternoon rush hour. The long awaited E-W bypass is not the answer since the vast majority of cars are still trying to get home off Dundas Street and not looking to "bypass" Waterdown.

Hopefully, these new zoning initiatives are designed to actually address the poor planning and execution of the past. Colour me Skeptical.

2. Waterdown Memorial Park has been virtually DESTROYED by the busy bodies that keep chipping away at what was a nice grassy area for people and events like Car Shows and Rib Fests.

It is slowly being paved over with needless paths (walk in a Parking lot or sidewalk if grass offends) more paved parking, ridiculous podium, a Clock not needed, skating rink with huge building, etc etc.

LEAVE IT ALONE. The area as is, serves the community as it should. Enough armpit to armpit apartments. There are already too many of them in Waterdown.
3. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed zoning changes that intend to implement the Secondary Plan Study. I’m a resident in the village core on Church Street, and will be affected by the proposed residential zoning changes.

I am encouraged to see regulations for the proposed Character Zone that would better regulate the size and scale of new dwellings in the area. I am very much in support having zoning in place that better protects the character of the neighbourhood and provide you with some items for your consideration:

**Height:**
The definition in the Flamborough Zoning By-law provides a measurement for height at different points of the roof, depending on the type of roof. Please take into consideration the effect of roofline massing, should the definition of height remain as currently worded. I anticipate that the current definition would allow for taller single storey homes, to accommodate higher ceiling heights and lofted/vaulted areas. Perhaps in the character area, a new definition of height should be provided that establishes height to the roof peak, rather than the midpoint as currently provided. See example below, where both two-storey homes on either side of the bungalow were constructed as of right under the current zoning. The max height for any dwelling in this case is 9m, measured from grade to the peak of the roof. The house on the right is left with a flat, unappealing roofline to accommodate 9-10 foot ceilings on each floor. The house on the left builds the second floor into the roof line and results in a more sympathetic building next to two single storey homes (it still has a flat roof portion shown in the image further below). Both of these houses are constructed to the taste of the builder, which you can see vary significantly in massing and scale. Under the Flamborough definition, the building on the right could have a full pitched roof, making the structure’s massing far more impactful than it already is. Even the roof over the garage for the house on the right can be a representation of how a tall single storey building can have a negative impact on the existing character. How height is measured in an important function of building sympathetically to the neighbourhood. Perhaps for two storey structures, the height should be measured to the peak, but for single and 1.5 storey buildings it can be measured from the midline to better accommodate future dormers.
Lot Coverage:
The definition in the Flamborough Zoning By-law provides lot coverage to include all buildings and structures, as well as decks. Perhaps consideration could be given to limit accessory buildings to 5% of lot area maximum beyond the proposed restriction of 25% or 35% total lot coverage. Lot coverage for accessory buildings is already limited to 5% in the Flamborough By-law. In my experience, when people rebuild or redevelop a residential lot, they often build to the maximum coverage, without taking into account the possibility of additional storage. You end up with variance requests, or frankly, a lot of illegal accessory buildings. Permitting accessory buildings up to 5% lot coverage in addition to the principle dwelling maximums would help support those requiring more storage which cannot be accommodated in a garage, and further, support enclosed areas for pool equipment to mitigate noise on abutting lots.

Consideration should also be given to covered vs. uncovered decks. Uncovered decks made of more permeable materials (ie, wood or composite) would not have the same visual or drainage impacts as a covered and concrete deck. Also, covered decks are more likely to be attached to the dwelling, therefore contributing to its overall massing and visual impact. In the case of a walk out condition where the deck is required to access the main living area of a dwelling, perhaps regulating the size of the deck to better control its overlook impact, rather than including it as part of lot coverage would be more appropriate. With outdoor living areas having a greater prominence in a post-pandemic culture, opportunities to improve landscaping and outdoor spaces should be regulated separately from the principle dwelling.

These suggestions may also be appropriate for the future residential zones in the Hamilton Zoning By-law 05-200.

