

**From:** ]

**Sent:** May-15-17 9:37 AM

**To:** Bedioui, Ida; AH

**Subject:** Fw: All Accessible Hamilton Harbour Concerns May 14, 2017

**Subject:** All Accessible Hamilton Harbour Concerns May 14, 2017

Hello to Ida Bedioui. I hope all is well. I cannot be at the meeting, so please accept this as my written submission.

Take care, peace, Susan

I am not in favour of these changes as I really do not want the North End/Harbour to change. It is lovely as it is and has a wonderful ambiance. To add in so much more development will make it more dangerous for the families and folks who already live there. I have been speaking to other businesses and organizations in the area too.

In short, Accessible Hamilton was formed in part to give voice to concerns about over-development as well as the need for any new development to be fully accessible. The current Harbour/North End designs are not accessible – none of the plans have any sort of ‘universal/accessible/barrier-free’ concepts.

Accessible Hamilton is supported by Mayor Fred, Aidan Johnson and Chris Cutler of the Mayor’s office. Accessible Hamilton is also supported by Craig Burley, a local lawyer as well as other various individuals and groups. MP Filomena Tassi is interested as well.

I will not share the other (Accessible Hamilton legal) details now as they have already been shared with the pertinent individuals and are not necessary herein.

**And, pg. 58. the comments about inclusionary zoning; That means developers will just build what they want without consideration for the low income/rgi tenants and then just ask for forgiveness. None of the units are adapted either from what I can read:**

With respect to the development application, there is currently no legal mechanism within which a Zoning By-law can mandate the inclusion of affordable housing. While it is understood that amendments to the necessary Provincial Acts to implement Inclusionary Zoning have received Royal Assent, the framework and associated draft Regulations have yet to be released by the Province. The timing in which to adopt an inclusionary zoning framework therefore do not permit the contemplation of inclusionary

zoning regulations within this report. However, should Council of the City of Hamilton and pg. 59 -

The community also raised the concern that relying on the Ontario Building Code to enforce minimum standards was insufficient to appropriately accommodate potential future residents with accessibility requirements, a situation even more challenging if those residents were also seeking affordable units.

Similar to the discussion on affordable housing, Staff note that detailed accessibility standards are typically beyond the function of a zoning by-law. However, should accessibility measures be required and implemented through the process, then this would need to be established through the disposition strategy as it pertains to the blocks zoned for development. Through the procurement process, criteria may include the requirement to satisfy the City's own Accessibility Guidelines, which are above and beyond the minimum requirements detailed within the Ontario Building Code. Should commitment to these higher standards be made, they will be secured at the site plan control stage.

These changes are too much, too big and take away from the ambiance of the Harbour. They are a legacy project on the backs of the poor, as the LRT is.

None of the designs are accessible/universal/barrier free at all. I asked the Brooke McIlroy at a planning meeting what their universal/barrier free design experience is and they had none. If the development goes through the City needs to hire Brad McCannell who works with the Rick Hansen Foundation 'Access for All' Program which ensures that all public spaces will be barrier free.

Accessible Hamilton has Mayor Fred's support, Aidan Johnson, Chris Cutler and others.

So some questions about the Harbour; where is McDonald Marina?

It is a bit distressing that the City is the owner of the lands as well as putting out the RFP's.

I also agree with Harbour West Neighbours that the Harbour should be a place of rest and relaxation, not Toronto style condos and restaurants that no one can afford.

<http://www.harbourwestneighbours.ca/>

Some Accessible Hamilton goals;

‘Accessible Hamilton’

Hello, my Canada 150 idea is to create an advocacy group called ‘Accessible Hamilton’. I hope to make Hamilton truly accessible for all as it is not now. There are some well-designed places, but there are some that are not.

One focus of the group is to ensure that all areas in Hamilton are fully accessible and do more than just meet the basic AODA building code. The objective is for the whole City to be completely barrier free, in attitude and design. I am especially concerned about the Harbour redevelopment. I think the 15% inclusive housing should be more than that. I also think the Harbour City Housing redevelopment and/or new build should include accessible units.

Another goal of my advocacy group would be to ensure that any and all further development in the City and area is accessible, disability friendly, safe for pedestrians and people with mobility issues. I would require funds for advertising, media promotion, webpage, etc. Rick Hansen has a great program called ‘Access for All’. Rick Hansen’s charity also uses the services of an ‘Accessible/Universal Design’ planner for the Vancouver airport. The Vancouver airport architect is Brad McCannell.

