

Resident Comments	Response
<p><b>A summary of all comments received since the October 2017 – March 2018 release of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law</b></p> <p><b>A. Connelly December 9, 2017</b></p> <p>I am writing to voice my concern over the proposal to amend the zoning in the Downtown Secondary Plan that allows 30 story towers to be built without community consultation. I am a resident of the North End, I have worked at the Central Library, and my son attends daycare at the Jamesville Children's Centre. I and my family spend a lot of time in the downtown area, particularly along James North. I am concerned with how this zoning change will affect the character of downtown Hamilton, and the folks who live, own businesses, and work in this area.</p> <p>Clearly Hamilton is experiencing a period of growth, and now is an opportunity to make smart plans for the future that allow all Hamiltonians to benefit from increased resources coming into our city. Working at the Central Library provided an incredible opportunity to interact with the folks who live and work in the area, and to see the growing disparity between folks with money and folks without, folks with housing and folks without,</p> <p>I worry about the ways that increased condo towers in the neighbourhood will affect the folks using the Sally Ann and Mission Services, as well as Wesley's services in the area. I worry about small business owners being pushed out, and current residents (especially renters - rents are out of control in this town all ready!) I worry about more galleries closing, more arts spaces not being able to afford renting in the downtown area. I am not opposed to condos on principle, and I think that planning for increased housing, and density in cities is important, but only if they are well built, mixed use and mixed income (and provide affordable housing), and part of a plan that takes the long-term future into consideration. I want to raise my son in a Hamilton that is diverse, that has a strong sense of community, that supports residents and small business owners, that fosters art, and that champions our heritage and history – through architecture, through memory of the working class history of this town. I want to live in a city that supports children and families through resources, services, rec centres, schools and libraries. And I don't want long-time residents pushed out!</p> <p>As my representative on Council I am asking you to vote against this amendment and too retain the 12 story limit on new developments.</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implements these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.</p>
<p><b>C. Maxwell/M. Simunovic – December 8, 2017</b></p> <p>Dear City Staff, Councilor Farr and Neighborhood Association Representatives:</p> <p>Together with my partner, Colina Maxwell, we have purchased and renovated four buildings in the downtown core – 173 James north (Centre 3 – originally The Print Studio), 126/128 James N (community arts/two forprofit store fronts), 110 Catherine street N (Threshold School of Building), 121 Hughson North (Spice Factory).</p>	<p>Revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan reinforce the importance of appropriate transition and integration into an existing area. All applications will be required to present to the Design Review Panel and must consider the comments in the design of buildings. Additional measures have been</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>We have seen many changes in our short 15 years associated with the core. Our main interest in purchasing physical spaces downtown was, and still is, to promote art and culture for ourselves and the wider community. Together with 3 other arts groups, The Print Studio helped initiate the Art Crawl ~ 11 years ago. We have always appreciated that there were many people living and working downtown for decades before we had the good fortune of integrating into the core, that there will be many people who will live and work in the downtown core after us, and we appreciate that our time on this earth is brief.</p> <p>So in our minds the main question is the following – what sort of a downtown core do we wish to leave for future generations – to be enjoyed by those who live and work downtown, and those who will come to visit or shop. I do think that replicating downtown Toronto is a poor solution – tall glass-covered condo towers geared towards singles or at most couples – with few families, and soulless streetscapes that prevent you from realizing you are in Hamilton, and not Toronto or New York. Encouraging condominiums built with a 30- year obsolescence horizon, and future problems that are not owned in any way by the builder, but rather downloaded onto naïve purchasers is the likely result of current city plans. We would prefer a core with more communal spaces and services; one that makes art and culture more, not less, accessible; and one that better balances the need for economic growth with the importance of preservation and quality of life.</p> <p>I hope that city staff will be allowed by key stakeholders to continue using their creativity, skills, and passions to keep moving The Hammer in an interesting direction for all Hamiltonians.</p>	<p>The Vision for Downtown states that: The Downtown Hamilton of the future shall be a vibrant focus of attraction where all ages, abilities, and incomes can live, work, learn, shop, and play. The future Downtown shall be a healthy, safe, comfortable, accessible, and prosperous community that promotes a high quality of life. It will combine the best of our heritage with new concepts and designs while seamlessly linking together the Downtown, surrounding neighbourhoods, the Waterfront, and the Escarpment.” (Policy 6.1.1.)</p>
<p><b>D. Akrey December 8, 2017</b></p> <p>Dear City Staff, Councillor Farr and Neighbourhood Association Representatives:</p> <p>I love Downtown Hamilton and appreciate the need to build upon the optimism and economic and housing boost from the last few years. We have a wonderfully creative, resilient and diverse downtown that encourages community and opportunity. I don't agree with the recent zoning amendment to the Downtown Secondary Plan to allow for 30 story buildings with no community consultation. The downtown should</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic,</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>maintain a maximum height of 12 stories. This will allow for growth at a rate the community can handle. This is the fairest solution. I am concerned about the following issues in terms of the community, and because they affect me personally:</p> <p>PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HOMES AND SMALL BUSINESSES due to high property taxes based on 30+ stories, skyrocketing rents and construction noise. This will impact most people especially those in the newly zoned areas and the most marginalized. This will affect me personally as well.</p> <p>SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES CLOSING due to lack of family units built in new developments. This will affect my family.</p> <p>INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND MORE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS. LRT is a great idea but it won't be enough. Hamilton has already recognized it has a problem regarding traffic safety and the new zoning and extreme population growth will make things worse. I value my safety and that of my community.