

**Pilon, Janet**

---

**Subject:** Marr-Philippo House

**From:** Starr, David

**Sent:** Monday, October 11, 2021 10:20 PM

**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca); Ferguson, Lloyd <[Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca)>

**Subject:** Marr-Philippo House

Hello,

Please ensure Marr-Philippo House is on the agenda for the Council meeting on Wednesday – I have emailed all councillors and the Mayor. I object to this planned relocation - it needs to be made a public issue, especially with the letter from Wilf Ruland which makes the City look like it is not performing their due diligence.

If you Google Wilf Ruland, professional hydrogeologist, you will see he comes well qualified and is local. Wilf's recommendation is that the proponent should be requested to provide proper and adequately detailed hydrogeological documentation to support their proposal to relocate the Marr-Phillipo House. **This is a reasonable request and part of the City's due diligence!**

I urge the City of Hamilton to put the development application ON HOLD PENDING RECEIPT OF FURTHER DOCUMENTATION.

David Starr, P.Eng, MBA  
Long time Ancaster Resident

**Letter from Wilf Ruland, professional hydrogeologist, regarding the testing of the contamination of the Marr-Phillipo site by Landtek, the environmental firm.**

Mr. Bob Maton, Ph.D. (Toronto)  
President, Ancaster Village Heritage Community, Inc.

October 7, 2021

Dear Mr. Maton,

I am writing today regarding the proposal to remove and relocate the Marr-Phillipo House from its current location at 398 Wilson St, Ancaster to a different location. Justification for the removal and relocation is said to be provided by a letter dated April 30, 2021 from Landtek Limited. My comments on the proposed removal and relocation and the evidentiary documentation to support the proposal follow below.

**Introduction**

I am a hydrogeologist, and I have worked as an environmental consultant for 35 years (2 years for a larger firm in Germany, and 33 years independently in Canada). I am a specialist in water contamination issues, and have dealt with many such issues over the course of my consulting career. I have reviewed data and documentation pertaining to many contaminated sites across Ontario.

The current proposal has the weakest evidentiary support I have ever seen over the course of my 35 year career.

### **Detailed Comments**

1) I have been provided with a 46-page PDF file entitled “Appendix “E” to Report PED21196”, which I am told represents the total documentation that was provided to the City of Hamilton’s Planning Committee on this issue for its meeting of Tuesday October 5, 2021.

The Appendix “E” PDF includes the following documents:

- a 2 page letter dated June 4, 2021 from GSP Group, which includes a map of the site
- a 3 page letter dated April 30, 2021 from Landtek Limited, which includes another map of the site
- a 38 page letter from GBCA Architects, whose last 3 pages are an Appendix containing the aforementioned Landtek Limited April 30, 2021 letter.

The only one of these documents to have been prepared by a qualified environmental professional is the Landtek Limited April 30, 2021 letter. I note that the author of the letter has not put a professional stamp or seal on the letter.

2) The Landtek letter consists of 3 paragraphs, which are reprinted in their entirety below:

“Based on the environmental investigations completed to date at the above site which previously included the location of a gas station, subsurface soil and groundwater impacts due to historical operations have been identified/confirmed. Impact plumes have migrated throughout several areas of the site and include areas beneath existing structures. Contamination has been found to depths of up to approximately 6 m to 8 m in some areas.

### **Remediation Measures**

The redevelopment remedial option is expected to be a ‘dig and dump’ methodology which will focus on the removal/disposal of the impacted materials. For this remediation, it is essential that safe physical access for excavation activities can be maintained. Additionally, given the significant depths and lateral extents of impact in some areas, it is Landtek’s opinion that the structural integrity of on[1][1][1]site structures will be jeopardized.

With regards to the above conditions, it is our recommendation that demolition/removal or relocation of the building structures be completed to allow for safe and effective environmental remediation to proceed in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) regulation for filing/acceptance of a Record of Site Condition (RSC).”

Missing from the Landtek letter are any hydrogeological data which would support their recommendation for removal/relocation of the Marr-Phillipo House.

3) Information missing from the Landtek letter includes the following:

- Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Report(s) for the site;
- any other hydrogeological/engineering reports;
- borehole logs for the boreholes and test wells drilled on the subject property;
- groundwater and soil testing results for petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs);
- map(s) and cross-sections showing the location of PHC contamination plume(s);
- groundwater level measurements;
- a listing of options for remediation of the site.

