

From: Suzanne Mammel [mailto:smammel@hhhba.ca]
Sent: January 17, 2017 2:58 PM
To: Ida.Bedioui@hamilton.ca
Subject: Item 9.2 on today's Planning Committee meeting agenda

Hi Ida,

I apologize but I was not expecting a six hour planning meeting and I have another meeting I have to attend at 4pm.

Attached are my speaking notes that I would like to submit as formal written comments regarding the motion being proposed. If you could please apologize on my behalf to Committee for my departure and circulate the attached, it would be appreciated.

On behalf of HHHBA:

I requested delegation status today regarding the proposed motion being put forward regarding on the fly changes during rezoning and plan of subdivision agenda items at Planning Committee.

I understand some of the reasons why committee members are concerned about some of the changes that are made. I was present at the December meeting where one instance of this happened, I've discussed it with Jason Thorne, and it was discussed at this yesterday's DILG as well. I understand that at times committee is asked to accept substantial changes on the floor which can be awkward and preclude the public who may expect one thing and get another.

However, we are hoping that some flexibility can be built in to the motion: there are times when errors or misunderstandings occur on both sides: staff and/or the proponent, either within the by-law itself, the conditions, and/or the staff report. And with a moratorium on changes to zoning for two years after a rezoning application, it is important to get it right. We would ask that you consider allowing for flexibility in the motion: that if the change is minor in nature and its effects well understood with little effect on the application, that committee still be allowed to consider it. However, if the change is more serious in nature, having an affect on the public's perception of the project (say adding a second story where one was proposed), or staff/committee's

ability to consider the net effect, that committee may refer it back to staff for review, and to be brought forward at the next committee meeting.

This would give staff/the proponent time to resolve the issue without imposing on committee to make a decision without all of the relevant information, and at the same time give a timeline to which it is addressed. I propose the above to allow for some fluidity and flexibility when appropriate, but giving committee some leverage to avoid issues that are either taking advantage of timelines or too complex to appropriately give such latitude.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. If you would prefer to defer this to a future meeting, we'd be pleased to work with you on wording that achieves your goals without limiting flexibility.

Suzanne Mammel

Sent from my iPad