

November 28, 2022

**Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department**

c/o City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

To the Chair and Committee Members:

**Re: Recommendation to Designate 66-68 Charlton Avenue West under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.**

I am the owner and occupant of [REDACTED] Charlton Ave. West in Hamilton, Ontario. I have owned and lived in the home on [REDACTED] Charlton since 2017. 64 Charlton Ave. West is the property located immediately to the east of 66-68 Charlton Ave. West (“66/68”).

I write in general support of the recommendation to designate 66/68 as a property of cultural heritage value pursuant to the provisions of Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. I have read the report of Lisa Christie and Steve Robichaud recommending the designation of 66/68 and, for what it’s worth as the immediate neighbour of 66/68, agree with the conclusions set out in that report by the author(s).

Apart from my support of the designation for purposes of recognizing 66/68’s cultural heritage, I am also concerned about the environmental impact of a demolition of 66/68. While I am admittedly no expert, I have seen reports that demolition results in 20-30% of municipal landfills; I have also read that, when century homes like 66/68 are demolished, there is a concern for the release into the environment of toxic contaminants.

While I am generally supportive of the designation of 66/68, I do ask that, in considering the question, the Chair and Committee Members balance the threat to heritage and the environmental impact of a demolition of 66/68, on the one hand, against the likelihood that that property will continue to deteriorate through its owner’s apparent neglect, on the other. 66/68 has been vacant since at least January 2022 and is now boarded up to prevent the unauthorized entry that was repeatedly reported to the owner and authorities (including by me) since its abandonment. A designation stands to be counterproductive to both any heritage and environmental objectives if it will only result in the owner’s further neglect of the buildings and their deterioration over time.

If designation can be accompanied by financial incentives to the owner of 66/68 aimed at facilitating preservation, or financial disincentives aimed at preventing further degradation, then my support of designation would be whole-hearted.

Yours very truly,



Idan Erez