‘...Brook McIlroy was retained in December 2014 to conduct the Pier 8 Urban Design Study. The scope of this study includes Pier 7 in order to reference and build upon the vision, land uses and Urban Design Study that was already developed through the West Harbour Recreation Master Plan for Pier 7. The overall character and connectivity of Pier 7 is referenced throughout the Pier 7 and 8 Urban Design Study to ensure that the future character of Pier 8 is compatible with what has been proposed for Pier 7 and to recognize the Urban Design Study that was already completed through the...’.

and; the issue with this is citizens with Disabilities;

The proposal satisfies Policy 2.2.3.6, and promotes and facilitates intensification with an appropriate built-form, height, scale, density, and type of development that appropriately complements adjacent land uses. The proposal includes an appropriate transition and variety of built for. The development concept of the lands is intended to reduce dependence on the automobile through its development as a mixed use, transit supportive, pedestrian friendly environment. The concept achieves the objective to develop as a complete community given the mix of land uses, range and mix of employment and housing types, high quality open space, and convenient access to

local stores and services.

**OTHER ISSUES: No one has talked about how DARTS or other adapted vehicles will get through development.**

Urban Design Study – not accessible/barrier free/universal design

In accordance with Policy A.6.3.8.9.4, the City completed an Urban Design Study which provided a finer grain analysis of such matters as height, massing and character of new buildings, and the appropriate physical relationship between buildings and public open spaces. The study integrated with the Urban Design Guidelines previously completed for Pier 7, which is contained within Appendix “I” to report PED17074.

**Design Review panel has no teeth and does not have a disabled citizen on it as far as I can tell Staff note that the City has conducted numerous public engagement opportunities and created a plan for continued engagement that included the review of the development**

application process. Should the zoning be approved, the development will also be reviewed prior to the Site Plan stage by Hamilton’s Design Review Panel and additional public input will be sought with regard to the design of the public spaces (to be conducted by the Waterfront Office). This, in addition to the Draft Plan of Subdivision conditions relating to control architects being required through construction, will ensure design excellence is achieved. The control architect and review by the City’s Design Review Panel is secured through Conditions 36 and 38 in Appendix “C” to Report

**And; No one has actually said what ‘affordable’ housing is and how it will be maintained. The first ‘affordable homeowner’ who sells will have their unit bought by an investor.**

**Inclusion of affordable housing. Although not secured as part of the Zoning By-Law,**

**the inclusion of affordable housing within the development was raised on numerous**

**occasions through the public engagement process. This requirement (of 5% affordable home ownership) has been secured through the Solicitation Process, discussed in greater detail under the affordable housing heading later in this report.**

***Roundabouts are dangerous for pedestrians and people with mobility devices!!!! Ancaster has trees in their roundabouts and no one can safely see around them!***

**Bad design choice:** Discriminatory! – how will someone with an adapted vehicle get service? How will citizens with disabilities/mobility issues who use their own vehicles get their groceries?

### Prohibited Uses

Understanding the intent to foster a pedestrian friendly environment, the implementing By-law prohibits a number of uses that are considered particularly auto-centric and which could potentially limit the pedestrian focus, including but not limited to drivethrough facilities, motor vehicle collision repair establishments and motor vehicle service stations.

(3) The report recognized the role of the North End neighbourhood as a special place, an identified child and family friendly neighbourhood and that what is done with streets plays a significant role in that character. As the developer of the next major project in our neighbourhood, the way in which the City's development on Pier 8 plays a role in substaining that character should be an integral part of your report. For example, how will the City's development aide in the retention of schools and recreational facilities? How will it aid in retaining the mixture of incomes, employment, social and family status that now make the North End neighbourhood such a case study for an inclusionary community? Those questions can be asked of the increase in commercial, a thought that crossed my mind as I counted the number of vacant stores on Locke Street today and recalled our Mayor's statement that Hess Village was coming to the foot of James Street and we should be prepared for it

Other concerns expressed by HWN –

I agree. The North End should not be turned into Hess Village – a scary place that I avoid now. So, if those sorts of noisy and scary restaurants come to the North End, the neighbours will suffer more. Sarcoa is already being a very, very bad neighbour. I have never eaten there as I cannot possibly afford it, nor do I want to support a business which is a bad corporate neighbour. I have a BA01 (double major Psychology and Theatre Arts from Redeemer University College and an Event and Conference management certificate from Mohawk College.). I have my Food Handler as well as Smartserv. Smartserv states quite specifically that if any establishment allows someone to drive drunk and does not take appropriate measures to ensure a patron does not become drunk, they are liable for any accident or injuries that can happen. That means that since the local neighbours are already complaining about Sarcoa's patron's being drunk and peeing all over the place, Sarcoa is also breaking the law every time they let a drunk patron leave and drive.

