

From: [Anna Kata](#)
To: [Kehler, Mark](#)
Subject: Comment re: 196 George St, file ZAC-19-023
Date: June 4, 2019 6:03:45 PM

To the Planning and Economic Development Department,
As per the letter I received dated May 1 2019, I would like to submit the following comment re: the Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment for the proposed development at 196 George Street in the Strathcona neighbourhood. I live across the street from this location, and I would like to note my opposition to the proposed new development in its current form.

1. PARKING: The issue of parking is perhaps the most concerning to me and my neighbours, and will have the greatest impact on the neighbourhood residents. We currently have *very* limited parking in our neighbourhood. Most houses do not have driveways, and those of us parking on the street are not only in competition with each other, but also with visitors to Locke Street, those who work nearby and park in our area, those parking to walk downtown for special events, and even those who park in order to commute out of town via the nearby Go Bus stop. We do not have the advantage of permitted parking areas to help ease this burden. The challenge is even greater in the winter, with accumulated snow on the sides of the street and snow banks deposited by plows.

The current development proposal states they will be providing one parking space per unit (12 spaces for 12 units). This is simply insufficient. Tenants with two cars will overflow onto the streets, as well as any visitors (noting that the developer is requesting an exception to avoid the requirement of having 3 spots allocated to visitors). Furthermore, based on the proposed plans, it appears that the placement of the driveway for one of the units will actually be reducing the existing street parking by at *least* one spot.

And while the parking issue will certainly be a problem upon completion of this project, I shudder to think of the difficulties we will experience while construction is ongoing - where will the countless laborers, contractors, and tradespeople park while they will be working on this development?

Currently the building at 196 George has a 16 car parking lot attached. Many of the neighbourhood residents end up parking there when spots are unavailable on the streets. Although this is obviously not an ideal situation, it demonstrates the lack of spaces available to the neighbourhood residents; the fact that it has to be used speaks directly to this area not having enough parking available already. If this "last resort" parking will no longer exist and a greater number of people will be

competing for fewer spots, this situation is only going to get worse. Where will these cars end up?

2. WATER & SEWERS: With the addition of a number of new residents, what effect will this have on the area's water and sewer services? The Strathcona Neighbourhood is serviced by some of the oldest sewers in the City, exceeding 150 years. The majority of the sewers on the interior streets were constructed between 1880 and 1925. How will a new development tie into this old infrastructure, and what sort of impact will it have on the neighbouring residents?

(There is apparently a servicing and stormwater report that has been commissioned (noted on a list of studies/documents at the developer's community open house), but this was not available to attendees at this event. We were told that the documents are available at City Hall - though this is certainly not the most convenient for those of us who work during the weekday 9-5 hours, and offers us little time to access this supplemental information prior to the time you have requested public comment by. I have to say that this certainly makes me feel quite uninformed as to the studies supporting this proposed development, and seems like a rather nontransparent process.)

3. CHARACTER: To quote from the conclusions of the Strathcona Secondary Plan background report, "Strathcona is a well-established neighbourhood, with significant views and buildings worth preserving and/or enhancing. Housing in the Strathcona Neighbourhood primarily consists of single detached or other low density housing built approximately 100 years ago. The housing stock is generally well-maintained and varied in architectural character, making for an attractive residential neighbourhood." I *strongly* oppose the idea of a new development in this location when the existing structure could be restored and maintained. 196 George first appears on the Hamilton Street Directory of 1890-91, making it at least 128 years old; however, I suspect it may have actually existed under a previous number before the residences on George St were renumbered in 1890. This building may have previously been #86 George, which is first mentioned in the 1877-1878 directory, making it 141 years old. Regardless of a difference of 13 years, it would be a shame to tear down a century home.

The homes surrounding it are of the Victorian era, and I believe it would be nearly impossible for a new development to match or reflect the neighbourhood's current built form. (Indeed, the renderings of the proposed development are rather... uninspired.) Again, quoting from the Strathcona Secondary Plan background report, "The age of the housing stock [in Strathcona] is much older than the City average. This represents a resource to be *preserved*, in the form of heritage housing areas

with cultural heritage value." Recently heritage buildings in Hamilton are being restored/preserved to revitalize their use (e.g. Lister Block, Cotton Factory, Westinghouse HQ), so the time seems right to continue this trend rather than to reduce the character of this neighbourhood. While there may not be official heritage designation/protection in play here, I believe the history of such building is always worth preserving, as it is simply incomparable to new builds.