Rear Yard Setback/Dwelling Depth:
Has an assessment been done as to whether this proposed approach would actually limit a property’s ability to achieve other aspects of the zoning regulations. For example, if the properties on either side have older, shallower dwellings, and far below the maximum lot coverage, are we preventing a reasonable sized dwelling from being constructed? Is the expectation to entertain variances in this instance to assess on a case by case basis?

Perhaps consideration can be given to the height of the structure that projects beyond the rear walls of the abutting dwellings. Or perhaps greater setbacks to both the main floor and upper levels to step the building further away from the lot line, where it projects beyond the rear wall of the abutting dwellings. This would allow a house to achieve an appropriate lot coverage, but limit the visual and massing impacts of larger dwelling onto the rear yard amenity space of the abutting properties. The example below shows the impact of having replacement homes developed next to the existing stock. I don’t think the solution is to limit the depth, but limit the impact of how much deep the dwelling could be,
unless you can demonstrate that you’re not providing undue hardship on the property’s ability to redevelop.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback.

4. These proposed zoning changes are a bit much for the average resident to absorb and much less understand. What I find extremely frustrating is all the new Waterdown development that has occurred over the last 5 years; which we as residents have tried to fight due to lack of infrastructure; that have been overturned and Waterdown is now overwhelmed.

5. As a resident of Waterdown of over 60 years I tend to welcome the growth and diversity that Waterdown has experienced over the last few decades. That being said I do believe it is time to put a stop to the many "monstrosities" that are starting to go up around town. The huge building at the old Shoppers Drug Mart site and the stacks and stacks of condos at Connon nurseries are a couple of examples. Let’s hold off on "sky scrapers" and any more condo complexes. As for people improving their own homes, I tend to believe they should have quite a bit of freedom. Who cares if someone puts a "wrap around" driveway in or a nice deck off their bedroom in their backyard. Again as long as their are not going nuts with added height or trying to turn a home into a 4 plex I am fine with. Contact me anytime with questions or comments.

6. Now they are concerned about zoning. Will these proposed zoning changes have a positive impact for residents or will it impose restrictions. If it imposes restrictions, then that becomes ironic as we’ve tried to fight expansion but they are building on every available square foot of land and nobody seems to be concerned about that growth. Oh, but god forbid an existing resident wants to build a double car garage or create more driveway space on his/her own land!!!
7. I have read through the zoning provided and I do appreciate the City’s movement on the parking issue. My questions and comments are as follows:

- It appears to me that 19 Flamborough St is still covered under special exemption 304. Can you confirm this.
- I appreciate that a Community Node that is well serviced by alternate transit options might benefit from reduced parking requirements. This is not the case in Waterdown that is largely a rural riding with no effective transit options accept the car. We own buildings in the Node and understand the business that goes on there. At the moment the more parking you have the more you can expand the business. I think your parking requirements should progress to the C5A standard over a time period as alternate transportation modes become available.
- My suggestion is as follows based on experience. Office loads are the most detrimental to downtown businesses as you have employees parking all day and typically who don’t do any business. Retail and personal services attract patrons that have typically short stays while doing business in the time they are there creating a higher changeover of the parking spot and more commerce per spot.
- My suggestion is that you reduce the no requirement for parking in Office uses to 50 sq. m and in retail and personal services to 100 sq. m and then move up by 150 sq. m as per your proposed schedule. This is something that can be reviewed every 5 years.

Thanks for your time and looking forward to hear from you.

8. After having read through the Secondary Node Plan for Waterdown, I have some concerns regarding traffic assessments and parking for business and institutional zoning. As a 25 year resident in the core of Waterdown, I have witnessed extreme growth in our Village. As is the case in many small towns, the original roadways were not designed to accommodate the current traffic congestion, let alone future density growth. Currently, the traffic issues in Waterdown are dire, especially during peak travel times.

