



December 21, 2020

**VIA E-MAIL**

Anita Fabac  
Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design  
City of Hamilton – Planning Division  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Dear Mrs. Fabac:

**Re: *Addendum to February 2020 Planning and Urban Design Rationale  
Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Resubmission  
1107 Main Street West, Hamilton (City File No.'s UHOPA-20012, ZAC-  
20-016)***

---

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

As you are aware, we are the planning consultants for **1107 Main Inc.**, the owner of the 1107 Main Street West (the “subject site”).

On behalf of our client, we are pleased to submit herewith revised materials in support for the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications. This letter has been prepared as an addendum to our February 2020 Planning and Urban Design Rationale report, in order to address revised plans enclosed with this resubmission. This addendum provides a summary of revisions made to the proposal to respond to comments received from the City and other commenting agencies, as well as to review the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2020, which came into effect on May 1, 2020 and Addendum 1 to Growth Plan 2019.

The Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment applications for the subject site were submitted in February 2020 to facilitate the redevelopment of the subject with a 15- storey mixed-use building containing commercial uses at grade. A total gross floor area (GFA) of 23,762.7 square metres was proposed, resulting in a density of 5.2 FSI. A total of 310 dwelling units were proposed, including 7 at grade related townhouses.

Since the time of application, we have reviewed the technical circulation comments received, met with staff, and held a Community Meeting on August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2020, gathered community and stakeholders feedback and have made a number of key revisions in response to the feedback provided.

The following is a resubmission that details a revised proposal and provides a response to the planning and urban design issues raised by the City of Hamilton's Planning Staff received in May 2020 as well as comments received by the general public.

## **2.0 REVISED PROPOSAL**

The proposed revisions are outlined in the architectural plans prepared by SRM Architects dated December 1, 2020 (see **Attachments**). The Key revisions include:

- The building north façade along Main Street West includes a step back at the northwest portion above level 12 with angular balconies to comply within the required 45-degree angular plane and applies the 80% of Main Street right-of-way;
- The revised built form and massing, incorporates additional step back along the east, west and the rear of the building and ramped amenity area through the center of the building connecting to the Synagogue property to the south;
- The unit counts and areas are updated based on the proposed redesign;
- The revised built form reintegrates the existing façade/entrance of the Grace Evangelical Church into the built form design and a community garden courtyard has been proposed at the corner of Main Street and Cline Avenue;
- The underground parking entry has been relocated to the far south of Cline Avenue.

This addendum letter concludes that, with these design revisions, the proposed development is consistent with the PPS 2020 and continues to conform with the 2019 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Further, the proposal continues to be appropriate from the perspectives of intensification, land use policy, height, massing, density, built form, housing policy and heritage, as otherwise set out in our February 2020 Planning and Urban Design Rationale report. Subject to the additional comments set out herein, the findings and analysis

set out in our February 2019 report continue to be relevant and accurate. **A detailed comment response matrix is included as Attachment 1.**

A summary setting out a comparison of the revised design to the original proposal is provided in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1 – Statistical Comparison**

	<b>Original Submission (February 2020)</b>	<b>Resubmission (December 2020)</b>
Site Area	4,517.0 m <sup>2</sup> (excluding road widening) 5,169.3 m <sup>2</sup> (including road widening)	4,517.0 m <sup>2</sup> (excluding road widening) 5,169.3 m <sup>2</sup> (including road widening)
Total Gross Floor Area:	24,251.5 m <sup>2</sup>	23,724.3 m <sup>2</sup>
• Residential	23,715.9 m <sup>2</sup>	23,109.1 m <sup>2</sup>
• Non-Residential	535.1 m <sup>2</sup>	615.2 m <sup>2</sup>
Density	5.36 FSI	5.31 FSI
Height	15-storey (45.0 metres)	15-storey (45.0 metres)
Total Units	310 units (100%) 4 bachelor units (1.2%) 166 one-bedroom (53.5%) 99 two-bedroom (32.0%) 24 three-bedroom (7.8%) 10 family size units (3.2%) 7 townhouse units (2.3%)	324 units(100%) 12 bachelor units (3.7%) 76 1-bedroom (23.5%) 113 1-bedroom + den (34.9%) 64 2-bedroom (19.8%) 16 2-bedroom + den (4.9%) 17 3-bedroom (5.2%) 8 3-bedroom + den (2.5%) 2 1-bedroom townhouse (0.6%) 8 2-bedroom townhouse (2.5%) 8 3-bedroom townhouse (2.5%)
Indoor Amenity Space	93 m <sup>2</sup>	158 m <sup>2</sup>
Outdoor Amenity Space	480 m <sup>2</sup>	480 m <sup>2</sup>
Vehicular Parking Spaces	234 spaces 226 spaces (Underground) 8 spaces (Townhouse Street Parking)	208 spaces 175 residential parking spaces 33 visitor parking spaces