The current building at 196 George appears to have gone through many iterations as a medical office. A medical office was its last recognized use, and the [last real estate listing](#) even noted that architectural drawings for a dental office were available. It is currently zoned D (One and two Family Dwellings) and H (Community Shopping and Commercial), and continuing this use - reinvigorating/renovating it as a commercial unit - would be the ideal situation for the neighbourhood. Not only would this maintain the current residential density and capacity of the neighbourhood, but it could also provide a valuable community service. Again, the Strathcona Secondary Plan background report notes, "There is a much higher than average proportion of apartment dwellers and fewer than average low density households compared with Hamilton as a whole. Due to this high proportion of apartment dwellers, services and amenities should be provided in Strathcona to meet the needs of this population." With one High-Density Residential dwelling directly next to this lot already, and another across the street, a commercial use/service would be of value to the neighbourhood rather than continuing to increase the population density. Moreover, this would also maintain the status quo in terms of parking, character, etc.

In an area with a well-defined historical character, I feel this character can be maintained - improving the building's structure and function, and thereby also improving the neighbourhood overall. In speaking with many of my neighbours I know that I am not the only one in the area to feel this way, and so I very much hope that you consider these points, and I strongly urge you not to approve the current plan and zoning amendment.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Anna Kata

From: [Jerome dg](#)
To: [Kehler, Mark](#)
Subject: 196 George Street South
Date: October 3, 2020 5:49:29 PM

Dear Mr. Kehler;

I am a former business owner and also a current resident of the Strathcona neighbourhood and live in 12-24-block of Pearl Street South with a passion & interest for local history, architecture and urban planning.

- When I first moved back here over 10yrs ago, I could always find a parking Space adjacent to where I live. In fact I would have the same exact spot 5 or more nights per week as we all seemed to favour "our spots".
- However, now the entire street and all those adjacent are rammed full of cars looking of parking, daytime and especially 5pm-8am. I can rarely if ever find a spot across from my house
- I am 1 of only 2 Homes on the street that do not have designated parking on our property by no fault of ours.
- I am a person living with Disabilities and require my car for Dr. Appt's, and for getting to my parents house daily as I am their primary support worker (PSW), saving local and provincial governments \$\$\$ by affording to keep them in their own home cared by me.

Now with a proposed 'Rooming-House and/or Student Residence to be built disguised at 6 stackable town houses that will have 3 bedrooms per unit which totals over 30 bedrooms, yet only requires 12 parking spaces.

Please make sure that his proposed plan does not go through as shown.

Thank you for your time regarding this very important matter/issue.

Kind regards,

Jerome P. de Graaf

14 Pearl Street South
Hamilton Ontario, L8P 3W5

FROM FORUMN POSTING, as found in SKYSCRAPER online

Perhaps both of these 2 gentlemen have lived in Hamilton too long, and/or all of their lives and are just used to bad architecture, or poor planning.

If you were too look closely you would see that the materials used are cheap big box store items (i.e: the porch railings) and that the proposed 12 "townhomes" are not sensitive to the history of the neighbourhood and/or cutting edge modern and/ or interesting, rather the developer has opted for a cheap looking generic suburban style townhome design.

The townhouse design is also merely hiding the fact that this is nothing more than a rooming house as within the 6-stackable townhomes are 30 bedrooms with a mere 12

parking spaces on a street/in a neighbourhood where there is already no parking to be found for those of us who already live and work here.

Hamilton Planning Dept/City Hall needs to get someone in charge who knows City/Urban Planning that is current and not based on what they did in the 1980's and or the desperate blight of the 90's here.

Perhaps our new WARD 1 City Counsellor, Maureen Wilson will step up to ensure that his development, as planned, will NOT get approval from City Hall.

The total lack of Parking Spaces vs the # of bedrooms on a street zoned both Commercial & Residential that require "X-amount" of Parking to reflect the needs of that street/area/residents/businesses should makes this an easy, 'NOT APPROVED'...try again/do better!

RE: ZAC-19-023
APPLICATIONS BY QSP GROUP INC. ...

THIS APPLICATION WILL IMPACT THE PARKING IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD WHERE PARKING IS ALREADY AT ITS SATURATION POINT. FROM THE INFORMATION I'VE SEEN TO DATE IT'S NOT CLEAR WHETHER THE PROJECT WILL HAVE 12 SPACES OR 24 SPACES - HALF OUTSIDE AND HALF INSIDE (GARAGES). AT THE VERY LEAST, THE PROJECT WILL ELIMINATE THE 7 SPACES CURRENTLY AVAILABLE ON PEARL ST. S. BETWEEN KING AND GEORGE.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION WOULD BE TO EXPAND THE 2 HR RESTRICTION TO GEORGE ST. BETWEEN RAY AND LOCKE AND TO PEARL ST FROM GEORGE TO MAIN. THIS WOULD GET RID OF WHAT I CALL THE "FREELoadERS" - PEOPLE WHO PARK ON GEORGE AND PEARL - WALK TO WORK DOWNTOWN - THEN LEAVE AT THE END OF THE DAY. PROJECT OR NO PROJECT, INCREASING THE PARKING RESTRICTION WOULD BE WELCOME

ELEN MASON 16 PEARL ST. S. L8P3W5 