People throughout Hamilton should be concerned with the problems the North End neighbourhood is facing. The City is the largest landowner in our neighbourhood. It is also the largest developer in our neighbourhood. And it is the land use regulator – setting the rules by which real estate, including its own real estate can be developed. This conflict of interest is severe, not dealt with in the Phillips Plan, and something that creates a huge burden for the neighbourhood to deal with.

and;

pg. 153.

**and ongoing concerns about rgi, affordable, etc. Not set so developers will use that as a loophole to not build to start.**

while the Urban Design Study promotes the development of an accessible, inclusive community, the specific question of where and how affordable housing might be provided is not within the scope of urban design, and will be addressed as part of the real estate disposition strategy. Secondary Plan policies contained in the Working Group Vision (items vi, vii, and viii above) require this consideration for all publicly owned lands within the West Harbour area.

The Urban Design Study does not preclude the provision of affordable housing on Piers 7 and 8, and notes that the specific provision of affordable housing units remains to be determined: *“Following the approval of this Urban Design Study a number of elements that came up through the consultation process will need to be addressed in implementation. Elements that require additional study and direction include: An approach to affordable housing for Pier 7 + 8 including a recommendation for preferred unit sizes and mixes that would fit within the building envelopes established by this Urban Design Study.”* (Report page 96)

**pg. 178.**

Recreation Planning – Community

re:

**LASTLY: So again, developers will come in and say they will build and then the height will go ‘up’ to accommodate something that should not be built. Then they will ask forgiveness for displacing lower income people as they already are in the North End. I really am so sad about the changes and the gentrification. I am also a Speaker with the HRPR (Speak Now) group that advocates for the disabled and with experience of poverty. I write op/ed pieces about disability related issues as well as writing for LinkedIn and the Mohawk College alumni blog.**

**And, pg. 58. the comments about inclusionary zoning**

**With respect to the development application, there is currently no legal mechanism within which a Zoning By-law can mandate the inclusion of affordable housing. While it is understood that amendments to the necessary Provincial Acts to implement Inclusionary Zoning have received Royal Assent, the framework and associated draft Regulations have yet to be released by the Province. The timing in which to adopt an inclusionary zoning framework therefore do not permit the contemplation of inclusionary zoning regulations within this report. However, should Council of the City of Hamilton**

**and pg. 59 -**

**The community also raised the concern that relying on the Ontario Building Code to enforce minimum standards was insufficient to appropriately accommodate potential future residents with accessibility requirements, a situation even more challenging if those residents were also seeking affordable units.**

**Similar to the discussion on affordable housing, Staff note that detailed accessibility standards are typically beyond the function of a zoning by-law. However, should accessibility measures be required and implemented through the process, then this would need to be established through the disposition strategy as it pertains to the blocks zoned for development. Through the procurement process, criteria may include the requirement to satisfy the City's own Accessibility Guidelines, which are above and beyond the minimum requirements detailed within the Ontario Building Code. Should commitment to these higher standards be made, they will be secured at the site plan control stage.**

**Tuesday May 16** - The Planning Committee will consider the Pier 8 zoning and subdivision application at a Public Meeting at 9:30 am in Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor at 71 Main St. W., Hamilton. Members of the public are invited to attend the Public Meeting and present their views regarding the proposal or submit written comments to [Ida Bedioui](#), the Co-ordinator of the Planning Committee, before noon on Monday May 15, 2017.

my contact details;

Susan J. Creer bio

S. J. Creer. B.A. Susan has been volunteering since she was a teen. She is a strong leader and community advocate with a focus on disability, poverty and accessibility. Her background includes professional speaking, theatre (professional and community), writing (op/ed, Mohawk alumni blog, LinkedIn), teaching and event planning. Susan is a Toastmaster International public speaking club member. She currently works teaching acting to youth and is a speaker with Speak Now, the HRPR Speaker's bureau. Susan's B.A. 01 is from Redeemer University College (Double Major Psychology and Theatre Arts). Susan also has an Event and Conference Management Certificate '12 is from Mohawk College in Hamilton. Susan is also an Associate member of the Routes Youth Centre in Dundas and a member at the Ainslie Wood Community Group.

---