		9 barrier free parking spaces
Bicycle Parking Spaces	156 spaces 150 spaces (Res. Long-Term) 6 spaces (Com. Short-Term)	174 spaces 164 spaces (Res. Long-Term) 5 (Res. Short Term) 5 Com. Short Term)

### **3.0 RESPONSE TO THE CITY STAFF COMMENTS**

The attached Comment Matrix (see **Attachment 1**) provides a summary of the comments received and how the resubmission responds accordingly.

### **4.0 RESPONSE TO THE COMMUNITY COMMENTS**

There have been numerous submissions from various community members regarding the proposed development received as part of the circulation of the application and the Community Meeting held on August 11, 2020.

#### **4.1 *Letters in Support***

A total of 17 letters of support were received from community members and members of the Adas Israel Congregation, including a petition signed by 20 neighbourhood households. The letters reference the need for new housing in the neighbourhood and apartment units that range in size, which will provide a mix of housing options for existing and new residents, all in a way that will help preserve the neighbourhood character. Many submissions stated that “as residents that will be most greatly impacted by the development, we feel this will enhance the quality of living in our area”.

**4.2 Questions received in advance and during the August 11, 2020  
Public Community Meeting:**

PLANNING

QUESTION – ANGULAR PLANES AND PLANNING JUSTIFICATION

We received a question about the reason behind the Zoning By-law application and the proposed building height as well as angular plane. Could you tell us a bit more about this, and talk about other policies and considerations from the PPS that were considered in putting forward this proposal?

RESPONSE

From a planning policy perspective, the site's location is appropriate for intensification.

- Provincial policy (Growth Plan and PPS) require municipalities to intensify within the existing boundaries and to identify strategic growth areas where new development is directed
- The UHOP identifies this corridor as a strategic growth area, a primary corridor where intensification is directed.
- The site is one of the largest along this corridor and can achieve the additional height being requested.
- The UHOP requires new development to be compatible with the surrounding context.
- In our opinion, our previously submitted Planning Rationale was able to rationalize how the proposal conforms with the policies set forth in the PPS and Growth Plan and how it maintains the general intent and purpose of the UHOP and Secondary Plan.

With respect to the building height and angular plane.

- The building was designed to respond to each of its 3 street frontages.
- The purpose and intent of Angular Planes are to provide transition to adjacent parcels of land and to limit built form impacts that include light, view, and privacy.
- At grade units proposed on Dow and Cline Avenue with upper portions stepped back away from the street.

- Main Street West is identified to be an intensification corridor to promote a higher density and transit-oriented development.

Built form impacts –how will the building responds to the surrounding context:

- We have reviewed the shadow impacts and, in our opinion, do not create any unacceptable impacts on the subject site or surrounding area
- Angular planes were applied to the building from the east side of Dow and west side of Cline.
- Only projections are from the taller portion (15-storeys) along Main Street West.
- Applying the angular plane greatly reduces the shadow impact to the low rise neighbourhood to the east, west and south.

Built form and Massing

- The proposed building has been designed in line with the City’s urban design policies and guidelines, in order to achieve an active and pedestrian oriented place, which responds to the Main Street Primary Corridor and appropriately transitions to the surrounding stable neighbourhood.

