

Thomas, Cameron

From: Liz Crickmore
Sent: Monday, September 03, 2012 9:24 PM
To: Thomas, Cameron; Clark, Brad; Powers, Russ
Cc: Heard
Subject: 24 Brock St N, Dundas. - OPPOSED

We write this letter as longtime residents and taxpayers in the Town of Dundas. We are also members of HEARD, and opponents of the proposed development at 24 Brock. We have been increasingly concerned over the proposed development at 24 Brock, and up until recently could not believe that any one in their right mind would ever approve such a plan as the proposed 6-7 stories that was presented to the City of Hamilton. Could not believe it until recently when we discovered that the City did approve the plan as presented, so now we write this letter to request that you reconsider this decision and respect the concerns of the HEARD committee as they present our concerns to you on Wednesday, Sept 5th, 2012.

Urban Development on such a small space as only a portion of the proposed land at 24 Brock can be built upon as the other portion is on the side of the escarpment. How can 48 units be build or allowed to be built, when only 18 units would be allowed to be built given the usable land available at 24 Brock under normal circumstances. Something just doesn't add up. One would have to ask... Was someone been paid off to look the other way and approve a building vilolation?

With a building this size, where will all the Waste Water go? Right now, the storm sewers can not handle the present waste water. What is the city going to do about this?

Water pressure in the area of Park and Brock is the worst in the city. With the addition of 48 units, the water pressure will be worse. Why do the citizens in this area pay taxes for water, when we hardly get any water pressure today?

There will be Increased Traffic on Park Street and Melville if 48 units are built on such a small plot of land. Given that the typical home has 2 or more cars in today's 2 to 3 family incomes, where is the proposed traffic going to park? The building only allows for 72 parking spaces. Where will the other 72 cars park in that area if every unit has 3 cars? There is very little parking on Park an Melville as it is. Where is the city proposing to park the addition vehicles given the small area where this building is proposed? Is the city going to be building a parking garage in the area to support the neighbourhood?

This large building is going to be built on such a small plot of land. There must be a serious impact on the Environment. Has this impact been fully examined? What about natural beauty? Now visitors to Dundas will no longer see the "Dundas Peak", but they will see a 6/7 Story Apartment building. Is this what we the citizens of Dundas are promoting for tourism? You know what they say.... "I can't see it from my house" so who cares. Well the citizens of Dundas do!

It troubles me to hear that this project has been cleared for a full 6 stories. It also begs the question of how many payrolls are Cam Thomas and Russ Powers currently sitting on? Perhaps the City of Hamilton, and also the one where Alex Szabo signs the cheques??? Regarding Powers, he certainly isn't protecting the best interests of his constituents who've supported him thru out his political career, nor does it seem like he has even listened to them. WE SMELL CORRUPTION, MR. POWERS. We may see your name on the next set of ballots, should you choose to run again in the next election. I am VERY sure that we will NOT see your name on the ballots for the election after that one tho...surely you will NOT be voted back in after disaffecting this beautiful valley town that you no longer deserve to represent. We will, however not be surprised to see or hear that you have reserved your penthouse condo, at a reduced cost of course; maybe that is why you seem to be putting up such a feeble fight on our behalf.

The proposed 6/7 Story cannot go through as proposed. I agree that the land should be developed given the present variance of 3 Story's, but not 6/7, given the large impact to area as started in this email. I implore you to take a second look at this proposal at 24

Civiled

Brock at it does not serve the best interest of the city at large.

Best Regards,

Liz Crickmore