My questions to the City of Hamilton are as follows:
1) With already high traffic congestion in the Waterdown core, what studies and assessments have taken place to address future requirements?
2) Are Traffic studies part of the Waterdown Secondary Node Plan? And if not, why?
3) With the addition of increased housing and business growth in the Waterdown core, what is being done about parking for all of the addition vehicles that can be expected?

I feel these are very valid concerns and the City of Hamilton needs to address these issues prior to ANY finalization or approval of the Waterdown Secondary Node Plan.

I look forward to your response.
Thank you for attention in this matter.
9. I am writing to you regarding “Proposed changes to residential zoning under the Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law 90-145-Z”, regarding the “Community Node” in the City’s Official Plan.

My name is Mary Swirski. I am the property owner of 50 Barton St., Waterdown (City of Hamilton). I object to the contemplated changes to zoning.

I live on Barton street, between Flamborough and Hamilton street, and this street block is already a high density area as development has already occurred beside my home and across from my home. This proposed zoning restriction would be (blatantly) discriminatory not only to me but the 3 remaining property owners on Barton St. who are situated beside (and across from) high density buildings. Please, I would invite you to come and take a visual look, this section of the city block already has been completely developed and there only remains 4 residential properties which have not been developed. The proposed zoning scope should not involve the residential homes on Barton Street (between Flamborough St and Hamilton St):

These homes have no historical value. A precedent has already been set by the city of Hamilton, and a high density area of Waterdown has already been created. Adjacent to the properties on Barton Street is a 10 story apartment dwelling. Across the street is a 7 story residential apartment building. And within 100 yards (corner of Hamilton St and Hwy 5) another 5 or 6 story apartment unit is currently being built.

People who cannot afford homes need apartments to live in, this meets the greater demand of society, and any future apartment units (on Barton St.) would be within one block of the existing transit route which goes down Hwy 5.

The homes I am referring to are 40 to 80 years old. My home is 60+ years old. Your proposed changes to zoning will negatively impact by creating (market) limits on what I can do with my property and who might buy it (reducing the value of my property). Someone looking to build a home on my property will not look favourably investing in a property which is so close to existing high rises.

A potential buyer of my home would not look favourably at investing the significant amount of money required to update my home due to its proximity to high rises/high density units. I look forward to seeing a change in your proposal, which allows my property to remained zoned for high density development.

Please may I ask that you confirm receipt of this email.

10. Good afternoon Melanie, I have had the opportunity to review the proposed zoning bylaw for the Waterdown core area and want to offer my comments based on my experiences with similar approaches in regulating infill housing.

Of specific concern is the proposed height limit of 9m. The Town of Oakville through brought forward the same standard. Prior to that time, there was greater flexibility in height for homes and that resulted more innovative designs that what is being produced
under this regulation. The concern attempting to be addressed was to ensure new homes were similar in height to existing housing stock. The next effect of that provision was to encourage the transition to new homes with flat or partial flat roofs. As new infill homes become larger the only way to achieve the building mass and interior floor heights desired in new homes was for the market to respond by incorporating flat roofs in the design. The emergence of more modern architectural styles has also been directly encouraged through this regulation. I would recommend a tour of new development in Oakville to see the impact of this height regulation.

I would strongly recommend that if the City wants to maintain the variety of roof lines found within the Waterdown Core that a height definition that restricts flat roofs to 9m and allows peaked roofs at 10 or 10.5m will encourage greater variety of built form in the future. Equally, permissions for additional height for architectural details as of right could be incorporated.

I would also recommend inclusion of permissions for secondary units as of right including secondary units in accessory buildings. The Waterdown core area has an interesting collection of old barns and other accessory buildings. The use of these structures for accessory units or home office space would go a long way to ensuring their protection. Equally the additional dwelling units will provide needed population to support the commercial uses within the core.

I would also recommend that if the City is concerned about building massing that a more effective tool is the use of residential floor area/lot area regulation similar to Oakville and Mississauga. I would also suggest considering the use of varying side yard setbacks/lot frontage ratios used in Mississauga’s older communities.

