8.3(a)

Hamilton, Ontario

September 4, 2019

Co-ordinator, Planning Committee City of Hamilton 71 Main Street West, 1st Floor Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Re: Public Information Meeting September 17, 2019

Application by A. R. Riccio Developments for a Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands located at 1351, 1355, 1359, 1375 Upper James Street and 16, 24, 34, 40, 48 Stone Church Road East, Hamilton (Ward 8)

Dear Sir,

I am writing to oppose the Application above. It is the latest in a series of applications and proposals to develop the subject lands in an unacceptable fashion. I have corresponded in detail in the past – most recently in 2018 with Mr. George Zajac (Files ZAC-11-070) – with each attempt to develop the subject lands in an unsuitable and unacceptable fashion. Previous correspondence should be on file, but I will briefly outline some of the many reasons that the lands should not be developed as proposed.

- (1) Traffic on Upper James and Stone Church Road continues to increase. It is difficult, time-consuming and frustrating to exit by car or on foot, from properties along both these roads. Crossing on foot is almost impossible especially dangerous for children accessing a nearby park and pool. The proposed development would add to the traffic congestion and increase once again, the danger of walking or driving on both roads. When E/W traffic is disrupted elsewhere (ie. the Linc), Stone Church Road is flooded with bumper to bumper traffic. Frustration on Stone Church Road leads to frequent speeding between stops at lights (ie Wellington, DiCenzo, W 5th etc.). Stone Church Road is frequently used for fire and ambulance travel which would be compromised by additional congestion.
- (2) Development as proposed would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area. An eight story building alone, directly across from Barton Stone Mt. Hope United Church, historically designated as one of the oldest building in Hamilton, would be unacceptable.
- (3) Increased congestion at the intersection of Upper James and Stone Church Road would result in additional accidents, damage, injuries and risk of loss of life. I oppose the proposed development, not just for aesthetic and convenience reasons, but also for serious medical concerns.
- (4) The area of proposed development abuts a park to the East. Many children approach the park and pool from all directions. No fencing or barriers could prevent the traffic danger to pedestrians.

I would hope that the Application will be rejected. Please notify me of the outcome of City decisions – including possible adoption. Please remove my address from this letter before it is entered into the Public Record.

Sincerely,

Obert C. Dichar

Robert C. Dickson

cc. John-Paul Danko, Councillor Ward 8