#### QUESTION – BUILDING HEIGHT

Another question we received was about other buildings in the area and how specifically they relate to this application. When you looked at those other three projects (McMaster Traymore Student Residence, the Columbia International College Student Residence, and Camelot Towers), what were the types of things you considered when you looked at those projects and then evaluated this particular site?

#### RESPONSE

- The existing and approved buildings represent an evolving neighbourhood character with denser development along Main Street West.
- Each development is reviewed based on its own merits and how it responds to its surroundings in a compatible manner.

- In this case, this site is an appropriate location for intensification and the proposed height is based on the relationship and built form impacts to the surrounding context.
- Strategic growth area and higher density envisioned along corridor.
- Height is based on a review and analysis of built form impacts.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### QUESTION

- There's been a question about the two buildings on site and the heritage of these two buildings, their relationship to the new building, as well as the relationship to the architecture of the adjacent Adas Israel Synagogue.
- We also received a question about the Cultural Heritage Landscape of the Grace Lutheran Church, its gardens, and whether there could be a way of incorporating some of the existing landscaping into the proposal?

### RESPONSE

- Both the Grace Lutheran Church and Adas Israel Synagogue are considered an "Inventoried Property", which means it is included on the "Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest" for the City of Hamilton.
- This inventory contains a list of over 6,000 properties which are identified as being of potential cultural heritage value or interest.
- They are also included on the "Inventory of Significant Places of Worship in the City of Hamilton", an ongoing project to identify and document heritage sites and structures throughout Hamilton, a city which is undergoing continuous change.
- Both properties are subject to heritage policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.
- Metropolitan Design Ltd. is the heritage consultant that forms part of the consultant team and they worked closely with the architect to design the project.
- As part of the application a Cultural heritage impact assessment was submitted in support of the application.
- The report concludes the proposal conforms to the UHOP policies and is an appropriate response.

- The resubmission includes an updated cultural heritage impact assessment, which addresses the comments received from the City and Municipal Heritage Committee.

## ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

### Building's Users

- There has also been a question about whether this development has been designed for students, and generally who are the intended users of this building?

### RESPONSE

- The proposal has not been designed or intended for student rentals.

### Unit Sizes

- We received a question regarding the average sizes of the building's units. Could you speak to what standard was used when determining the proposed unit sizes in this building?

### RESPONSE

- The proposed mix of units is provided in Table 1 above. Additionally, the average unit sizes being proposed are as follows:

Bachelor Unit – 355 SF

1 Bed Unit – 495 SF

1 Bed + Den Unit – 515 SF

2 Bed Unit – 750 SF

2 Bed + Den Unit – 800 SF

3 Bed Unit – 900 SF

3 Bed + Den Unit – 1000 SF

### Design / Aesthetics

- When it comes to the inspiration for the building's design, could you tell us a bit more about that? For example, going through what design elements you've incorporated to reflect the context and character of the local neighbourhood and surrounding buildings.

### RESPONSE

- The design of the proposed building is a result of a number of considerations, including materials found in the neighbourhood, an evolving architecture within

the neighbourhood that includes a mix of styles and more recently the introduction of modern buildings.

#### Balconies

- SRM has designed other buildings in the City without balconies, why does this building have balconies?
- Do you anticipate there will be concerns or noise complaints due to the uses that would be adjacent to the residential building? Will those uses (for example, the synagogue) limit the functionality of the balconies?

#### RESPONSE

- Buildings without balconies tend to be designed for student residence buildings and office buildings.
- Balconies have been provided for additional personal amenity space for each unit.
- There is no anticipation that there will be any concerns or noise complaints due to the balconies, since it is common, planned, permitted and encouraged to have balconies on mid-rise and tall buildings along intensification corridors within the urban area and near other sensitive uses (residential and institutional uses).

#### Playground

- We had a question about whether there would be any impacts (e.g. shadowing) on the synagogue's playground?

#### RESPONSE

- Due to the orientation of the proposal, no shadow impacts are proposed to interfere with the synagogue's playground.

#### AMENITY SPACE

There was a question regarding the amount of indoor/outdoor amenity space that's provided, what the amenity spaces are like, as well as how this all relates to the zoning by-law requirements?

#### RESPONSE:

- The Zoning By-law requires:
  - An area of 4.0 square metres for each dwelling unit less than 50 square metres;

- An area of 6.0 square metres for each dwelling unit more than 50 square metres;
- The zoning bylaw defines an amenity area as either outdoor or indoor:
- Shall mean the area of a lot intended for recreational purposes, and shall include areas that are landscaped, patios, privacy areas, balconies, communal lounges, swimming pools, play areas and similar uses, located on the same lot, but shall not include a building's service areas, parking lots, aisles or access driveways, or Planting Strip.
- The proposal exceeds the zoning requirements and provides:
  - A large indoor amenity room (+/-1,000 sq. ft.)
  - Large landscape courtyard (+/-480 sq. m/5,200 sq. ft.)
  - As well as private balconies and terraces.

#### OTHER QUESTIONS

#### MEETING WITH NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATIONS

There was a question regarding the November 2019 meeting with neighbourhood associations, and the community feedback and discussion at this meeting with regards to a height increase from 13-storeys to 15-storeys. Could you clarify that meeting for us and the proposed design changes that followed from that meeting?

#### RESPONSE

- We (consultant team, ownership group, and Rabbi Green) met with representatives from the Ainslie-Wood Westdale Community Association and Ainslie Wood Community Association.
- At that time the proposal was for a 13-storey building with 2-levels of underground parking. At that meeting some of the representatives stated that they understood that Main Street West is an intensification corridor and that they accept that height is appropriate at certain locations like this one.
- They also the discussed the need for additional parking and economically the additional level of underground parking would require additional saleable area.
- Based on this feedback the proposal was revised to increase the height and add a level of underground parking.

#### COMMERCIAL USES

There was a question about the types of businesses and tenants that the applicant is thinking of for the retail/commercial component of the project, as well as some questions about why there are no designated parking spaces for this commercial component.

#### RESPONSE

- The types of businesses and tenants that will occupy the commercial space of the proposal will be market driven. Local uses that can operate in the space being provided will ultimately be the types of businesses and tenants that will be selected.
- No designated parking has been provided for the commercial component due to the urban and pedestrian focused nature of the built form. It is common practice that commercial/retail uses that front onto an intensification corridor such as Main Street West would provide no dedicated parking.
- In addition, it is anticipated that the residential visitor and commercial parking will be shared between the two uses.

#### TRAFFIC AND PARKING

- Another question we received is whether parking spots in the underground garage of the proposed building might be rented out to McMaster students or other non-residents of the building?
- Question regarding the 8 proposed at-grade parking spaces along Cline and Dow for the townhouse units, which will be permit parking. Can you share a bit about the rationale for including these parking spaces at-grade and not in the proposed underground parking garage?
- Some are also wondering about the school drop-off and parking plan on Cline and Dow. Could you explain this a bit more?

#### RESPONSE

- The proposed vehicular parking is intended for the residents and visitors of the proposed building. Utilizing the parking as a “commercial parking facility” to be used by other uses in the area is not proposed and, as such, would not comply with the Zoning By-law.
- The proposal was revised and the on-street layby parking was removed from bot Cline and Dow.

#### QUESTIONS/COMMENTS DURING THE MEETING:

There were a number of questions asked during the community meeting, the following is a summary of the questions and our responses. Questions that are answered above have not been repeated here. We have grouped the questions into categories to better answer the concerns being raised.

##### *Building/Built Form*

- Are floor plans available to view?
- A "mid-rise" building is defined by the City of Toronto as 5-6 stories, with a maximum of 11 stories. The proposed building is not a "mid-rise" building.