The work being undertaken in Waterdown is important and I hope these comments help achieve all that is planned for area.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding my comments.

11. Hi Melanie. My name is Denise Reinhart and I live on Mill Street North. I would like to thank you and the committee for all of your hard work and dedication to this project. Personally I am thrilled with all of the proposals as I love the heritage of Waterdown. I think it’s great to honour the history of the “village” while allowing growth surrounding the original village but not within it. History is important and I think “preserving and protecting” our history helps give a community spirit. I also think it’s very important to make the downtown area including Hamilton Street walkable.

Thx again. So happy with the recommendations !!!!!

12. The proposed amendment to Zoning By-law 05-200 (Commercial and Institutional Zoning) is a tiny step in the right direction, however falls short in setting provisions to truly protect the old core portion of Waterdown. Simply limiting heights and setbacks, doesn’t address
the very real concerns I, and many of my neighbours have.

We live on Kelly Street, backing on 306 Parkside Drive. As you will be aware there’s a pending application for development of this land. I want to preface this by saying I’m not in any way shape or form opposed to development of said land. There’s a need for housing in the City of Hamilton and this land can help ease the burden. What I am concerned with, is any new development which isn’t in keeping with the area.

If 306 Parkside is no longer to be utilized for the purpose on which the zoning was provided, institutional, what barriers are stopping the City of Hamilton re-zoning this land back to R1 or what will be R1-74x? So, it can be in keeping with the each and every property that abuts the boundary? COH obviously has the ability to implement by-laws to control land use, wouldn’t this be an excellent place to use that ability?

The large block of land which is encompassed by Church St. to Parkside Dr. and Mill St N to Main St N., currently doesn’t have a single a townhouse located within, much less rows of them. How can we as a community be serious about keeping the "Core of Waterdown" an area of significance, and allow 40 plus townhouses to be built at 306 Parkside? In short, we cannot.

Development of the 306 Parkside drive property is welcomed, but not as rows of townhouses. To keep the village feel, 1-2 story detached or duplex dwellings with sufficient off-road parking would be a refreshing addition to our community, and one that I would happily support.

Lastly, can you please tell me why the Parkside end of Main St, Mill St, Kelly St and a few others in the core are not protected by a heritage by-law in the same way the Dundas St end of Main St, Mill St and Kelly St is? Surely, the larger area is significant enough to warrant its inclusion in the heritage by-law?

13. I’m sorry I missed the deadline for the zoning feedback yesterday, but the flyer sent to me was misplaced and I only ran across it this morning. I did read through things a few weeks ago though, and wanted to make comment on my street in particular, and the proposed zoning change to R1-47e.

First though, some quick background. I live at 18 School Street, which is one of the original houses in the area. At one time the property would have included everything on the South side of School Street as well as the properties which border it on Main. Originally this house fronted on Hill Street, which ran from the corner of Union and Mill to connect to Snake Road (we think). This road was removed when the rail line went through, but obviously the orientation of the house stayed the same. Because of this, our house does not front on School Street at all, and the other houses also don’t really front on the street either.
We have been slowly restoring our home, which as you can image is a long process. The last item for us to complete is the garage, which we are not planning to get to for a few years yet. I was a little confused by the proposed by-law change, in that it seemed to be using R1-47 and R1 74 interchangeably (perhaps a typo). Regardless the document makes mention of a step back from the house façade of 3m for garages. However for our house and 24 School Street this makes no sense. Both of our existing garages are on the School Street end, with the house behind the garage (Again, they fronted on a street perpendicular to School Street.

Currently our garage faces 90deg to the road, but we were planning on having it face School Street to make things look less odd. The by-law change as it is written would not allow this re-orientation, and I really don’t think it makes any sense for our street at all (given it’s history). I would request that (if I have read the by-law correctly) the restriction on garage location be removed for School Street, as well as the restrictions for driveways. I would prefer not to get caught up in an unnecessary battle when we go to do the garage in a few years.