4) The recommendation in the last paragraph of the Landtek letter reads as follows:

“It is our recommendation that demolition/removal or relocation of the building structures be completed to allow for safe and effective environmental remediation to proceed in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) regulation for filing/acceptance of a Record of Site Condition (RSC).”  
In the absence of the information listed in 3) above, this recommendation can only be considered premature and unsupported. It should not be accepted by the City of Hamilton.

5) It may be that the proponent or the authors of the Landtek letter have more hydrogeological data or information available them - if so, then this has not been shared with myself or the members of the City of Hamilton Planning Committee.

As such, the Planning Committee did not have adequate hydrogeological information to support its decision in favour of the proposal to move the Marr[1][1][1]Phillipo House.

### **Recommendation**

I recommend that the proponent should be requested to provide proper and adequately detailed hydrogeological documentation to support their proposal to remove/relocate the Marr-Phillipo House. In the meantime, the City of Hamilton should put the associated development application on hold pending receipt of further documentation.

Please feel free to contact me if there are any questions about any of the issues raised or the recommendation made in this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Wilf Ruland (P.Ge.)

**From:** Sandra Starr

**Sent:** Thursday, October 7, 2021 12:09 AM

**To:** [john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca](mailto:john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca) ; [arlene.vanderbeek@hamilton.ca](mailto:arlene.vanderbeek@hamilton.ca) ; [brad.clark@hamilton.ca](mailto:brad.clark@hamilton.ca) ; [brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca](mailto:brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca) ; [esther.pauls@hamilton.ca](mailto:esther.pauls@hamilton.ca) ; [jason.farr@hamilton.ca](mailto:jason.farr@hamilton.ca) ; [judi.partridge@hamilton.ca](mailto:judi.partridge@hamilton.ca) ; [lloyd.ferguson@hamilton.ca](mailto:lloyd.ferguson@hamilton.ca) ; [maria.pearson@hamilton.ca](mailto:maria.pearson@hamilton.ca) ; [nrinder.nann@hamilton.ca](mailto:nrinder.nann@hamilton.ca) ; [sam.merulla@hamilton.ca](mailto:sam.merulla@hamilton.ca) ; [tom.jackson@hamilton.ca](mailto:tom.jackson@hamilton.ca) ; [mayor@hamilton.ca](mailto:mayor@hamilton.ca)

**Subject:** Marr-Philippo House

Hello,

The 180 year old Marr-Philippo House is one of the very few remaining buildings on Wilson Street dating from the early era when Ancaster Village was first established, beginning at the end of the 18th century. It is a crucial link to the historic origins of Ancaster. Beside it until recently there had been a contemporaneous frame building, the Marr House - dated similarly to the Marr-Philippo House and closely associated with it - which was suddenly demolished without notice and without acknowledgment of its value to the Village by the same developers seeking to relocate Marr-Philippo House.

A recent article in the Spectator reports that the reason the developers wishing to relocate Marr-Philippo house is to clean up hydrocarbon contamination from a gas station a few meters away, contamination which is **presumed** to be below the building. However, there was no drill-testing of the ground below the building to justify this move. If no contamination has been found, their justification for the relocation is simply not

valid. The developer is avoiding this potential problem, which is easily rectified by the City demanding proof. Why is the City not demanding proof of their claim of contamination?

It is very doubtful the Marr-Philippo house will survive the move. Please vote to prohibit relocation! If the developer proceeds to move the building (which I strongly disagree with), the City needs to hold them to a bond and pay a HUGE penalty if the building is demolished in the move? There is more than one way to play this game with the developers.

Furthermore, I do not understand why once a heritage-designated building is moved, it loses its heritage-designated building status and associated protection – if that's the case, then simply no historic building should be permitted to be moved. Again, it is quite transparent that the developer is seeking relocation to nullify the building's heritage designation.

I am not against intensification. I embrace thoughtful intensification while simultaneously protecting our heritage!

I implore each of you to vote to ensure that our heritage buildings are protected.

**The potential relocation of Marr-Philippo House is yet another step in the destruction of Ancaster's unique position as the second earliest established village in Upper Canada.**

Sandra Starr

Ancaster Resident

*NOTICE: The information contained in this electronic mail transmission is for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed or intended and may contain information that is privileged, personal or otherwise confidential. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any individual or entity other than the named or intended addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named or intended addressee) except as otherwise expressly permitted in this electronic mail transmission. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error. Although the sender takes measures to protect its network against viruses, no assurance is given that this transmission is virus-free. Thank you.*