

6.4(a)(ii)

UHOPA-17-027; ZAC-17-063 comments after staff report:

RE: health and safety, and structural concerns

I'd like to point out that sunlight is not only important for the physical body due to heat and vitamin D; but sunlight is also important for mental health, as anyone with any degree of Seasonal Affective Disorder can attest to, and as can anyone whose mood and sleep cycles rely on adequate sunlight.

Glass has fallen out of the exterior walls of already-built highrises before, and, if I'm not mistaken, has also fallen out Jackson Square; so I am concerned the whole Television City project is a health and safety risk.

Two-level underground parking already runs under 95 Hess Street S. and 181 Jackson Street W. with no separation between the addresses. Television City wants to add six levels under their towers. Is there a requirement that there be a minimum amount of soil per unit of measurement surrounding building foundations? What could happen with too little soil?

RE: privacy

Even if there are no balconies on any of the towers but all the walls are made of windows, there is still a lack of privacy all the way around. For example, when I stand on my balcony, I can see people walking, and what they're wearing, from at least a block away. When I look towards and across Hunter Street because I want to see stars, moon, night skyline, and lights along the top of the escarpment, I can sometimes see colours of clothing in other people's apartments. Sometimes I can even see what they're doing in their apartments. A lot of apartment tenants in the area used to have drapes, and they used to put up Christmas lights. In recent years, possibly because the cost of using electricity has increased in price, the use of Christmas lights has decreased and so has the use of drapes. This is not a big deal here because of how far apart the apartment buildings are.

But, Television City, wanting to put windows on the sides of its towers just a small number of metres away from other apartments, should have to mandatorily install drapes and mandatorily keep all drapes closed at all times to avoid invading the privacy of those who already live just a small number of metres away. If the people inside the condo towers don't like what closed drapes do to their view, they will have a better understanding of what Television City's towers will be doing to the people who live just a small number of metres away.

RE: policy that affordable housing and housing with supports shall be encouraged

There are about 6,000 on the Hamilton waiting list for affordable housing, but with prices at Television City almost \$250,000 for just a studio, and up to almost 1.5 million for others, there is nothing affordable in this development. Instead, prices like Television City's say: rich, elite few, out of reach of Hamilton's needs. What it does not say is: social responsibility, care, and wanting to help Hamilton's needy people who need a place to live.

RE: the publicly accessible but privately owned outdoor seating court and patio area

How long will it be publicly accessible? At what point will Television City decide it no longer wants the public using it and makes it part of their gated community? The small stones they have

surrounding their sign on Jackson Street W. repeatedly end up on the sidewalk. When I complained to the sales staff about it, because a woman in front of me was having trouble on it with her walker, one of the first things the staff brought up was talking to the landscaper, and blamed the locals with dogs for allowing their dogs to use the stones as a toilet and do what dogs do to try to cover up their waste. I couldn't believe it when the staff brought up talking to the landscaper before he said he could sweep the sidewalk. I got the impression that taking care of the sidewalk in front of their own property was an afterthought. Seriously, a landscaper about stones on the sidewalk? No wonder the stones had stayed on the sidewalk for weeks with no attempt to be cleaned up before I complained on behalf of someone else (who couldn't get into the sales centre because it is not accessible to anyone who cannot walk up the stairs). I'm not saying it's okay to let dogs use other people's property as a toilet – it's not, and owners should be responsible for what their dogs do -, but the lack of accessibility to the Television City's sales centre and the lack of responsibility for the appearance of the *sidewalk* in front of their own building made me wonder how cooperative Television City and its staff and residents want to be, or if they're going to try to get rid of locals so they can have more people like themselves.

RE: noise

While a noise study is required to determine what noise owners/lease-holders of Television City condos would experience, is there a noise study also required to determine how much noise Television City will make against surrounding residents with construction, people – especially children and unconcerned guests – using the outdoor pool and/or level two outdoor amenity terrace at who-know-what hours, dogs that may bark long and loud at any hour outdoors, and the echo those noises will produce because they will so loudly hit, bounce off, and disperse loudly and even more to buildings so close? Or will Television City and its owners/lease-holders be allowed to be as irresponsible for their own behaviour as Metrolinx/GO transit wants to be for *its*?

RE: policy for strong pedestrian focus to create a comfortable and animated pedestrian environment

How comfortable do you think pedestrians will be with as many more drivers as Television City would bring, especially before and after work, so close to where so many seniors and disabled already live? When the city put up new stop signs on Caroline at Jackson, drivers still blew right through without stopping, and, if I remember correctly, the house at the North West corner of Hunter and Caroline was hit TWICE by vehicles that collided when traffic in the area was increased.

RE: transportation and parking

As far as all the bike parking Television City is proposes to encourage bikes instead of vehicles, bikes rarely get ridden in any kind of bad weather but vehicles get driven in any kind of weather and bikes are hardly comparable with vehicles for distance, speed, comfort, and convenience. As someone who can hardly get anywhere without a bus, I know bikes will never be the comparative transportation alternative law-makers want to make it, and, considering most City councilors refused to use public transit when challenged to support it, public transit will never be as popular or likeable as private vehicles, no matter what planning policies try to do or how close they put public transit. So Television City will only increase vehicle traffic, and, after work, there is not enough parking space on surrounding streets to accommodate new vehicles Television City won't provide parking spots for.

RE: policy regarding new development/redevelopment eliminating street level parking lots along major streets

If there's a lot of development that eliminates street level parking, where are all the employees who come to work downtown going to park?

RE: design

The building design looks like it belongs on Toronto's Front Street, or maybe Hamilton's new waterfront, but not in an area with pre-existing character this building design essentially trashes.

RE: height

Lamb said he wants to have the tallest building in downtown Hamilton. I wonder what Freud would say about that.

I noticed that on page 9 of the DRP Visual Book (October 20 2017), it says, "The proposed towers are designed to MINIMIZE sky views". They certainly would minimize any view of the sky and the ability to see anything in the sky.

Even if the city approves 30-storey buildings, it should be noted that the higher-than average ceiling height of each story that Television City is advertising (and has already sold some of) likely brings the height of each tower to about 33 to 44 average-height storeys and not just 30 and 40 as they claim. If the storeys they claim do not include the commercial base, the towers will likely be even higher than 33 to 44 storeys.

A public comment in the staff report appendix points out that a convenience store in one of the promotional pictures has been removed and replaced. As seen in other promotional pictures, liberties have been taken to where they no longer reflect reality. For example, the apartment building between the proposed 30-storey tower and Jackson Street W. has been reduced by almost half the number of floors, making the Television City towers look not as high and overbearing. However, when promotional materials don't reflect reality, I have to wonder what else from the company isn't being truthful.

RE: unacceptable views

Page 7 of the DRP Visual Book (October 20 2017) says, "In our opinion, the proposal does not create any unacceptable impacts to views of the escarpment or any other 'key views'".

Seriously? They can imagine a whole bunch of positive images to sell their condos and try to get their applications approved so they can get what they want, but they can't (or refuse to admit they do) foresee how they're monstrosity will negatively impact the rest of the area? Apparently, they have failed to see their monstrosity from the perspective of anyone but themselves, and what they have seen has been only what they want to see. I am compiling some images of Television City's unacceptable impacts to views and will submit them the night of March 19.

Thank you for continuing to invite public input.

181 Jackson Street West