</p> <p>LOSS OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS ==I mean---come on!!!?? What will happen to heritage buildings if the new zoning recommendations are approved? I appreciate the value they add to the city.</p> <p>LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY for all but those with most resources at the expense of everyone else. I want to be able to prosper in Hamilton and to contribute to my community and want everyone to feel they can do the same. Please please think on this.</p> <p>Not everyone can afford what you can!</p> <p>I am a coming on 6years now here---feel it as my new home---and it makes me cry when I consider that this will all go to the highest bidder. I don't understand why the powers that be don't invest in the soul of the city.</p> <p>It seems it is all just following Toronto. Feels like so many missed opportunities and just a drive towards what will make money. Hamilton is unique----please----don't ruin it!</p> <p>Thank you for your time and please keep me posted,</p>	<p>Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been</p>
<p><b>D. Horne December 8, 2017</b></p> <p>Good Morning,</p> <p>I am writing to voice my opinion and objections to the changes in the downtown secondary</p>	<p>Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>plan.</p> <p>I specifically object to the change from 12 storeys to 30 (presumably 30+) storey structures towering over our downtown. The impact to our skyline, our heritage buildings, small businesses and homes (!!!) will be immense. Rents will skyrocket- soon, we'll be in a situation like Toronto with traffic jams, cookie cutter franchises and all of the originality, heart and grit of our fantastic downtown will be erased.</p> <p>This change is not one that keeps with 'Putting People First'. I want my Hamilton to be inclusive and innovative. Creative and welcoming- not concrete and faceless corporations.</p> <p>Please reconsider these changes. Our community begs you.</p>	<p>approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.</p> <p>The revised Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan is clear that while high-rise development is permitted in identified locations, it is not appropriate in every location or on every site identified. While the plan does permit heights of up to 30 storeys it will be the applicants responsibility to demonstrate how the transition in scale, public realm, context and fit policies have been achieved. The new policies also establish the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum permitted height, which has been reinforced by the implementing Zoning By-law.</p>
<p><b>J. Cantar December 9, 2017</b></p> <p>Dear City Staff, Councillor Farr, and Neighbourhood Association Representatives,</p> <p>I have lived and worked in Downtown Hamilton my whole life. I grew up in Strathcona and as an adult have always lived in Durand. While I appreciate the need to build up the core and boost our economic profile to accommodate growth, I believe as a city, we need to grow what we already have: a wonderfully creative, resilient, and diverse downtown that encourages community and opportunity. I don't agree with the recent zoning amendment to the Downtown Secondary Plan to allow for 30 story buildings with no community consultation. The downtown should maintain a maximum height of 12 stories. This will allow for growth at a rate the community can handle. This is the fairest and most sensible solution.</p> <p>I am concerned about the following issues in terms of the community, and because they affect me personally:</p> <p><b>PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HOMES AND SMALL BUSINESSES due to high property taxes</b></p>	<p>Consultation for the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan review has occurred throughout the process. In total, there have been 33 consultation events. Releasing the draft documents throughout the process has provided for a fulsome consultation process and has resulted in a number of revisions to the plan. The release of the drafts in October was an additional opportunity for the public and stakeholders to review and provide feedback prior to the plan going to Planning Committee and Council.</p> <p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>based on 30+ stories, skyrocketing rents, impaired exposure to sunlight, horrendous and prolonged construction noise/pollution and therefore decreased reasonable enjoyment. This will impact especially those in the newly zoned areas and the most marginalized. This will affect me personally as well. Of particular note is the proposed Television City project.</p> <p>LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY for all but those with most resources at the expense of everyone else. I want to be able to prosper in Hamilton and to contribute to my community and want everyone to feel they can do the same.</p> <p>LOSS OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS. What will happen to heritage buildings if the new zoning recommendations are approved? I appreciate the value they add to the city.</p> <p>SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES CLOSING due to lack of family units built in new developments.</p> <p>INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION, AIR POLLUTION AND ACCIDENTS. While I endorse the LRT, it simply will not be a solution in and of itself to address these concerns. Hamilton has already recognized problems regarding traffic safety. The new zoning and extreme population density without addressing traffic flow and infrastructure is nearsighted at best and disastrous at worst. I value my safety and that of my community. Furthermore, pollution and air quality is a huge concern for myself as a pedestrian and cyclist. Again, the current monstrous Television City proposal is of particular concern to me in this regard, living just off Queen St, which is already well used and congested at times.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implements these policies.</p> <p>Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.</p>
<p><b>J. Huffa December 8, 2017</b></p>	<p>Consultation for the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan review has occurred throughout the process. In total, there have been 33 consultation events. Releasing the draft documents throughout the process has provided for a fulsome consultation process and has resulted in a number of revisions to the plan. The release of the drafts in October was an additional opportunity for the public and stakeholders to review and provide feedback</p>
<p>Dear City Staff, Councillor Farr and Neighbourhood Association Representatives:</p> <p>I love Downtown Hamilton and appreciate the need to build upon the optimism and economic and housing boost from the last few years. We have a wonderfully creative, resilient and diverse downtown that encourages community and opportunity.</p> <p>I don't agree with the recent zoning amendment to the Downtown Secondary Plan to allow for 30 story buildings with no community consultation. The downtown should maintain a maximum height of 12 stories. This will allow for growth at a rate the community can handle. This is the fairest solution. I am concerned about the following issues in terms of the community, and</p>	

