

March 18, 2020

Sean Stewart
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage & Design – Urban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Re: Official Plan Amendment File No. UHOPA-20-007 & Zoning By-law Amendment
File No. ZAC-20-012

Dear Mr. Stewart;

We have formed a community group of neighbours in the area of the subject property that will be impacted by any activity on 19 Dawson. Residents were asked to voice their concerns in writing and the following document is a compilation of everyone's emails.

As a general statement, we think the owner's plan as submitted does not respect the residents in this neighbourhood. The plan does not protect the existing neighbourhood and has no regard for existing built form, established streetscapes and neighbourhood character nor does it address any overlook or privacy issues. It will be disruptive to nearby neighbouring homes and does not respect the scale and character of the existing neighbourhood.

We see a correlation between this project and the Ancaster situation that resulted in a new By-Law for "ER" zoned residences. Instead of tearing down 1 residence to build a larger one, this proposal will tear down 1 building and replace it with 6 that will most probably occupy a larger percentage of the lot than what's permitted under the Ancaster By-Law and will probably still require multiple variances. We see no reason why we wouldn't be afforded the same consideration.

If you have to make a zoning amendment, change it back to the original zoning designation of single family residential, R1/ Low density residential 2a. The original "Bland Gardens" subdivision was registered in the early 1950's as single family including 19 Dawson. It was rezoned in 1957 to accommodate the Mason's through a gift transfer. This lot was never intended to be anything other than single family. It's surrounded by single family homes and at 62.5 x 120, 19 Dawson has the same or smaller footprint than any other lot in the neighbourhood.

The following concerns are excerpts from some resident's emails. You'll notice some common themes;

"3 stories will block the escarpment view and do not blend with the existing residential area"

"...still creates a problem with visitor parking as is already apparent with Amica visitors & staff."

"...what the impact will be on the neighbourhood i.e. water pressure, population density, increase in traffic, street parking etc..."

"...we have seen so many speeding cars already as well as the backlog of parked cars on both sides of Dawson over to Passmore."

"The zoning amendment would completely change the character of the neighbourhood i.e. increase traffic, footprint, safety, lack of resources due to school closures, privacy, noise."

"How are these 6 units going to affect our water pressure? We are already losing water pressure from Amica but now we will have 6 more units to put more pressure on our water loss."

"So I see the property has now been sold. That's unfortunate, because it would have been an ideal location for a park or parkette seeing that we don't have a park in our neighbourhood"

Most importantly, we don't think that it meets the technical requirements under the Urban Hamilton Official Plan or the intended spirit of the plan when it comes to building & enhancing "communities".

Under the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, 2.4 talks about "communities" and how Residential Intensification is a key component of the growth strategy. Using the criteria to evaluate developments under "residential intensification", the amendments & owners' plans fail miserably in numerous ways.

2.4.1.4 (b) the relationship of the proposal to existing neighbourhood character so that it maintains, and where possible, enhances and builds upon desirable established patterns and built form.

A 6 unit/3 story townhouse project adds nothing to the character of a single family neighbourhood. Aesthetically, it doesn't fit in.

(d) the compatible integration of the development with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character...

It's not compatible. All are single family detached, most are 1 storey, the odd 2 story. There isn't a 3 story dwelling anywhere in the neighbourhood. The streetscape would not remain the same.

(f) infrastructure and transportation capacity...

The water pressure is barely within the acceptable range & has deteriorated with Amica. The supply lines for Amica were connected to Passmore instead of the high pressure line on King Street. Our fear is a further pressure on the water supply and increased load on the storm & sanitary system.

2.4.2.2 (b) compatibility with adjacent land uses including matters such as shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, traffic and other nuisance effects.

Plan for onsite parking is a fantasy, not reality. When we voiced our concerns over Amica, we were told the plan had enough spaces allocated. As per the attached photos, you'll see the spillover onto adjoining streets from Amica. The same thing will happen with this project.

Nearby properties will lose privacy. A 3 story structure will be able to overlook a number of adjacent and nearby properties.

Traffic & safety concerns – there is an open traffic file CSR15008105 started October/2018 which outlines our concerns. This still needs to be addressed. Further, a 6 unit/3 story project has the potential to impair vehicle sightlines at the corner of Dawson & Passmore creating more vehicle & pedestrian safety concerns.

(c) the relationship of the proposed building(s) with the height, massing and scale of nearby residential buildings

(d) the consideration of transitions in height and density to adjacent residential buildings

3 story/6 unit townhouses gives no consideration to the adjacent properties which are 1 story, single family

(g) the ability to respect & maintain or enhance the streetscape patterns including block lengths, setbacks and building separations

Plan does not enhance current streetscape patterns, it would negatively impact it. While still under zoning review, we believe that multiple variances will be required if this plan is approved which wouldn't respect setbacks and building separations.

Obviously, we are against both these amendments and the owners' plans, as submitted. We await details on the public meeting & wish to be notified of any decision with respect to either of these amendment files.

Respectfully submitted: