

Summary of Public Comments Received

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>Concerns regarding the size and number of dwelling units proposed within the building.</p>	<p>Staff have been in discussion with the applicants to request information confirming that the proposed unit sizes meet the minimum requirement of the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>In terms of the number of units, the proposal complies with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan as all the technical studies required to confirm that the number of units can be supported, including but not limited to a Parking Justification Study and engineering servicing studies, have been approved by technical staff.</p>
<p>Concerns on the impact of the extension on the subject lands.</p>	<p>The proposal complies with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan regarding built form and scale of the neighbourhood. It is adequately setback from the existing single detached dwelling units to the rear. The proposed setbacks coupled with the required planting strip along the rear property line screen the surface parking area from the existing single detached dwellings, which meets the intent of the policies.</p>
<p>Concern regarding number of parking spaces provided.</p>	<p>The proposal complies with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan based on the findings of the Parking Justification Study submitted in support of the proposed development. Transportation Planning approved the study, and the proposed reduction can be supported. The site is also well served by multiple transit routes which provide additional modes of transportation. The proposed development is located within 500 metres of Hamilton Streetcar Railway Route 1 Westbound only, Route 1a Westbound only, 10 B-Line Express Westbound and Route 12 Southbound.</p> <p>While Street parking is available in the neighbourhood, it should be noted that the residents of the proposed multiple dwelling would not be eligible to obtain street parking permits as more than three units are proposed.</p>

Comment Received	Staff Response
Concerns regarding a decrease in property value.	Staff are not aware of any empirical evidence to suggest property values will decrease.
Concern with the demographic or section of the population that may occupy the building.	The Zoning By-law cannot “people zone” or exclude sections of the population from living in a residential unit. The Zoning By-law is intended to regulate land use and built form.
Concerns that the proposed use will transform into a housing support service (institutional uses).	Concerns that the proposed development will be a housing support use as there are a large number of existing institutional uses in the neighbourhood. As part of the application, the applicants have not indicated that the proposed development will accommodate an institutional use. At this time, the owner has indicated that the proposed development is a market rate rental residential building. A Residential Care Facility for the accommodation of not more than 20 residents is a permitted use in the Zoning By-law. A change in use permit would be required through the building department if a new use was proposed.

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 7:01 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: Opposition to File: ZAC-22-053

To whom it may concern,

As residents of Ward 3 in Hamilton, residing in the vicinity of 83/85 Emerald St., we are very concerned about the Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application for said property.

The property in question has raised many concerns in the past regarding the quality of life of its residents and this new proposal does not address the previous issues and instead appears to be creating a situation where conditions will be worse. The number of units proposed is quite high for the size of the property and thus makes it seem that the quality of life of any resident of 83/85 Emerald St., in such cramped quarters, will be quite poor.

The current proposal also mentions a proposed extension without any details of how the existing property will be improved. There are also no details about how this extension will impact the neighbouring properties.

We are strongly opposed to any zoning changes or development of the property that don't improve the quality of life of future residents of the property and the current residents of the neighborhood.

Kind regards,
Residents of Tisdale St. South

Please note that we are happy to provide our personal information to the City upon request to verify that we are current residents of the neighbourhood, but we do not want any of our personal, identifying information to be a part of the public record.

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 4:29 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: 83-85 Emerald St. North

As you know the Stinson neighbour hood is saturated already with rooming houses, Lodges Etc. Hunter St. East and some of Emerald parking has been taken over by the employees from the Dental Place next door to the so called Lodge. They have a huge parking lot , but obviously can't handle all the Employees. Not sure where these 70 units will park. We are saturated now in the Stinson Hood with Lodges, rooming houses etc. Too much is too much.

Concerned Citizen

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 5:00 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: Regarding ZAC-22-053

Hello Jennifer,

I am writing in regards to the zoning proposal for ZAC-22-053.

As it stands, the proposal will not contribute to this community in any meaningful way. It will result in overcrowding, resulting in additional traffic congestion, services needs provided by the city including garbage collection for example, and will impact infrastructure including but not limited to things like parking and adequate waste storage. We are already in a densely populated area, with high crime rates and lack of sufficient resources available to accommodate the existing population.

Furthermore, the proposal will decrease the existing property value, essentially moving this neighbourhood more towards a slum than a prospering neighbour of mixed backgrounds. 300 square feet is not a livable space for most people, and I would be curious to understand the type of dweller this proposal would attract. We already deal with break ins, property damage and illegal access, and a high concentration of halfway houses. The land site this proposal sits on is not even addressing any of the infrastructure concerns, let alone the socioeconomic ones. It is void of any true investment in anything related to the needs of the community in which is it proposing to serve.

Critical information is missing from this proposal. Please consider the needs of the community over the needs of the developer.

Regards,

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 8:13 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: ZAC-22-053

Re File ZAC-22-053 Zoning Change for 83 and 85 Emerald St. South

I have been a home owner in this area for the past 17 years and love living here. During this time we have experienced numerous changes with regards to Group Homes, Lodges, Shelter's and just recently being informed that Mission Services will be adding to this mix. All these changes are in a four block radius. This has created an over saturation of these facilities in our neighbourhood. Having witnessed these changes on a daily basis, I have some questions that I would like addressed. With the completion of St. Patrick's school and having in excess of 300 children attending the school I find this request for a by-law change very concerning.

Just exactly what is this facility going to be?

Who is the owner of this facility?

Who will be managing this facility?

Will there be washroom facilities in each unit?

Will the renters be-able to lock their doors?

Will this be rented by the day, week, month or are the owners going to be using this as a shelter and receiving government funds?

Will wrap around services be provided 24/7?

Will there be management on site 24 hours a day?

Will there be inspections of the facility?

Who are the stakeholders in this investment?

Wanting to change this property into 70 units is a very unreasonable request and this is before they are requesting an additional three stories. Not providing how many additional rooms they want to put in the addition.

Thanking You in advance for your time,

A concerned resident of Ward 3

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 1:38 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: 83/85 Emerald St.

Hello Jennifer,

I am writing to you to express my concern over the zoning bylaw amendment application for 83/85 Emerald St. From my understanding, the developer has proposed expanding the property to 70 units that would be about 200-300 square feet each. With units this small, I feel that this would equate to a rooming house.

I have lived on Emerald St. for almost three years now. I love the neighborhood and there are many people living here that care deeply about the area. I understand that there is a need for housing and a need for services, but I strongly feel that this neighbourhood has more than its fair share of these services. I feel that concentrating so many services in one area goes against social cohesion principles. I will remind you that in our area, we have cathedral shelter, an overflow men's shelter, multiple halfway house and residential care facilities, two proposed safe injection sites, and a men's shelter with 108 beds moving in. I will also remind you that a brand new elementary school is almost finished being built. I do not have children, but I am concerned about what these children might be exposed to during their time in this school.

In our neighbourhood, it is not at all uncommon to be overwhelmed by garbage, needles, drug paraphernalia, open drug use, intimidation by drug users, etc. My partner and I are both teachers and make a good income. We want to make this area our home for the foreseeable future, along with many other young couples in the area. I have to admit, that when we have children, we might have to take a really hard look at our neighbourhood and whether or not we are interested in raising children in an area of such a high concentration of services. I can look past having to pick up needles and discarded methadone bottles out of my alleyway when it is just my partner and I living here, but I am not sure how much more I could handle after having children.

I recognise that I come from a place of privilege. I know that services and affordable housing are needed. I would just like the city to acknowledge that these things need to be spread out across the city. With my privilege comes the option of moving away from this neighbourhood if things get worse. I would like you to consider the many, many children who live in this neighbourhood whose family do not have the option of moving. Many of these children live in apartment buildings and our parks and public spaces are the only places they have to play. Please consider them when making decisions about the future of this neighbourhood.

Thank you for reading.

Ward 3 resident

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 3:42 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: ZAC-22-053 comments

Hi Jennifer,

Please accept the below comments regarding the development plan ZAC-22-053.

The proposal for 70 units under 300sq ft at 83/85 Emerald St S would fly in the face of all the efforts made to make Hamilton a livable city. 300sq ft is small even by "tiny house" standards. It is nearly impossible to fit a full bathroom, kitchen, bed and living space in that square footage for a single person. It is absolutely not livable for a family. If the pandemic taught us anything, it's that people need space to live. **Micro units are not the answer to urban density: they are a race to the bottom.**

No apartment even for single occupancy should be less than double that size, and what we really need are units 3-4 times that size at affordable prices so families can live comfortably in the urban core for the long term.

If we don't think about the liveability of the housing we approve in our city, we are condemning our city to exclude families, to make community temporary, and to push people out if they want anything better. Think about that: "if you want better, leave downtown Hamilton" is a bleak message to be sending. But that's the message directions an approval of this project would send.

Build apartments! Build multi family homes! Build densely! But build long term liveable.

Thank you.

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: File ZAC-22-053

Ms Allen:

I am contacting you to formally file my concern regarding the proposed zoning changes and building plans for 83-85 Emerald Street.

The information provided by your department, is unclear whether the proposed 70 units to be included in the current building will be individual units with cooking and bathroom facilities included or whether these will be rooms only constituting a rooming house situation. It also does not state the size or proposed use for the proposed three story rear addition. It does not seem possible on the current site to add a rear building and still provide 10 surface parking spaces and 108 square meters of outdoor amenity space.

I called your number this morning in hopes of having these questions answered, prior to submitting a written response to this proposal.

I would appreciate a timely response so that the September 19th deadline can be met.

Thank you

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 5:38 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: Re: File ZAC-22-053

Thank you so much for your quick response to my questions. It clarifies that the rear addition is required to be able to fit 70 very small units within the property.

I am interested to know whether the garbage and recycling collection will be included in the "amenities" area to the south or out front to make it accessible for pickup.

I would very much appreciate viewing the submitted plans. If they cannot be emailed, I can pick them up at City Hall.

One last clarification... does an email constitute a written submission of concern or do I need to drop off paper copies once I formalize my final thoughts?

On Mon, Sep 12, 2022 at 3:30 PM Allen, Jennifer <Jennifer.Allen@hamilton.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your email.

The applicant is proposing a total of 70 dwelling units which include cooking and bathroom facilities within the existing building and the proposed three storey rear addition. The proposed dwelling units range from approximately 18 square metres (200 square feet) to 35 square metres (375 square feet) in size.

The proposed rear addition will maintain a 14 metre setback from the rear lot line. 8 parking spaces is proposed along the rear property line with two parking spaces proposed in the front yard. The amenity area is proposed to be located in the southerly side yard adjacent to the rear addition. If you would like to view the plans submitted by the applicant, please let me know.

Sorry I missed your call this morning. If you have any follow up questions, please feel free to call or email me.

Thank you,

Jennifer

Jennifer Allen

Planner II – Urban Team

Development Planning

Planning and Economic Development Department

City of Hamilton, 71 Main St W, 5th Floor, L8P 4Y5

Ph: 905.546.2424 ext. 4672

Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Allen, Jennifer <Jennifer.Allen@hamilton.ca>
Subject: File ZAC-22-053

Ms Allen:

I am contacting you to formally file my concern regarding the proposed zoning changes and building plans for 83-85 Emerald Street.

The information provided by your department, is unclear whether the proposed 70 units to be included in the current building will be individual units with cooking and bathroom facilities included or whether these will be rooms only constituting a rooming house situation. It also does not state the size or proposed use for the proposed three story rear addition. It does not seem possible on the current site to add a rear building and still provide 10 surface parking spaces and 108 square meters of outdoor amenity space.

I called your number this morning in hopes of having these questions answered, prior to submitting a written response to this proposal.

I would appreciate a timely response so that the September 19th deadline can be met.

Thank you

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: File ZAC-22-053

Ms Allen:

Please accept this email as my written submission of concern regarding the proposed changes to 83-85 Emerald Street South. Without the details of the plan, I may be making assumptions on some points.

1. The proposed plan of putting 70 units in the current building and proposed addition does not provide adequate, let alone quality accommodations for those renting a unit. A unit of 200 square feet is not conducive for social interactions with family or friends, but I am unaware of any proviso for a building meeting space/ common area to be available for this use.

2. The proposed plan does not provide adequate space for landscaping, parking and amenities.

It is my understanding that the zoning by-law requires a minimum of .3 spaces per unit, so 70 units would need to have 21 parking spaces provided. This is also a requirement for lodging homes as per the bylaw.

There does not appear to be any plan for any green space, visiting space, smoking areas in the current plan.

Where will garbage and recycling be stored so that it is accessible for pickup. There will not be adequate room to get garbage trucks into the rear space, so garbage would have to be stored in the front of the building. This is unsightly in a residential neighbourhood.

The owners for this building appear to be proposing what would constitute a huge lodging home, without actually proposing to run such a facility. This is designed to accommodate as many people as possible in the least amount of space with no thought to the impact on the neighbourhood. I strongly oppose this change.

In accordance with the notice, please provide me with a copy of the staff report prior to the public meeting on this matter.

I have included my personal information, but request that it be removed prior to posting on the city's website.

Thank you

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 8:24 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: 83-85 Emerald Street South

Jennifer Allen,

City of Hamilton Planning & Economic Development Department

Development Planning – Urban Team

71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L9P 4Y5

Ms. Allen:

Re: Zoning By-Law Amendment (File No. ZAC-22-053)

This letter is to share my concerns about the proposed plans regarding the property at 83 Emerald Street, Hamilton.

STRUCTURE AND INTRIGUIGTY

-Proposing a 70 micro-unit in the existing structure will change the look of a Victorian house. This style of housing will not adhere to the look of the neighborhood.

- the largest unit will be less than 300 sq feet, it will not provide sufficient room for anyone to have a dignified living.

- the proposal does not include the numbers of washrooms, living space and kitchen.

If it's shared, there must be a 4 to 1 ratio.

That is 17-18 private washrooms with toilet, sink and shower. The proposal does not indicate the number and size of the kitchens and living spaces.

A public style shared washroom should not be utilized to replace private washrooms. This is essential for health, safe and dignified living.

-Covid is still spreading all over the world. There must be at least 3 to 4 larger units with private washrooms, private living space and kitchen to quarantine.

- 70 micro-units must have a planned layout in place for covid outbreaks. It must be designed to prevent the spread of covid.

-10 parkings spaces for 70 units is not sufficient. Emerald Street, Hunter Street and East Ave are already at it's max capacity for parking.

- The plan does not indicate fire safety . Every floor must be built to have an easy flow to evaluate and ensure the safety of the residents.

COMMUNITY IMPACT

-The Stinson neighborhood already has dozens of lodging houses, residential care facilities, group homes and shelters. The community can not handle any more of these facilities. If 83 Emerald St S operates as a lodging home, it is poor planning to have so many of these homes in one area.

-70 micro-unit in one house will cause friction and aggressive tensions amongst the residents. Living in tiny spaces, so close together and without appropriate privacy will cause a negative impact to the residents. These aggressive tensions will impact the whole neighborhood.

-Stinson neighborhood already have suffered from over concentration of lodging homes, Residential Care Facilities, rooming houses and shelters.

70 micro-units at Emerald St S will negatively impact the neighborhood that is already dealing with over concentration of social housing.

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 7:15 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer; Nann, Nrinder
Subject: ZAC-22-053 Proposed development 83/85 Emerald St S

I am writing in regards to the proposed development of 83/85 Emerald St S.

I will get to the point and start with the Pros.

I am not opposed to the land being used in a professional, appropriate use that will see contributions of engaged residents in our community. See a standard of care and programs offered to benefit the residents of that address, and offer a quality of life that would improve the intended residents standing within the community. I am not opposed to a well staffed, secure location for future residents of that address.

I am opposed the current zone designation change and development proposal that exists on 83/85 Emerald by the applicant that would see 51-70 micro units.

To the point here is why:

1. The current designation would see an increase in the Stinson/Corktown resident density to group homes, lodging home residents and create an inequity of community engagement, support, planning and outreach in these neighbourhoods. As these neighbourhoods have struggled with since 2001 and the code red reports.

The facts, I am flanked by 4 group/mutli residential care facilities and am raising a family in this neighbourhood. There are an additional 3 care faculties towards Stinson and 2 group homes towards king Street. I live directly across the street from what was previously the Emerald Lodge and experienced property loitering, property damage, and my kids lived with the anxiety of someone yelling at all hours. There was no recourse for us at all in that situation for 15 years of this experience. We never knew of violent offenders, and never seemed to be able to advocate for change for the level of abuse, and unkept living conditions the residents suffered during their residency under the owners of the Emerald Lodge. Yet, we were subject to public nuisance behavior daily as their neighbour. We were subject to police, and paramedics at all hours responding to calls to 83/85 Emerald.

You can appreciate the concern we have when there is no evidence that the current development proposal offering 51-70 micro units, facility will offer security, safe housing and programs to improve the quality of life of the future occupant/residents of that address and that of their neighbours.

Second point, the development is unrealistic to the proposed size of the property with regards to occupancy, room sizes or is the proposal in keeping with the cohesion of the neighborhood. Especially, when this property is of historical significance to the residents as the Emerald tea room and beside a property like Cathedral which is currently being temporarily allocated as a women's shelter.

The amenity space and expectation of use or access has not been adequately outline and does not seem to provide attention to those details as it has not been properly addressed on the site plan.

There are additional concerns that I could add but the reality is Hamilton needs mutli residential group homes and Hamilton needs affordable housing but not like this. These are real people, who need a place to feel pride of home. Not

be packed into an infill solution that would see them no better ahead in the current situation. Proposed developments like these need to be fairly seeded into communities around Hamilton to foster community outreach, not disproportionately, densely pack into one neighborhood with no outreach, no support and not contributing to the surrounding business, school and infrastructure in an equitable way.

I hope that the points to why our household opposes the current zoning and development of 83/85 Emerald St S are clear and understood. I may be reached at this email address but do not wish for my personal information to be made public. Which includes my contact information or my address.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns and do hope that this fosters clear dialogue on all sides with regards to current proposed use of this property.

ZAC-22-053

Phone Calls Received

August 30, 2022

- Concern with the size of the units and the type of tenants that would occupy those units

September 9, 2022 – Anonymous

- Concern with the size of the units and the management of the building as a result of the size of the units

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 12:07 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Cc: Office of Ward 3 City Councillor Nrinder Nann; Nann, Nrinder; Weinberger, Alexandra
Subject: Re: 83/85 Emerald

Your quick response and action is greatly appreciated.

Will a new sign be put on the property as well as updated correspondence to residents to reflect changes in already scheduled deadlines etc given the length of time this sign has not met the requirement for public notice?

Thanks

From: Allen, Jennifer <Jennifer.Allen@hamilton.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 11:15 AM
To:
Cc: Office of Ward 3 City Councillor Nrinder Nann <ward3@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Weinberger, Alexandra <Alexandra.Weinberger@hamilton.ca>
Subject: RE: 83/85 Emerald

Good morning,

Thank you for your email. We have advised the applicant the sign will need to be relocated closer to the street in order to satisfy the *Planning Act* requirements for public notice.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thank you,
Jennifer

Jennifer Allen
Planner II – Urban Team
Development Planning
Planning and Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton, 71 Main St W, 5th Floor, L8P 4Y5
Ph: 905.546.2424 ext. 4672

From:
Sent: Friday, September 2, 2022 1:32 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer <Jennifer.Allen@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Office of Ward 3 City Councillor Nrinder Nann <ward3@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Weinberger, Alexandra <Alexandra.Weinberger@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 83/85 Emerald

Review my attached pictures. The zoning change sign CANNOT be read from the street and there is a PRIVATE PROPERTY NO TESSPASSING sign that is posted right beside the city sign so by law NO resident can walk on the property to read the sign.

How are people that didn't get the letter suppose to read the sign?

Also the sign is NOT visible until you are directly in front of the building. Why was the sign not posted on the front lawn for high visibility?