Resident Comments	Response
<p>because they affect me personally:</p> <p>PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HOMES AND SMALL BUSINESSES due to high property taxes based on 30+ stories, skyrocketing rents and construction noise. This will impact most people especially those in newly zoned areas and the most marginalized. This will affect me personally as well.</p> <p>SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES CLOSING due to lack of family units built in new developments. This will affect my family.</p> <p>INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND MORE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS. LRT is a great idea but it won't be enough. Hamilton has already recognized it has a problem regarding traffic safety and the new zoning and extreme population growth will make things worse. I value my safety and that of my community.</p> <p>LOSS OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS What will happen to heritage buildings if the new zoning recommendations are approved? I appreciate the value they add to the city.</p> <p>LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY for all but those with most resources at the expense of everyone else. I want to be able to prosper in Hamilton and to contribute to my community and want everyone to feel they can do the same.</p> <p>Finally, I am expecting in the future greater transparency and effort can be implemented in letting the public know about issues that directly affect them.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and please keep me posted,</p>	<p>prior to the plan going to Planning Committee and Council.</p> <p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implements these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.</p>
<p><b>J. Leach November 2, 2017</b></p>	
<p>Hello,</p> <p>I would like to add my feedback on the tall buildings study currently underway.</p> <p>- very much agree with the importance being placed on sidewalk/street interaction. This is one of the biggest keys to vibrant city-building. A walk through NYC is all one needs to do to realize that sidewalk interaction is what matters, not height.</p>	<p>The Niagara Escarpment is a very important natural heritage feature that frames the Downtown. While buildings existing that exceed the height of the Niagara Escarpment it has been reiterated that the Niagara Escarpment is a defining feature that should be protected.</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>- very much agree with architectural treatment of rooftops and hiding mechanical penthouses</p> <p>- agree with limiting shade during the spring/summer on parks/public outdoor plazas</p> <p>- shadows on the roadway aren't a concern in my opinion and shouldn't hinder development</p> <p>- disagree with height lower than the escarpment face. We already have building higher than this, and there are many buildings ON TOP OF the escarpment. It's not a wild, protected nature preserve. It's part of our urban city. We've had buildings taller than the escarpment for decades and it hasn't bothered anyone.</p> <p>- I would like to see encouragement for a central cluster of 'new tallest' buildings being promoted in the core downtown area. Buildings from the 1970's remaining our tallest landmarks is pretty bad in 2017. Like it or not, skylines tell a story about when a city was prosperous in our North American context.</p> <p>- developers are able to offer entry-level pricing in taller buildings due to the economy of scale. Building mandated to be shorter result in higher prices per unit. This flies in the face of our city-building goals of encouraging housing for all walks of life. - we only have a small area to go tall in Hamilton...let's encourage some landmark new towers, not stifle development and limit housing choices.</p> <p>Many thanks!</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implements these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development</p>
<p><b>J. Owen December 9, 2017</b></p> <p>The building that I own stands at the corner of Wilson and Catharine Street. It has been here for more than 200 years ! It and the many old buildings on this block represent much of the evolution of this city's history and need to be protected and cherished by the community. The block contains a charming mix of big homes, workers cottages and small businesses plus a church . There are even, lawns, gardens, and a number of large trees on Catharine St. Seems like a nice street to walk a dog or stroll with a child .</p> <p>&gt; A well travelled friend of mine who has lived in many major cities in the United States , Europe , and Mexico , said she thought Hamilton was very picturesque and reminded her of Prague! She also informed me when ,she heard birds singing outside my building , " Because of pollution there are no longer any birds left in Mexico City ! None ! "</p> <p>&gt; My building know as Hughson House is ,I'm sure , the oldest building in the city . Built in part well before the War of 1812. It was the original farmhouse of Nathaniel Hughson Senior the</p>	

