

From: Robert Dickson <

Sent: September 13, 2019 1:17 PM

To: Zajac, George <George.Zajac@hamilton.ca>; Rybensky, Yvette <Yvette.Rybensky@hamilton.ca>

Cc: Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Critical Omission from Application for Development (PED19059)(Ward 8)

ATTENTION: George Zajac, Yvette Rybensky
Planning and Development
City of Hamilton

RE: Application for Zoning By-law Amendment
File ZAC-11-070
PED 19059 Ward 8

Thank you for providing me with the details of the **Staff Approved Application** for Zoning By-law amendments to permit development of properties at the South East corner of Upper James Street and Stone Church Road in the City of Hamilton.

On careful review, I am deeply concerned that either by accident or lack of information, a description of the lands in close proximity, repeatedly and critically **OMITTED** the presence of Barton Stone – Mt. Hope United Church and Education building, which are located on the South West corner of the same intersection – directly across the street and only a few feet away from the proposed development. In the Application, **land to the West of the development is referred to as “a cemetery”**. **No mention of the Church buildings.** The

Church is Historically designated as a Heritage structure – and is the oldest church in Hamilton. It is in active use for weekly worship and other meetings. It is adjacent to the church's Education Building, which is used daily for many activities – including programs for children. The Church is critical to the appearance of the intersection.

It will be immediately apparent that the presence and use of the Church and Education Building are historically critical and generate large volumes of traffic at an already complex intersection.

Development as proposed (repeatedly over the years) to the East – across the street from the Church would have major implications for several City departments. Without addition to the proposed application and development, Traffic, Historical Background, Cultural Heritage, Design, Landscape character of the surrounding area, Urban design, Safe Communities Department, Health Hazards, Shading (no more “sunrise services”) etc. will not have had, nor will have, adequate information to make an informed decision about the proposed development – or the current “Staff Approved” Application - already in print and incomplete.

Once again, I strongly oppose the current Application. I would suggest that the property owners adopt the “ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION” suggested in the Staff Report.

Please remove my email contact from this email before it is entered into the public domain. Please attach this email to my previous letter of September 4, 2019.

Thank you for your consideration and understanding,

Dr. Robert Dickson