

6.3(i)

35-357 Hunter Street West  
Hamilton, ON L8P 1S6

City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
77 James Street North-Suite 400  
Hamilton, ON  
L8R 2K3  
Attention Edward John

October 29 2012

Dear Mr. John

Re: File: ZAR-09-043 By-law amendment Allenby -Phase 2.

I am in receipt of the details for a zoning amendment on lands located on 2 and 4 Blanchard Street at Poulette in Hamilton (referred to in your letter of October 23rd as Poulet), and would like to make the following concerns known.

I live in a third floor unit of a building that faces south and will be directly and drastically effected by the proposed project. The unit I own was converted by the same developer and is in the nature of a 'loft', meaning that there is really only one space.

There are three (3) windows that will be facing the proposed development. Each window is approximately 3'.4"x 8'.4" or 1.04 metres by 2.54 meters, and the sleeping area is directly facing the windows.

There would be a total elimination of my right to privacy if this proposal went ahead as planned. The obstructed view would also be a loss to me, but I understand that is not a right.

There are six units in this building that would be similarly impacted, and while I do not represent them at this stage in a collective objection, I ask that the impact upon them be duly noted.

The developer could eliminate this threat by a design that did not have windows or balconies facing north, and I ask that you make this a condition of any approval.

My other concern is of a community nature and the negative impact for the traffic traversing Blanchard Street which, despite the name, is presently merely a lane that leads from Poulette to Locke and used mainly by those whose houses are on Melbourne Street and have parking at their rear. Were the residents of the proposed 36 units to begin using this thoroughfare to or from Locke Street, the result would be a traffic nightmare, and

will certainly *not* benefit or enhance the area as claimed in A.2.1.13 of the official plan on page 9. The suggestion by the Public Works Department for the owners to acquire two-way access from Poulette will not remedy this potential calamity. Any pedestrian or cyclist use would be hazardous in the extreme given the lack of available width for Blanchard. While it is noted on page 24 (e) that additional land may be acquired for two way traffic to make it wider than the current approximately 12 feet, this is nor for the entire length of the street. It should be a minimal condition that the width be sufficient for 2 cars to pass, in addition to space for pedestrians and cyclists along the *entire* length of Blanchard from Poulette to Locke.

Section C.7.3 (para iii) supports developments that are utilitarian by having regard to, among other things, height, privacy, and overview. Clearly, this development fails to meet these standards.

This development is not in keeping with the Kirkendall North Neighbourhood Plan and is *not* compatible with surrounding residences as stated in the analysis provided by you for reasons above stated.

Your staff has concluded that 1 parking space per unit is sufficient despite the current requirement for 1.25 space. My experience at Allenby; (a building also housing 36 units) where several units have 2 parking spaces, and there are 6 visitor spots; has demonstrated that with only 4 visitor spaces proposed for the development there will be a parking problem from the outset. The anticipated price of the units presupposes that they will appeal to working couples, many of whom will require two vehicles. While transit is good, it will not solve this problem and in my opinion no deviation from the By-law should be considered.

The inclusion of a private commercial parking lot should not be considered a mitigating factor here, since the residents of the proposed development would be unable to use it on a permanent basis, unless it is the intention of the developer to sell long term parking contracts to the residents after they have been deprived of such an amenity by the granting of the By-law amendment of 1.25 spaces each, thus adding insult to injury.

I have attended the 'community meetings' and at the last one I was one of three people in attendance when the meeting convened. However, it cannot be argues that public apathy is a license to grant developers unreasonable rights to effect the lives of those who live in this community.

I trust that you will keep me apprised of the progress of this development application. I have a prior engagement which may prevent me attending the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, though I will do my best to be there.

Yours truly

Peter Watson