**Resident Comments**

co-founder of Hamilton . Hughson owned the farm from King St to the bay and George Hamilton owned a farm from King St to the escarpment . Together they proposed the first planned community in Canada . The house was hand built of stone, brick , and wood all gathered on site. It was home to his wife Rebecca Land (Rebecca St.) and their four children . His oldest son was James which is where James St gets its name . The house is so early it pre-dates roads ! At that time, Wilson , John and King St. didn't have names but were Indian trails. It is my understanding that a building this old in a downtown core of any major city in North America , is extremely rare ! Many communities first buildings were built of wood and frequently destroyed by fires before they were rebuilt in stone or brick . Both Toronto and Hamilton had such fires but Hughson House was already brick and was outside the city centre of King and James where the fires occurred. The earliest buildings in the centre of Toronto if not destroyed by fire were long ago removed to make way for office towers .

> I've done extensive research on this house and area . For the last decade I have been carefully preserving the interior of the building and in the future hope to restore the original appearance of the exterior . I also plan to share my findings with the local community in the coming years .  
> > Why do people move to Hamilton?  
> > I decided to buy in Hamilton in 2004 .

> It was not for the condo towers ! It was more about the scale of the buildings and the livability of the city .

> If you enter the city via York Boulevard one sees picturesque water and trees , it looks rural . Visit the Waterfront park at the base of Hughson St. and look around . It feels like you are in cottage country as apposed to a city . I believe it is the absents of towers that make Hamilton attractive .

> The city needs human scale development not towers .

> One only needs to look at Toronto News to see the problems with building up. How a fire in one unit can cause such stress for so many . Frequent reports of glass or ice falling from tall buildings can result in streets to be temporarily closed. In this time of global warming , extreme weather can produce blackouts and floods ,rendering these structures ,with their air conditioning and elevators, basically uninhabitable. Segregating the wealthy folks into glass fortresses is not healthy for anyone . And then there is the Toronto traffic congestion . As a friend of mine said " poverty is not the problem , wealth is the problem ! We are using up vast amounts of resources , fuelling our monster cars , monster trucks and monster houses."

> I would encourage city planners to remember , like so much of life, "Everything in

**Response**

applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.

Heights have changed along Cannon Street and along parts of Wilson Street to address the appropriate transition to abutting low density residential and low-rise built form. Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study. The revised Plan establishes more criteria for buildings to be evaluated against, such as shadow impact, wind impact and visual impact and establishes the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum threshold for height, which is further implemented by the Zoning By-law.