Jennifer Allen,
City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Department
Development Planning – Urban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L9P 4Y5

12th September 2022

By email to Jennifer.Allen@Hamilton.ca

Ms. Allen:

Re: Zoning By-Law Amendment (File No. ZAC-22-053)

This letter is to make comment about the proposed plans regarding the property at 83 Emerald Street, Hamilton.

Please note that currently, per your communication, the zoning plans appear to be at best nebulous and do not fully explain what exactly the proposed re zoning will entail or include; therefore, we are opposed to any plans regarding the property proceeding pending disclosure of full and complete details of all intentions regarding size as well as immediate and future usage of the dwelling that the re-zoning covers.

As an instance, my and my family's concerns include, but are not restricted to the following:

We require information on:

- The type of residences the property will comprise
- Number of individuals the property will house, the letter states 70 units, please define 'unit'
- The proposed/intended demographic of the residents
- Clear definition of the expression 'dwellings' per your intended *usage*
- Quantity of unit/dwellings intended for the building as-is/as well as upon completion of a proposed extension
- The size of each 'unit'
- Transparency of other properties the companies operating as John Gladke / and / David Joy currently manage/own in the Hamilton area
- Information regarding Realty Holdings Group if this is the intended group who will be managing said property
- Well-defined plans as to the footprint/land space the new building extension will occupy and extend onto the existing lot, and therefore we need to be made fully aware how it will impact and potentially visibly encroach onto the rear of our property at 62 Tisdale Street South

To our knowledge, the re zoning verbiage includes a wide and varied gamut of potential uses; ie: Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc. This requires a full, clear, transparent and complete explanation in layman's terms and the use of the verbiage 'etc' needs to be deleted and its intent more clearly defined.

Our interests regarding this property development as residents of this community, and as concern on a community level are thus:

- The application from the developer is not of a quality one would expect from a developer who wishes to integrate plans into and uplift or balance the community. It appears to lack a minimal respect for our community
- The current application does not address sufficient landscape/amenity space for 70 tenants
- The proposal of less than 300 square feet per unit does not provide quality housing and would therefore suggest the intention is to create a high-density 'rooming-house'
- Another rooming house/high density dwelling/half-way house/Community Lodge/Club (and-or various other tenuous and imprecise terms) is not in keeping with the cohesion of the neighbourhood and the sheer existing amount of these facilities in the immediate area is a distinct threat to alter the character of this neighbourhood and as historically proven almost certainly leads to further congestion of the area, crime and contributes to existing residents being pushed out of their comfort zone through threat and intimidation

Our personal interests regarding this property development are thus:

- Our concerns are not only limited to the ill-defined nature of the future proposal but on our past experiences with the tenants, usage and general mis-management of Emerald Lodge over the past twelve years since we have lived at this address. For the record, we feel it is notable at this time for us to make you aware of the stressors that we have had to endure and which are in part, are creating our immense anxiety that it will potentially be repeated by recreating a similar environment.
- Our family has endured a long list of traumatic incidents that have arisen because of the nature of the building, its use and its tenants. Some of those occurrences have presented potentially dangerous consequences to our family members and to our property.

For example:

We have endured:

- Loud and disturbing behaviour both during daytime hours and throughout the night
- Aggressive behaviour, fighting, and loud, offensive language
- Lewd behaviour including explicit, crass nudity
- Openly using the outdoor property as a toilet
- Tenants and non-tenants regularly using the outdoor space to engage in drinking/smoking parties and openly engaging in drug use and drug-deals
- We constantly dealt with the task of cleaning up debris which was thrown over the fence into our property, the debris included food packaging, beer bottles, and dangerous drug paraphernalia including used needles
- Experienced a worrisome building-blaze at the Emerald Lodge
- Dealing with an apathetic approach to our calls to the management company only resulted in a negative response including intimidating language and at times escalating into verbal abuse.
- In addition; we have suffered from property stolen from our garden and garden shed on several occasions. We found fire-starting materials which had been thrown over the fence to the areas behind our garden shed between our property and that of the Emerald Lodge. Our property was often used as a thoroughfare by visitors to, and residents of, Emerald Lodge.

This is just a small example of the many indignities we have experienced and hopefully it is an insight as to our trepidation over this new proposal.

