

From: Chris DiFrancesco

Sent: August 9, 2024 1:37 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Baldassarra, Alaina <Alaina.Baldassarra@hamilton.ca>; Robichaud, Steve <Steve.Robichaud@hamilton.ca>; Fabac, Anita <Anita.Fabac@hamilton.ca>; Catarino, Jennifer <Jennifer.Catarino@hamilton.ca>; Collingwood, Tricia <Tricia.Collingwood@hamilton.ca>; Dal Bello, Rino <Rino.DalBello@hamilton.ca>; McMeekin, Ted <Ted.McMeekin@hamilton.ca>; Scally, Maureen <Maureen.Scally@hamilton.ca>; Toman, Charlie <Charlie.Toman@hamilton.ca>; Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Letter of concerns regarding proposed development at 173-177 Dundas St E in Waterdown

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Hello, my name is Chris DiFrancesco and I live at [REDACTED]. I have some concerns that I would like to be on record for the Aug. 13 Planning Committee meeting regarding the proposed development at 173-177 Dundas St E in Waterdown. May I request that this letter be circulated to all planning committee members and be included on the agenda for the meeting as well?

In my opinion this site is not an appropriate one for a development of this scale. First and foremost is the concern regarding traffic in the area. The lights at Riley and Dundas streets are at the crest of a blind hill and the sightlines are already quite compromised for a 60km/hr street. Adding the number of dwellings in this proposal with the entry and exit so close to this intersection would significantly increase the concern for accidents involving vehicles or pedestrians. It should be noted that the only pedestrian crossing of Dundas street for hundreds of metres would be between Riley street and the entrance/exit for the proposed development, with all of its new vehicle traffic. Almost all school children walking to Guy Brown and Waterdown High schools from South Waterdown use this crossing. As someone who cycles to work in Hamilton for half the year, I am already very uneasy crossing here and have serious concerns about the proposed increase in traffic. I also fear that the congestion caused here will send more traffic down Scott St and McDonald Cres to access Dundas, negatively impacting the many children who play here and access the library via the footpath from Scott. Other factors compounding traffic issues are Waste disposal (curbside pickup for 18 units will significantly snarl traffic on Dundas) and snow removal (where are they going to put the snow in the winter?) and limited space for guest parking leading to many parking on adjacent streets and at the library. I understand the City was provided a traffic study done by the developer but has there been any independent studies done?

My second concern involves the sheer scale of this proposal. 18 units on 2 residential lots far exceeds the allowable density of 40 units/hectare and will lead to a substantial increase in noise from vehicles, air conditioners, lawn mowers, music devices and pets. All of the buildings for hundreds of metres are 1-2 storey homes on large single lots, the proposed development is totally out of character for this neighborhood. In 2018 an application at 12 McDonald was denied as an "over intensification of development", and it was only proposing 2 (!) homes on a single residential lot so if this decision was valid I cannot see how the proposal at 173-177 Dundas can be seriously considered.

My last concern is the size of the proposed lot and dwellings. The developer plans to raise the grade of the north side of the property backing on to ours by 2m. There is already quite a difference in elevation between the lots, and raising the grade and installing 2 story dwellings so close to the back of the

property line will unacceptably reduce privacy to houses behind them giving a clear line of sight from their ground and 2nd floors to both of my daughters bedrooms and bathroom at the back of our house. Additionally, it will create loss of sunlight as most of our limited winter sun comes in low from the south of our properties.

Water runoff would be affected as well, virtually the entire site would consist of hard surfaces. Our backyard is soggy for 4 months of the year and pools water during heavy rains so any additional runoff could make it much worse and create damage to nearby structures. What would the retaining wall look like (aesthetics) and who would look after maintenance and repair if there are problems?

Lastly, the proposal to reduce the front yards from 7.5m to 2.5m would be very different from any surrounding building creating a jarring incongruence of the streetscape.

In short, this proposal seems to be just too big and too much for the actual site, creating numerous issues, the biggest of which is traffic safety.

Thank you for hearing my concerns,

Chris DiFrancesco