

## Summary of Comments Received from Applicant's Public Consultation

### Katelyn Gillis

---

**From:** Katelyn Gillis  
**Sent:** November 22, 2023 1:13 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: 259 & 265 Wilson Street East, Ancaster

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for being in touch and confirming receipt of the letter.

Please see responses below to your inquiries in [green](#).

I hope this provides you with clarification but if you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to be in touch via this email or my office extension below.

Best,

Katelyn Gillis  
Senior Planner  
T. Johns Consulting Group  
905.574.1993 x.207

DISCLAIMER: This email message and/or its attachment(s) are CONFIDENTIAL, proprietary information of T. JOHNS CONSULTING GROUP LTD. It is intended solely for the named recipients(s) listed above and should be maintained in strictest confidence. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the information contained herein (including any reliance thereon) is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this information from your computer and destroy any related paper copies. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 22, 2023 12:01 PM  
**To:** Katelyn Gillis <kgillis@tjohnsconsulting.com>  
**Subject:** 259 & 265 Wilson Street East, Ancaster

Hello Katelyn

Thank you for notifying impacted property owners of the proposal.

We are concerned that the adjustment would enable additional space being designated 'Mixed Use Medium Density' as clearly that would favour any future development should it arise.

259 Wilson St E (Brownlow Partners Building) was site plan approved in 2010 with limited on-site parking. Instead, the office building's parking was dependent on a long-term lease over Ryerson Church lands, namely the lands proposed to be purchased by the landowner of 259 Wilson St E. Under the Ontario Planning Act, both the severed and retained lands must conform to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. Thus, in result of the boundary adjustment, we are required to designate the lands transferred from Ryerson Church from Institutional to Mixed Use Medium Density, Pedestrian Focus. The Mixed Use Medium Density, Pedestrian Focus designation is common along the Wilson St E corridor.

There is no future development planned. The intent is to maintain the parking area and right-of-way as is. However, instead of leasing the lands, 259 Wilson St E would own the lands.

Moreso, our concern is related to the adjoining lands known as Fieldcote .... An area designated as protected and yet suffering from increasing encroachment - mostly manifest in the significant light pollution resulting from external lighting violating an area hitherto darker .... And so increasingly less hospitable to the wildlife which the Fieldcote Trust sought to preserve.

My understanding is that any existing site lighting was approved by the City of Hamilton. Again, no development is proposed and therefore, the proposed boundary adjustment will not adversely impact the abutting lands.

Without being notified as to what is planned, then as presented it seems access to the church would be frustrated and need to be via Sulphur Springs Road ... which already has a Church on it and so increased traffic ?

The information letter sought to be clear that no physical development is proposed. I apologize if this wasn't the case. The existing right-of-way that is owned by Ryerson Church with a right-of-way in favour of the Brownlow Partners building will continue to benefit both owners. Ryerson Church will continue to access their parking area from the driveway off of Wilson St E.

And given the existing users of 259 already include RBC etc, unless all that is proposed is a switch of ownership to enable the church to raise funds - and the purpose of the severed lands remains as is, then the application seems to be a precursor to a future plan of which we would be very concerned.

I can appreciate your assumption of future plans, but this is not the case. No future development is proposed.

Of course if the conditionality of the severance is that the purpose of the lands remains for ground level parking only .... Then our prime concern is the light pollution that would deteriorate should further lighting be contemplated

I will confirm that the lands will remain surface parking, as it currently is. No additional lighting is proposed.

Regards

[REDACTED]