#### REPONSE

- A website has been created for the project, which provides a all of the submission materials and will provide updates and any resubmission materials. (<https://www.1107mainhamilton.com/>)
- The City of Toronto's mid-rise guidelines define a mid-rise building as generally relating at a 1:1 ratio to the street in which it fronts, which in most cases significantly exceeds 5-6 storeys. The City of Hamilton Tall Building Guidelines identifies that a "Mid-Rise" building is a building ranging in 6-12 storeys on a lot depth of approximately 32.6 - 44.6 metres. The subject site has a depth of approximately 58-86 metres. Furthermore, only 3- storeys of the proposal, of which have been drastically reduced in floorplate site and drawn close to the Main Street West frontage are in excess of a "mid-rise" building per the City Tall Building Guidelines. In addition, the large depth of the subject site also allows for the additional height where being proposed with no negative impacts to the residential neighbourhood. It is our opinion that the proposal maintains the general intent of a "mid-rise" building.

Where is garbage collected and how is it picked up? How do you ensure that garbage is not strewn on the streets and does not interfere with daily school drop off and pick up. How do you ensure that garbage does not impact neighbourhood - especially with mice and rats.

#### RESPONSE

- Garbage pickup and storage is provided internal to the building and not on the street.

- Details related to garbage will be addressed during the required Site plan control stage.

Being an owner of 3 homes on Dow. Comment on the sewage please. We are all having back up issues because there is only one line. This building would add to the problem.

#### RESPONSE

- A Functional Service Report has been prepared and is in support of the proposal, which addresses sewage capacity. City staff are reviewing the report and proposal to ensure it complies with the City's requirements.

#### Traffic/Parking

- There are presently markings on Cline at Main pavement that appear to lay out a lane reduction measure. Is that part of your considerations on traffic?
- How many cars can wait to make a turn at the north end of Cline between the project's driveway and Main? At sometimes there is a solid line of eastbound vehicles across the ends of Cline and Dow.
- The study by the City done in 2018 concluded that some of the immediate intersection are operation close to the capacity and that was before the application was submitted.
- Will any streets end up being made into "one way" streets?
  
- What are the plans to address the traffic flow in and out of Dow avenue? Already in the school months its difficult to turn off of main street , in school hours Dow avenue turns into a one way street
- There is already surge of traffic at drop off and pick up time of HHA school children. Having difficulty accessing court at the back of school. How will the applicant ensure that we will not be negatively affected with an increased congestion?

#### RESPONSE

- There markings do not relate to the subject proposal.
- The driveway on Cline was moved south to provide additional queuing.
- A transportation Impact Study was submitted with the application and concluded that the traffic generated by the proposed development does not add adverse impacts on the nearby road network and no road improvements are triggered as a result.

- No changes to the street system are proposed, including any directional conversions.
- The underground parking is accessed from the driveway on Cline Ave. S., which will help alleviate the traffic on Dow.

Miscellaneous/already answered above

- How will property tax be assessed? Is there any modification since religious institutions occupied the site or are involved in ownership?
- Aside from commercial and residential use, will the common areas include anything that will be a meeting room or “cultural” uses.
- Concerned about the very limited commercial parking spaces. Since we do not know of the businesses that will come in to the neighborhood how do you plan of accommodating a proper/sufficient parking?
- Are you aware of other developments to higher density that this project will lead or has led the way, located on Dow or Cline?
- There is a concern regarding the traffic entering the complex from Main St. Street onto Cline and conversely exiting the complex from Cline onto Main St. How is this being addressed?
- I live in the immediate neighbourhood and find it difficult to access my neighbourhood either entering or exiting. Will the city of Hamilton be installing traffic lights on both Cline and Dow Ave.?
- How will the Applicant reconcile the fact that proposed development assumes the residents will use bikes as a mode of transportation when there is a significant lack of bike lanes on Main St? Since there are no immediate plans to develop new bike lanes by the City, how will the safety be assured?
- How many mature trees can be preserved?
- This question is for Mr. Falletta: In slide 1.4, you referred to this plan area of mixed use being for 6-8 storeys, which seems far more reasonable. How can 15 storeys fit here?
- Being an owner of 3 homes on Dow. Comment on the sewage please. We are all having back up issues because there is only one line. This building would add to the problem.
- What steps are included in the proposed development to make it consistent with the city council's declaration of a climate emergency and its commitment to net zero greenhouse gas emissions from Hamilton by 2050? For example, are the parking spots to allow installing charging stations for electric cars?