In closing, we anxiously await your early notification of the upcoming date of the proposed Public Meeting.

Concerned Residents of the Stinson Community of Hamilton.

cc: Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 10:07 PM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Subject: Concerns over Zoning By-Law Amendment on Emerald

Jennifer Allen, City of Hamilton

Planning and Economic Development Department

Development Planning - Urban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5
905-546-2424 ext. 4672
E-mail: Jennifer.Allen@Hamilton.ca

September 19, 2022

ZAC-22-053

RE: Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application for 83/85 Emerald St: An extreme multi-unit dwelling in an overburdened neighbourhood.

We advocate for an orderly development of safe and healthy communities and the promotion of building methods that is well designed and encourages a sense of place for the residents of the building and for the neighborhood.

To Jennifer Allen and to whom this is c.c.:

We request that our names and contact information does not appear in public. If our name is legally necessary for the process, it is OK but we still request that the City and C.C recipients remove our personal information if they wish to use our text.

1: We adhere to the opinion & concerns as formulated by Ward 3, Councillor Nann and we present & submit them as our own in this document:

"Based on my review of this file and discussions with staff, I have a number of concerns about this application.

Firstly, the application itself is not of high quality and does not provide the attention to detail I would expect from a developer who is wishing to work with community on their plans.

The current application also does not provide sufficient landscape space, amenity space, nor enough allocated parking for the number of proposed units.

Additionally, the proposal lacks a range of unit sizes for quality housing, and 300 square feet as the largest unit size is very tiny.

Finally, packing in 70 micro units into the space, even with the proposed expansion, is out of character with the neighborhood cohesion.

2. We adhere to the concerns posted by neighbours and submitted them as our own:

(a) I walk this fine line between wanting everyone adequately and affordably housed, and being concerned that I'm falling into nimby territory, because I'm concerned about the number of rooming houses, assisted living, and shelter spaces within our neighbourhood.

(b) Healthy communities are ones of mixed income. From reviewing some of the recent census data there's an opportunity to diversify the neighbourhood as it leans more towards lower income levels. This section of Emerald deserves a fighting chance to be more than just another neglected area.

(c) I have nothing against lodging homes, as Stinson has several, but this is going way too far, the street can't handle what we have and there are very few amenities in our area, there is not even a proper Park.

(d) Last year a developer intended on 50 micro-units at the former Emerald lodge and Councillor Nann informed us that it was a "new fancy name for a rooming house without staff". Considering that in our neighborhood a room in a rooming house goes now for...\$800, 70 micro units without staff will make a nice profit. It depends of the "business plan" of the developer...Nothing wrong with profit, but not at our cost. At least, legally we have input on the change of this zoning. There was no community consultation for the new Mission Services, 400 King E, 101 men. Nor for the in-the-works 299 Main St (same block) "lodge" 58 men.

3. Other concerns:

(a) We have requested Councillor Nann to contact the owner-developer David Joy to obtain a precise "RENTAL MODEL" for the location. What segment of the population are these 70 units intended for? Will his tenants contribute to the balance of the neighbourhood? What impact in the community, positive or negative, is projected?

(b) I would be glad if the building is never used again as an "institution" and never again have another House of Horrors like Emerald Lodge. ... but I don't trust E/S-XXX and I am deeply disturbed and concerned by the vague information provided to date.

(b) Our neighbourhood has been historically over-burdened. We have a large number of rooming houses, assisted living, halfway houses and 2 shelters (Main & Emerald St, low barrier women shelter 100 beds; 45 West Ave, men shelter 28 beds) within our neighborhood. To this concentration it has been recently added Mission Services, NEW location 101 beds for men at 400 King St E [King & Victoria] and on the works is a lodge for 58 men at 299 Main St E [Main and Victoria]

(c) After the operation of Old Cathedral as a shelter began in the Fall of 2020 and the encampments that it attracted...the crime rate in our neighborhood has, according to Frank Bergen, Chief of the Hamilton Police Service, increased 111% [ONE HUNDRED AND ELEVEN PERCENT]. The situation improved the last few months, but the 2 years negative experience made us weary of the possibility of an increase of high acuity individuals without expert staff support may have a huge negative impact on the community.

