

**Pilon, Janet**

---

**Subject:** 9326 Dickenson warehouse application

**From:** Elizabeth Knight

**Sent:** June 1, 2023 7:33 AM

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

**Cc:** Bello, Aminu <[Aminu.Bello@hamilton.ca](mailto:Aminu.Bello@hamilton.ca)>; Thorne, Jason <[Jason.Thorne@hamilton.ca](mailto:Jason.Thorne@hamilton.ca)>; Robichaud, Steve <[Steve.Robichaud@hamilton.ca](mailto:Steve.Robichaud@hamilton.ca)>

**Subject:** 9326 Dickenson warehouse application

Dear Councillor Tadeson and members of Hamilton City Council,

I am writing to ask you to reconsider, at the June 7 council meeting, your decision to allow the developer of File 25T-202002 to go ahead with his warehouse plan **with no additional environmental conditions**. Don't be fooled by the developer's Planner, Mr. Webb and his greenwashing. When pressed to explain how this application meets or exceeds sustainability targets he paused for what seemed like an eternity before replying only that an environmental impact study was completed. Since such a study is a requirement, his answer is very telling: this application meets the minimum requirements. It maximizes the footprint of just one of the four planned buildings and does nothing at all beyond the minimum that is already required to "Design with nature by protecting streams, mature trees, wetlands, significant habitat and integrating topography into developments;" as is explicitly expressed in item 8.2.2 of the [AEGD secondary plan](#).

The Airport Employment Growth District land is zoned for employment. No one is disputing that this area should be developed, but we should not sacrifice exemplary planning principles to appease billionaire developers who present plans that primarily benefit them, with precious few requirements from the City to protect the natural heritage beyond the bare minimum. AEGD developers should be held to the highest standards and made to adhere to the principles of the AEGD Secondary Plan.

**The AEGD is an "Eco-Industrial Park"**. Not a business park or an industrial park but an **Eco-Industrial Park**. The words are mentioned over and over in the secondary plan. The intent is to protect and enhance nature wherever possible but that principle is not being considered in this present application. Between the significant woodlot, the hedgerow, the five headwater tributaries and the provincially significant wetland on this property we have a literal goldmine of biodiversity, tree canopy and natural heritage that is at risk.

While I am grateful that Councillors Nann, Cassar, A. Wilson and M. Wilson voted not to support this application as it currently stands, I am dismayed that you as ward councillor supported it without seeking to impose even a single additional condition at all on developer Panettoni, a multi billionaire firm from Etobicoke who should certainly be pressed to propose a much stronger plan that both builds warehouses and protects nature.

[Appendix C on the meeting agenda](#) has 52 conditions mostly to do with construction and road building, and very few to do with preservation of natural heritage. But there is still time to strengthen this application and make it better by adding conditions at the council meeting on June 7 which I hope you will work with your colleagues to do.

Panettoni is planning three more 40K m2 buildings on this site and therefore certainly has the space available to save at the very least, the row of around 200 mature trees, which according to mapping, is very close to the property boundary. With a modest reduction in the size of the building, moving it further to the east, or the reconfiguring of the parking lot, those trees could be preserved and even enhanced and serve as a potential pathway for wildlife to reach the wetland. Don't underestimate the crucial importance of that wetland to mammals and amphibians who travel in and out of it

from the significant woodlot each day for their survival. A thirty meter buffer between the wetland and the towering walls of a warehouse complex is bare bones minimum and equivalent only to the length of two buses.

Councillor, Wards 11 and 12 share the AEGD and I would urge you and Councillor Cassar to read very carefully the secondary plan for that area. It is beholden upon you both to know it inside out so you can guide your council colleagues in decision making from a position of knowledge and understanding. It is an Eco-Industrial Park and the intent for the AEGD is to preserve nature wherever possible while still designing for employment.

Given that this is just one of four buildings proposed for this property, it would seem there is plenty of wiggle room to reduce size, reconfigure parking, or do what is necessary to save the more of the 236 trees and the hedgerow along the property boundary, preserve more than just one of the five headwater tributaries, give a much larger buffer to the wetland than the minimum that is required by law, give a larger buffer to the significant woodland / significant wildlife habitat (as noted in the field studies) than the minimum 10 meters that is required by law, and ensure some sort of wildlife corridor to the west.

Thank you for considering imposing environmental conditions on this application at the June 7 council meeting. Many who care about agriculture and the wetlands found on our dwindling Hamilton farmland will be watching that day. Between urban boundary expansions and Greenbelt removals, Hamilton has lost 7000 acres of farmland and wetlands thanks to Mr. Ford. Let's do what we can as a city to preserve the scraps of natural land that are left.

I also thank you in advance for thoroughly reading and fully understanding the principles of the [Secondary Plan for the Eco-Park](#) in your ward which will see many more development applications in future years.

Hamilton is excited about this new term of council and your commitment to do better. This application is the same old thing, but our standards now, in a warming world with unprecedented biodiversity loss, simply must be higher. Let's get this one right to set a precedent going forward.

Kind regards,

Elizabeth Knight

Ward 12

Blue = wetland and tributaries

Red = property boundary

Green = significant woodlot ("significant wildlife habitat" in the environmental study) and hedgerow.

