

**Pilon, Janet**

---

**From:** clerk@hamilton.ca  
**Subject:** 560 Grays Road, Planning Report 19-001, Item #9

**From:** Lakewood Beach Community Council <LakewoodBeachCC@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** January-20-19 2:25 PM  
**To:** DL - Council Only <dlcouncilonly@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca  
**Subject:** 560 Grays Road, Planning Report 19-001, Item #9

Dear Honourable Mayor and Council,

You would have no way of knowing this by reading the Staff Report, but this particular development and what has occurred is a poster child for a community's engagement resulting in a complete lack of power in what is suppose to be a democratic process. How many of you abhor the citizen's you are elected to represent so much so that when an applicant agrees to build a Sun Shelter in their local neighbourhood park in exchange for an increase in height and density, you turn down that offer? That, in and of itself, proved to the community local input means absolutely nothing to our elected representative.

Subsequent to the meeting, we have now found out that the noise barrier wall from the building to the Grays Road overpass, that was included in the site plan when the 4 storey was approved, has disappeared in this rezoning application. That barrier was offered by the applicant and deemed necessary to ensure the residents who live on Grays wouldn't have an increase in the ambient noise from the QEW due to the tunnel effect this new build would have.

Some of you were wondering why more residents didn't submit comments or delegate at the Planning Meeting on Tuesday. You took this lack of submission as approval. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

We, as a neighbourhood association consolidated our neighbours issues and subsequently met with the applicant's representative years ago. During that meeting, we discussed some possible community benefits,- besides addressing the lack of infrastructure such as no safe passage for these new residents to have to get to the local park or to socialize locally. For example we made requests for: 1 affordable unit per floor (4 in total), SOBI bike hub , Sun Shelter in our local park (we lost @ 100 trees there due to Emerald Ash Borer), land designation for future possible HSR bus shelter, noise wall extension, etc. Absolutely none of which has now been provided in this latest rezoning application.

We would also like to clarify some misconceptions:

1. We want Commercial! Livable walkable community services were planned for in our area. We had preferred that this development be a mixed-used commercial/residential development. Had we known at the time our one remaining local plaza (convenience store, dentist, etc) was coming forward with a proposal to demolish it and build an apartment building, we would have been more aggressive on this front. *(As an aside, we DO support retail locally. That store has been a viable business for over 20 years, the dentist close to 20 years & the patissiere @ 15 years. . There has **never been a failed local services business** at that location. Saying we don't support commercial is an outright falsehood)*
2. We weren't opposed to townhomes because we have issues with that form of housing. We had concerns about the lot coverage. It should be obvious to most that flooding is a major concern when

building on a floodplain & experiencing 150 year storm events that result in major area floods is concerning. The 4 storey build vs townhomes, reduced the lot coverage which we felt would have less impact and was more in keeping with the PPS's on Healthy, Livable, Safe and Sustainable communities. The increased surface parking for the 151 units now increases the non-permeable surface.

3. We are still very concerned about the lack of infrastructure & local amenities. Our seniors are feeling isolated & every pedestrian feels they are taking their life in their hands when they walk on the roadway due to the 3x vehicular traffic growth. We aren't buying that with development comes change. We were told that in the 1990s and then again with the 900 units at Green/Millen.

There is much more to this file, but suffice it to say, we have come to realize the ugly truth: we as citizens are not welcome in this process. This was made very clear during the first 'community meeting' when our councillor was recorded as stating "we are not here to debate the proposal. It's a done deal". It also hasn't gone unnoticed that meetings hosted by our councillor on behalf of the applicant are Sales Presentations (Mr. M from Royal LePage was introduced as the Broker of Record to sell the units during the first meeting). Not the type of meeting contemplated under the Planning Act; nor conducive to listening to the citizens. With this history, most residents don't even bother to participate.

With 66% of the ballots in the recent election cast for someone other than who was elected to represent us, coupled with the tactics used during this planning process to disengage citizens, it is pointless for citizens to come forward with their input. No one is willing to listen. How very sad.

#### Lakewood Beach Community Council

P.S. Although we have written to all of Council, we wanted to let you know that we completely understand why you, as a rep for other wards, would support high density developments in our area. Historically, substantial Development Charges generated due to local developments has not been spent in our area. That revenue has gone towards your own ward's capital growth projects. Plus too, the extra TransCab tax levies help to further subsidize the hsr transit service provided elsewhere. (estimate \$2 million annually). We do question however why this particular rezoning was allowed to shift to Stoney Creek tax base. The lot was part SC and part Hamilton but the whole lot was taxed under the Hamilton municipal levy rates. The majority of the units will be built in what was the Hamilton land portion, but the whole lot will be changed to SC rates. Appears we'll forfeit additional tax revenues for some reason, with a shift in increased taxes to old Hamilton; albeit slight.