(d) Parking: We have not been informed of Mr. Joy's rental model, so we don't know if his 70 tenants or what percentage of his tenants will own vehicles and the plan presents only 10 parking spots. At this precise moment, parking on our neighbourhood streets is SO SCARCE that lately there have being multiple incidents of "frustration" resulting in anti-social behaviors ("keying", breaking mirrors).

4. In order to inform our opinion, we also request Mr. Joy background as a developer and as a landlord and if his building/s present any negative impact on the community near by. Unfortunately, a person or organization may act with the best of intentions yet their oversight of reality manifest grave effects. For instance a well know and respected housing org , INDWELL:

2021: "A trial heard drug users frequently went between units in the building where Pilon was found dead":

<https://www.thespec.com/news/hamilton-region/2021/11/23/hamilton-murder-trial-george-opassinis-michel-pilon.html>

and 2022: "A look inside Indwell's Parkdale Landing, where drug-dealing visitors have posed such challenges the non-profit says it will never build another high-needs building so large"

<https://www.thespec.com/news/hamilton-region/opinion/2022/04/28/indwell-affordable-supportive-housing-hamilton.html>

We submit this document in a hurry not to lose the deadline Sept 19, 2022, but we reserve the right to present more concerns as we are given more information."

Please don't do this to our neighbour hood,

Baldassarra, Alaina

From:
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 8:11 AM
To: Allen, Jennifer
Cc: Nann, Nrinder
Subject: Emerald St lodging house

Hi Jennifer,

I'm writing to you with regards to 83/85 Emerald St application for 70 units.

We live in the area and are raising are 3 daughters here and attend the local public school, Queen Victoria.

Our community has a large amount of group homes and transitional housing, if I'm not mistaken. The highest concentration of any ward in the city. We are compassionate neighbors and want to see our marginalized neighbors housed. What concerns me is that we're not spreading out the supportive housing and concentrating them in one neighborhood. I don't want to get into the issues we have, as we knew Stinson had a lot of support housing when we bought here 8 years ago. We've done and do a lot to live with our neighbours that need additional support, it's time for other communities to step up as well.

Stinson deserves better then to have another 70 units in a spot that doesn't support that many people.

We hope you don't approve this application and consider the families that live here already.

- These changes have resulted in the reduction of the number of units from 70 in the original application to 62.

The goal of the application remains unchanged: to provide affordable market rental accommodation for singles and couples in furnished suites while retaining most of the existing building, particularly the front façade, and adding to the building at the rear without increasing height. The design retains the house-form appearance of the building from the street, including the front yard landscaped area and the mature trees, while adding significantly to the stock of affordable market rental housing in Hamilton.

To achieve this goal of increased housing supply, while retaining as much of the existing building as possible, requires a number of trade-offs, all of which are reasonable and supportable on planning grounds. These include reducing the number of vehicular parking spaces from the provisions of the by-law, while significantly increasing bicycle parking spaces (addressed in the revised transportation and parking analysis under separate cover), providing a hybrid of public and private garbage pick up with the garbage vehicles backing onto the street, and reducing the landscaped area at grade to accommodate servicing requirements.

Public Open House

The application was presented at two public open houses held at the Central Memorial Recreation Centre on the afternoon of February 22 and the evening of February 27, 2023. Flyers announcing the meeting were distributed to households from Victoria Avenue to Wentworth Street and the Escarpment to King William Street. The open houses were also advertised in the Councilor's newsletter and her social media feed.

The open houses were attended by more than 30 residents and interested parties, including the area Councilor. There was strong support for the application at the open houses. Participants were concerned about the poor state of the existing abandoned building, which has been frequently vandalized and were anxious to see the application move forward as quickly as possible. Residents did not wish to see outdoor amenity space due to noise and history of disruption in the area on similar outdoor spaces.

Updated Site Statistics

Lot area	1413.18 sq.m.
Lot frontage	23.79m
Existing gross floor area	979.98 sq m
Existing density	0.8 FSI
Existing lot coverage	24%