Resident Comments	Response
<p>Moderation"</p> <p><b>K. Archibald December 8, 2017</b></p> <p>Dear City Staff, Councillor Farr and Neighbourhood Association Representatives:</p> <p>I love Downtown Hamilton and appreciate the need to build upon the optimism and economic and housing boost from the last few years. We have a wonderfully creative, resilient and diverse downtown that encourages community and opportunity.</p> <p>I don't agree with the recent zoning amendment to the Downtown Secondary Plan to allow for 30 story buildings with no community consultation. The downtown should maintain a maximum height of 12 stories. This will allow for growth at a rate the community can handle. This is the fairest solution. I am concerned about the following issues in terms of the community, and because they affect me personally:</p> <p><b>PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HOMES AND SMALL BUSINESSES</b> due to high property taxes based on 30+ stories, skyrocketing rents and construction noise. This will impact most people especially those in the newly zoned areas and the most marginalized. This will affect me personally as well.</p> <p><b>SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES CLOSING</b> due to lack of family units built in new developments. This will affect my family.</p> <p><b>INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND MORE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS.</b> LRT is a great idea but it won't be enough. Hamilton has already recognized it has a problem regarding traffic safety and the new zoning and extreme population growth will make things worse. I value my safety and that of my community.</p> <p><b>LOSS OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS</b> What will happen to heritage buildings if the new zoning recommendations are approved? I appreciate the value they add to the city.</p> <p><b>LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY</b> for all but those with most resources at the expense of everyone else. I want to be able to prosper in Hamilton and to contribute to my community and want everyone to feel they can do the same.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and please keep me posted,</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implement these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p><b>K. de Jong December 8, 2017</b></p> <p>Dear City Staff, Councillor Farr and Neighbourhood Association Representatives:</p> <p>I have lived and worked in Downtown Hamilton for the majority of my life. While I appreciate the need to build up the core and boost our economic profile and accommodate growth, I believe as a city, we need to grow what we already have: a wonderfully creative, resilient and diverse downtown that encourages community and opportunity.</p> <p>I don't agree with the recent zoning amendment to the Downtown Secondary Plan to allow for 30 story buildings with no community consultation. The downtown should maintain a maximum height of 12 stories. This will allow for growth at a rate the community can handle. This is the fairest and most sensible solution.</p> <p>I am concerned about the following issues in terms of the community, and because they affect me personally:</p> <p><b>PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HOMES AND SMALL BUSINESSES</b> due to high property taxes based on 30+ stories, skyrocketing rents, impaired exposure to sunlight, horrendous and prolonged construction noise/pollution and therefore decreased reasonable enjoyment. This will impact especially those in the newly zoned areas and the most marginalized. This will affect me personally as well. Of particular note is the proposed <i>Television City project</i>.</p> <p><b>LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY</b> for all but those with most resources at the expense of everyone else. I want to be able to prosper in Hamilton and to contribute to my community and want everyone to feel they can do the same.</p> <p><b>LOSS OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS</b> What will happen to heritage buildings if the new zoning recommendations are approved? I appreciate the value they add to the city.</p> <p><b>SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES CLOSING</b> due to lack of family units built in new developments.</p> <p><b>INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION, AIR POLLUTION AND ACCIDENTS.</b> While I fully endorse the LRT, it simply will not be a solution in and of itself to address these concerns. Hamilton has already recognized problems regarding traffic safety. The new zoning and extreme population density without addressing traffic flow and infrastructure is nearsighted at best and disastrous at worst. I value my safety and that of my community.</p> <p>Furthermore, pollution and air quality is a huge concern for myself as a pedestrian and cyclist. Again, the current monstrous <i>Television City proposal</i> is of particular concern to me in this</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implement these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>regard, living just off of Queen st North, which is already well used and congested at times. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Please inform me of updates on this subject.</p> <p><b>M. Rozenberg December 9, 2017</b></p> <p>Dear City Staff, Councillor Farr and Rob Fiedler (Neighbourhood Association Representative):</p> <p>Hope you are all well and thank you for your time.</p> <p>I love Downtown Hamilton and appreciate the need to build upon the optimism and economic and housing boost from the last few years. We have a wonderfully creative, resilient and diverse downtown that encourages community and opportunity. Development is a part of this.</p> <p>I don't agree with the recent zoning amendment to the Downtown Secondary Plan to allow for 30 story buildings, towards the end of a years-long process, without more time for community consultation. The downtown should maintain a maximum height of 12 stories. This will allow for growth at a rate the community can handle. This is the fairest solution. The current map goes too far! According to the current proposal, half of the lion's share of downtown is slated to torn down and replaced with skyscrapers. I don't believe this is benefit to the community.</p> <p>I am concerned about the following issues in terms of the community, and because they affect me personally:</p> <p>PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HOMES AND SMALL BUSINESSES due to high property taxes based on 30+ stories, skyrocketing rents and construction noise. This will impact most people especially those in these newly zoned areas as well as the most marginalized. This will affect me personally as well. Firstly, I am worried the construction noise will affect my living and working environment. Also, I am worried I may lose my house and home-based business -</p> <p>which is licensed through the city - on account of being taxed at the rate of a plot of land that is zoned for 30+ stories. I am also concerned about my neighbours and friends who own property that is either mixed-use or commercial. Will the city be putting them in a compromised situation because of high property taxes?</p> <p>I understand increased property value means higher taxes; however, I am not talking about that. I am talking about being taxed at the rate of a plot of land zoned for a 30+ story building. Hopefully I am wrong; however, I worry the city may be wanting to push me out to make room for tall buildings. I love this city and am passionate about contributing positivity here and I hope</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implement these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.</p> <p>Heights have changed along Cannon Street and along parts of Wilson Street to address the appropriate transition to abutting low density residential and low-rise built form.</p> <p>Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.</p>

**Resident Comments**

**M. Rozenberg December, 9 2017 (continued)**

city staff can support me in doing so, as I'm sure you want to contribute positivity as well.

SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES CLOSING due to lack of family units built in new developments. This will affect my family. Most developers prefer one and two bedroom units. Without any safeguards, we could end up with giant towers with no families and increased population, at the same time as closing schools and community centres on account of low enrolment. This has happened in many cities, including Toronto. After our downtown high school closes, does Hamilton want to be known as the city that closes down its schools while claiming community progress? Is this a benefit for the community?

INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND MORE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS. LRT is a great idea but it won't be enough. Hamilton has already recognized it has a problem regarding traffic safety and the new zoning and extreme population growth will make things worse. I value my safety and that of my community. I see and hear about two accidents in my neighbourhood every year! I heard a woman in a wheelchair get hit by a car in front of my house a few years ago and don't look forward to more of this.

LOSS OF HERITAGE BUILDINGS What will happen to heritage buildings if the new zoning recommendations are approved? I appreciate the value, personality and character they add to the city.

LOSS OF SUNLIGHT: If all is closely-knit tall towers encroaching upon each other, No-one gets sunlight, everyone gets to only see a row of neighbours' apartments. Beasley park is currently lovely and sunny but that is threatened by aggressive development.

LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY for all but those with most resources at the expense of everyone else. I want to be able to prosper in Hamilton and to contribute to my community and want everyone to feel they can do the same. The creative entrepreneurial spirit of the city, such as the one epitomized and promoted to folks outside of Hamilton through the Art Crawl, is threatened by the current Downtown Secondary Plan.

Commercial rents will skyrocket to the point where small businesses may no longer afford rents. The creative and entrepreneurial spirit of "You can do anything in Hamilton" will be in deep trouble. Opportunities will be available to a select few, mostly corporations. We may even see empty storefronts due to rents being too expensive, as is the case in many cities. In these cases, empty storefronts are seen primarily as investments and have no practical use. For instance, Art Galleries on James St N have been closing over the past few years and will likely close at a faster rate when drowned out by armies of 30+ story condos driving up rents. At what point can the events still be called "Art Crawl" when the galleries close?

**Response**

The revised Plan establishes more criteria for buildings to be evaluated against, such as shadow impact, wind impact and visual impact and establishes the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum threshold for height, which is further implemented by the Zoning By-law.

Resident Comments	Response
<p><b>M. Rozenberg December 9, 2017 (continued)</b></p> <p>INFORMED PUBLIC</p> <p>Finally, I am hopeful in the future, greater effort can be implemented in letting the public know about issues that directly affect us. I am saddened more of an effort was not made to let everyone know about this final proposal. I only found out about this very recently. I spoke with a few neighbours and no-one knew about it. Perception is that it's been under the radar. This is unfortunate considering there is a fear that to the city planners, our individual properties (and most of the neighbourhood) is slated for being replaced by 30+ condo towers.</p> <p>Even if some folks in the neighbourhood did support development, it's hard to believe the support is equal to the most recent and somewhat aggressive zoning proposal that seems to support people like me being displaced from our homes.</p> <p>Again, I thank you for considering my opinions. We can work together to continue to build a great city that builds on its strengths, rather than replicates the problems of unchecked growth seen time and time again in cities throughout the world. We can work together for a city-building solution that works for everyone.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, your work for the city, and please keep me posted</p>	
<p><b>K. Andrus December 7, 2018</b></p> <p>When reviewing the downtown secondary plan I was shocked to notice that suggested future densities around heritage sites, both dedicated and registered, listed maximum building heights of 12-30 storeys on properties that rarely exceed 4 storeys. It is important to residents of downtown, and the residents of Stinson specifically that the unique character of Hamilton's historical buildings be maintained as much as possible. Stinson's vision statement states:</p> <p>Stinson is a diverse and engaged community with a natural, <b>historic</b>, and vibrant character. Residents across downtown have historically seen that development and "urban renewal" often comes at a cost: the sacrifice of downtown's historic character. One need only remember the loss of the Eaton's building, Birks Building and many others to understand the concerns those living downtown.</p> <p>More recently the Gore buildings and the perception developers played a "bait and switch" on the frontage of the Kresge's building have done little to reassure us that history and adaptive reuse is a priority for most Hamilton developers. It also does not instill much faith in our existing</p>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implement these policies.</p> <p>The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>systems of heritage protection. The current fear, as borne out in experience, is that if a current historical property sitting at 4-6 storeys is procured by a developer were it is zoned as potentially useful for 12-30 storeys that the property will be procured with a mind to "demolish it by neglect". Adaptive reuse and ground level walking experience will be sacrificed for mega-density and developer's needs.</p> <p>You can, through the downtown plan, add additional protection from the tendency to demolish these properties by setting lower and more realistic height targets closer to heritage buildings existing uses. People living in and around downtown are not against density. Every neighbourhood has mid- and high-rise buildings and welcomes growth in the core. However, we wish for growth to be accommodated in a way that is mindful of the historic look and feel, as well as multi-use nature, of the downtown core.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>objectives and policies of the Plan.</p> <p>Heights have changed along Cannon Street and along parts of Wilson Street to address the appropriate transition to abutting low density residential and low-rise built form. Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.</p> <p>The revised Plan establishes more criteria for buildings to be evaluated against, such as shadow impact, wind impact and visual impact and establishes the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum threshold for height, which is further implemented by the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The revised Plan also provides clear direction to maintain, preserve and reuse cultural heritage resources. Additional protection has been provided through the implementing Zoning By-law, by requiring that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment be completed prior to any demolition or development within a Cultural Heritage Landscape.</p>
<p><b>M. Chan December 8, 2017</b></p>	<p>Entrances to a building are not restricted in the Zoning By-law. Access contemplates both ingress and egress.</p>
<p>Please see below comments to the Draft Regulations for Zoning By-law 05-200:</p> <p>D2 Zone Amendments for the Draft By-law to amend zoning by-law 05-200</p> <p>(1) Section 6.2.1.1 (i) A. on page 18 – please include the following word "egress" and "maintenance" so that it reads</p> <p><b>Shall not be permitted within the ground floor, except for access, egress, accessory office, maintenance and utility areas</b></p>	

