

Wednesday, September 26th, 2018

Legislative Coordinator, Planning Committee
 City of Hamilton
 71 Main Street West, 1st Floor
 Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Regarding the Application for Amendment to Zoning By-law No. 6593 for Lands Located at 567 Scenic Dr, Hamilton (Ward 8)(PED18173)
 File No. ZAC-17-030

To Whom it may Concern,

Directly from the: Application for Amendment to Zoning By-law No. 6593 for Lands Located at 567 Scenic Dr, Hamilton (Ward 8)(PED18173) - Page 3 of 29

"The lands are currently being used as a medical office that was approved as a **temporary use** under Committee of Adjustment Application HM/A-14:270 on November 27, 2014 for a period of two years. A second Committee of Adjustment Minor Variance Application, HM/A-16:370, to continue to use was heard before the Committee of Adjustment on December 1, 2016 and the **application was denied.**" It is currently September 2018, 1 year and 9 months from when the application was denied- yet the building is still in use- illegally?- as a doctor's office.

There is already community access to numerous pharmacies and stores; grocery, hardware, fast food along the Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) transit routes 34 & 34a less than a two minute drive away, or a 10-15 minute walk.

Westcliff Mall, on the corner of Upper Paradise Rd. and Mohawk Rd. W, which is 6 blocks away from the corner of Upper Paradise Rd. and Scenic Dr. already has a doctors' office (dental), a clinic for hearing aids a pharmacy and more, a medical doctors office would fit in seamlessly! Why re-zone a lot in a **residential** area when there is commercial property available that close-by? Having a doctors clinic in the mall would serve to increase traffic to all of the stores and bolster the community!

The two closest pharmacies to the corner of Scenic Dr. and Upper Paradise Rd. are located at:

- Rexall Pharma Plus: **1.4 km** at 640 Mohawk Rd W Unit 21, in Westcliff Mall
- Shoppers Drug Mart: **1.7 km** at 801 Mohawk Rd W, in Harvard Square Mall

By putting a doctors' office in one of these malls the residents in the neighborhood are still very close to the doctor, there is a pharmacy already in place and established, and there would not be a pharmacy put into the middle of a residentially zoned area which would keep narcotics on site and invite crime into what is currently a safe neighborhood.

Additionally, the doctors character or history of awards that may have been received should have absolutely no bearing on the decision on whether or not to change the zoning of the lot at 567 Scenic Dr. from "B-1" (Suburban Agricultural and Residential) to "CR-1/S-1766" (Commercial Residential). This is not at all relevant. Nor is it relevant that I can do a search on Google for "doctor office near scenic dr hamilton" and discover that the Shine Family Clinic only has 3.7 out of 5 stars, out of 9 reviews, and Dr. Shine is one of the lowest rated doctors that appears in the search.

The are some letters in favor of the proposed development are in the literature package form the September 18th City Hall meeting more than once, this serves artificially to inflate the number of submissions and drown out the voices of those who are opposed.

I would urge the committee to be wary of accepting all submissions of support for this project as there are patients of the doctors' office who are traveling some distance by car to attend the clinic, who may not in fact be residents in the neighborhood and who may be submitting letters in support. This would serve to artificially inflate the data that shows support for this proposed development and drown out the voices of descent from actual residents of the neighborhood.

To the issue of having adequate parking spaces for the proposed commercial use, Mr. Terry Whitehead's office indicated in 2016 that 19 parking spaces were required, this was without consideration to a pharmacy location and a further residential occupation. Despite members of the community asking for clarification on this issue, by the time of the community meeting on May 16, 2017 no further clarification had been received. (Information supplied by Community Meeting-PIC- Comment Form, Samuel Songes.)

1. Further concerns are that the creation of this proposed development is not needed at this location in the neighborhood as there are commercial alternatives very close by.

2. An apartment building does not conform to the style or 'compatible integration of the development with the surrounding area' in the neighborhood. At the meeting in City Hall on September 18th a photo was used by the developer to show that a 2.5 story building would fit in well, however the residence pictured was totally misrepresented as it is not directly across the street. In fact, 2.5 stories would be taller than the adjacent structures.

3. This development would not serve to beautify the area, is not needed for infilling or population density or residential intensification as there are already town houses and a school residence already established in the area.

4. A development of this nature would serve only to put money in the owners pocket and devalue the homes surrounding it as it would essentially be a store front and apartment building.

5. There are houses in the area which have been on the market as rental properties over the past few years, these houses have not been maintained, have not been improved and have brought graffiti to the once pristine area. There is no reason to believe that this proposed development would be any different.

6. The parks and trails in the neighborhood are currently accessible to the public year round, having 2 rental units does not serve to make these public grounds 'more public'

Finally, Mr. Terry Whitehead has not been available to the public to respond to concerns about this matter and his office has repeatedly ignored phone calls from members of the community. During the meeting at city hall on September 18th, he did not object to the use of the term 'single family home' when it was used by persons in favor of the development, however he vehemently objected to the term when used by persons who were opposed to the project.

For whatever reason Mr. Terry Whitehead has failed to respond to objections from the community, has failed to provide advanced notice about meetings, has tried to 'fast track' an approval for this proposed development, has expressed anger and frustration when presented with concerns or criticism about the proposed development from members of the community and has referred to members of the community who have objections to the proposed development as 'elitist'.

Mr. Whitehead, for whatever reason, is clearly too emotional invested in the project to be objective and he should immediately recues himself from any further involvement or votes with regards to this matter as he is not adequately able to represent the whole community due to his unwillingness to listen to a segment of its members.

Thank you,



Diane Hansebout



589 Scenic Dr.

Hamilton, 