**RESPONSE:**

- It is our understanding that the property will be assessed like all other mixed use buildings.
- The revised proposal includes a large 158 square metre (1,700 square feet) indoor amenity area space that can be utilized for a community room/party room for the residents of the building.
- The City's Zoning By-law provides a parking ratio for local commercial uses in mixed-use buildings. These tend to be lower, since the uses are typically utilized by neighbourhood residents that walk.
- The application included the submission of a tree protection plan, which identified existing tree resources on site and within the abutting right of ways as well as a plan for their protection. Existing trees in the centre of the site are proposed to be replaced as part of the redevelopment.
- Redevelopment of lands within the urban boundary and in an area well served by public transit provides a significant opportunity to reduce greenhouses gases. In addition, at the future site plan and building permit stages the detailed architectural plans will review the proposal and determine opportunities to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide charging stations.

**5.0 EVOLVING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

In the 10 months since the development application for the subject site was submitted, the Provincial Policy framework applicable to the subject site has been partially modified. In particular, a new Provincial Policy Statement (2020) and Growth Plan 2019 (as amended) were released and are now in full force and effect. The policy changes are addressed below.

*Provincial Policy Statement (2020)*

On February 28, 2020, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing released the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which came into effect on May 1, 2020 (the "2020 PPS") and replaces the Provincial Policy Statement (2014). In accordance with Section 3(5) of the *Planning Act*, all decisions that affect a planning matter are required to be consistent with the 2020 PPS.

As compared with the 2014 PPS, the 2020 PPS includes an increased emphasis on encouraging an increase in the mix and supply of housing, protecting the environment and public safety, reducing barriers and costs for development and providing greater certainty, and supporting the economy and job creation.

Policy 1.1.1 provides that healthy, liveable and safe communities are to be sustained by promoting efficient development and land use patterns; accommodating an appropriate affordable and market-based range and mix of residential types, employment, institutional, recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs; and promoting the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs.

Policy 1.1.3.2 supports densities and a mix of land uses which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities and which are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed. Policy 1.1.3.3 directs planning authorities to identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development, accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment, where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities.

Policy 1.4.3 requires provision to be made for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected market-based and affordable housing needs of current and future residents by, among other matters, permitting and facilitating all types of residential intensification and redevelopment; promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities and support the use of active transportation and transit; and requiring transit-supportive development and prioritizing intensification in proximity to transit, including corridors and stations.

Policy 1.7.1 of the PPS states that long-term prosperity should be supported through a number of initiatives including: encouraging residential uses to respond to dynamic market-based needs and provide necessary housing supply and a range of housing options for a diverse workforce; optimizing the use of land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities; maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and mainstreets; and encouraging a sense of place by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning.

In our opinion, the proposed development is consistent with the 2020 PPS.

*The Growth Plan For the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019, as amended)*

On May 16, 2019, a new Growth Plan (A Place to Grow: The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe) came into effect, replacing the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017. Subsequently, on August 28, 2020, the Growth Plan was amended by Growth Plan Amendment No. 1.

While the amendments includes changes to the population and employment forecasts, the horizon year of planning and makes a number of other more technical changes, it does not change the Growth Plan conformity analysis completed in our February 2020 Planning and Urban Design Rationale report and remains valid.

## **6.0 CONCLUSION**

Subject to the additional analysis and opinion provided above, the findings set out in our Planning and Urban Design Rationale report dated February 2020 are still relevant and applicable to the revised design, and as a result, it is our opinion that the proposed development, as revised, continues to be appropriate and desirable in land use planning and urban design terms. Therefore, recommend approval of the Official Plan Amendment and rezoning application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bousfields Inc.



David Falletta, MCIP, RPP

DF:jb/jobs

Cc: 1107 Main Inc c/o Darryl Firsten  
A. Dear, City of Hamilton  
S. McKie, City of Hamilton  
Srm Architects c/o Marc Villemaire