Resident Comments	Response
<p>(2) Section 6.23 (a)(vi) Building Setback on page 20 – Please remove the word NOT so that it now reads  <b>Accessory buildings and structures SHALL be subject to section 6.2.3 a) i)</b></p> <p>(3) Section 6.23 c) vi) Please insert the following after this section:  <b>(vii) A second exist is required for residential units which can</b>  <b>1. be accessible from the building rear or side with direct access to the public sidewalk. This is In line with good practice to plan two ways out.</b>  <b>2. must not pass through a utility area with direct access to the public sidewalk</b></p> <p>(4) Overall comment – since residential use is permitted in a D2 zone, then the existing residential development needs to be recognized, and any proposed commercial activity to be approved, has to be assessed in relation to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All abutting existing residential development</li> <li>• Comments of affected parties and</li> <li>• Applicable by-law and statute</li> </ul> <p><b>D5 Zone – Amendments for the draft By-law to amend zoning by-law 05-200</b></p> <p>I do not agree with the introduction of commercial activities in a residential zone D5. There will be land use conflict between commercial and residential use of neighbouring properties. It is not a "Downtown Residential Zone" it is "Mixed use zone" or D2 Zone getting created.</p> <p>I will forward more comments as the draft by-law amendment for 05-200 progresses.</p>	<p>Accessory buildings are regulated by the General Provisions Section of Zoning By-law 05-200. Additional Regulations are not required.</p> <p>The Zoning By-law does not regulate building entrances. Requirements of the Ontario Building Code must be met.</p> <p>There are policies in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan to address compatibility between uses.</p> <p>The Urban Hamilton Official Plan establishes the principle of allowing local commercial uses in Multiple Dwellings to allow access to daily and weekly uses.</p>
<p><b>D. Wootton March 7, 2018</b></p> <p>I understand that the City is presently undergoing a review of height restrictions downtown and I would like to add my comments at this time.</p> <p>2  To me, generally the further from the escarpment you are, the higher the buildings should go! To get a view on how a skyline should proceed in Hamilton's case, you have to look no further than the view from Mount Royal in Montreal. To me, that is hopefully what Hamilton could look like someday! Heading north, I would suggest that 20 stories be the limit to Hunter St, 30 from Hunter to Main, unlimited or at least to 50 storeys from Main to Wilson, 30 stories from Wilson to Barton and then 20 stories to the lake. A few exceptions should always be made to add interest to a skyline.</p> <p>I am very concerned that Hamilton is again becoming closed to business and that it will have to</p>	<p>Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.</p> <p>The revised Plan establishes more criteria for buildings to be evaluated against, such as shadow impact, wind impact and visual impact</p>

