

From: Chris Ritsma

Sent: July 3, 2024 11:48 PM

To: Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Beattie, Jeff <Jeff.Beattie@hamilton.ca>; Cassar, Craig <Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca>; Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Francis, Matt <Matt.Francis@hamilton.ca>; Ward 4 <ward4@hamilton.ca>; Kroetsch, Cameron <Cameron.Kroetsch@hamilton.ca>; McMeekin, Ted <Ted.McMeekin@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Tadeson, Mark <Mark.Tadeson@hamilton.ca>

Cc: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Philpott Church Redevelopment Heritage Designation Deferral

To Mayor Horwath, Planning Committee and its members,

I followed along with the designation and while I think it is positive in some ways, I think there is room for improvement to avoid hurting the congregation and likely resulting in an appeal to higher government.

I would like to start with what is important to me;

1. **Housing** – We need more housing, both market and social housing to meet the needs of Canadians and Hamiltonians. The housing crisis continues to spiral out of control and Hamilton should step out of the way as much as possible to allow the construction of private market housing and more affordable social housing in an attempt to create supply for the immense demand and to put downward pressure on purchase and rental prices. More housing means more options and lower costs (or at least smaller increases)
2. **History, Heritage and Culture** – Hamilton demolished much of its historic downtown long before I was born, and continues to do so today. Being Canadian is about what was here before I was, and what is here after me. This church building has been standing in the same spot since before my grandfather's father was born. On that alone it is remarkable to me, but sometimes that isn't enough to justify protection because the needs of today outweigh appreciation for the past, and sometimes a building isn't more important than that. This building does have other importances though as mentioned in the heritage report, but there is also a subjective value to being one of the last remaining buildings in an area otherwise decimated.
3. **Pragmatism** – I like to think that I approach problems in a sensible and realistic way. This building, or at least part of it should be saved in my opinion, but I also recognize that this is private property, owned by a private organization, not by the public. That does not mean that what is developed cannot and should not benefit the public, but I recognize and I hope that the Planning Committee recognizes there are other interests at play, including profitability, and housing needs outlined above. If City Council, and Planning Committee feel this building is historically valuable and should be saved in whole or in part it must provide value in such a way that it was not able to through the purchase of the property with public funds and maintaining the property.

Some concessions I believe the city could make to provide benefit to the public, respect heritage value and allow housing needs to be met while allowing the congregation and developer to make money that they are entitled to make from a private sale and private development include the following:

Action	Explanation
Retain only the important parts of the structure	<p>On the heritage report the building was split into 4 distinct parts, A, B, C, D. The city should remove any protection for parts C&D and only consider protecting parts A&B.</p> <p><i>While it is important and laudable to protect as many parts of our heritage structures in the city, concessions must sometimes be made. If the options are nothing or no redevelopment, then I believe that protecting the most important parts (the oldest structure and the usable hall) is better.</i></p>
Development Charge Amendment	<p>Reduce or waive certain portions of the development charges to reduce the financial burden of protecting and repairing a heritage structure.</p> <p><i>If the redevelopment provides benefits to the public, then development charges meant to benefit that same public should be waived in part to assist with the cost of repairing and maintaining that portion of the redevelopment that protects heritage features or benefits. Things like the parkland fee, or just a generalized reduction that provides a portion of the cost reduction to help with repair.</i></p>
Zoning By-Law Amendment	<p>Allow the portion of the property not containing the heritage structure to be permitted to be taller. 100 Main St E is approximately 126m tall, and this or slightly taller could be allowed considering it would be rare and is being considered for the purpose of providing heritage value. Allowance of 143m-160m should be explored similar to the 147m Block 16 development at Pier 8. If this is done, the city should ensure the proposal stands out in a well-designed fashion as it will be able to be seen from far away.</p> <p><i>This area is already zoned for the tallest structures in the city. The zoning by-law notes that this area is Highrise 2, the tallest designation, and furthermore, there are no expected impacts to the viewshed by developments in this area.</i></p>
Zoning By-Law Amendment	<p>Allow the usable heritage structure space to be used by the public for public/private events and be considered amenity space for the purpose of meeting zoning requirements.</p> <p><i>Amenities can benefit both residents of developments or the public. If this property has retained features it should included in the amenity supply for the purpose of meeting the minimum amenity requirements to proportion</i></p>

that it benefits the public and residents (ie. More retained heritage counts toward more amenity supply).