Resident Comments	Response
<p>wait yet another 50 years until prosperity returns. Meanwhile, as paying jobs go elsewhere, poverty increases and more and more Hamiltonians do not have a place to call home. I'm also continuously shocked by the lack of excitement on the part of Hamilton's council toward the L R T . Many builders have already said " no L R T , no construction " ! Why is it that Hamilton always has to take a back seat to most other Canadian cities ?</p> <p>At the moment, City Hall seems to be closing its doors to business again as I've noticed it doing so in the past.</p>	<p>and establishes the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum threshold for height, which is further implemented by the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The heights established in the revised Downtown Zones reflect the change in grade from the Escarpment. The heights have been calculated based on the elevation of the block in comparison to the elevation of the Niagara Escarpment.</p> <p>The heights proposed allows for the appropriate amount of development required to achieve the minimum density targets established by the Provincial Policy Statement and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.</p> <p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan provide greater clarity to the future development potential in Downtown. Pre-zoning and establishing conditions for development provide certainty as to the City's requirements and process.</p>



**Beasley Neighbourhood Association Comments**

**Response**

**A summary of all comments received since the October 2017 – March 2018 release of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law**

Steve, this is a more detailed, Beasley-centric email to follow-up on the one sent yesterday for the Ward 2 neighbourhood associations meeting with you tonight. I've reviewed the proposed Downtown Secondary Plan changes and have some specific comments to pass along on behalf of the Beasley Neighbourhood Association (BNA). First, it is hard to escape that the new Downtown Secondary Plan envisions a major scale jump in development intensity for the Downtown planning area, especially in terms of height permissions. BNA members have been consistently interested in seeing a reduction of surface parking lots in the northeast quadrant of the Downtown planning area, so development pressure in that area is welcome. We have the 71 Rebecca development application which is seeking 40 storeys on the parcel now occupied by Urban Core (a Community Health Centre). That parcel is directly north across the street from the planned John/Rebecca Park and it is hoped that that project will catalyze completion of the Park, but also the development of surrounding parcels. In principle, the BNA is supportive of this. That is we support in general terms this development as necessary and beneficial. The BNA has not taken a position on the details of the project, and in particular, the height requested because it exceeds the 30-storey maximum found in the new Downtown Secondary Plan and it far exceeds existing permissions. We look to the Planning Department for guidance on what the appropriate height and density of proposals such as this should be.

With reference to that, however, the BNA is concerned about the overall direction between the May 2017 and October 2017 drafts of the Downtown Secondary Plan, especially the removal of the discretionary height ranges that allowed for lower maximum heights in the land-use maps and 05-200 zoning by-law and a discretionary range that topped out at 30 storeys above these. From our point of view, that provided the City and neighbourhood with a mechanism to ensure that taller buildings provided a community benefit in exchange for additional height and density ... that benefit could be public amenities or public realm improvements, affordable units, more family-sized units, and so on. At a minimum, it would provide the City greater leverage to ensure proposals for tall buildings are distinctive architecturally and use the extra height to create more slender tower designs or innovative and visually interesting floor plate shapes. When we look at the October 2017 revisions all that is gone and replaced with considerable areas of Beasley now designated with a 30-storey height limit. That includes a number of blocks between Wilson and Cannon that are currently a mix of low-rise buildings, including detached and semi-detached houses. This approach seems unduly permissive and will potentially encourage destructive speculation. It seems excessive given the amount of land already available for development south of Wilson Street that is currently being used for surface parking.

[Stepping outside of land-use planning and into urban land economics, I'm personally

The revised Plan also provides clear direction to maintain, preserve and reuse cultural heritage resources. Additional protection has been provided through the implementing Zoning By-law, by requiring that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment be completed prior to any demolition or development within a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan. Additional policies have been added to require replacement of affordable rental housing units as well as bonusing agreements for tall building development. These policies provide a framework to maintain affordable housing stock and gain community benefits.

Beasley Neighbourhood Association Comments

Response

sceptical that in the next 10 years the absorption of high-rise condominium units will warrant this volume of developable space. I (and others) fear that what we will see is just a few large projects like LIUNA's on the Kresge site and Television City be approved and absorb the lion's share of demand for a number of years ... a speculative boom that results in a few tall towers represents what Jane Jacobs used to call "cataclysmic money" rather than the more "gradual money" that fuels urbanism (liveability, fine-scale diversity, and complete communities). The result could be a few gleaming towers and vast under-developed areas and destabilization of adjacent low-rise blocks/neighbourhoods).

The BNA would prefer if the extent and scale of the upzoning were reconsidered and lower height limits encouraging a more incremental or gradual form of change adopted in the plan for most of the Beasley area north of Wilson. We also would like further consideration given to how more mid-rise construction might be encouraged. We fear this plan will encourage isolated tower development that doesn't repair enough of the ground-level urban fabric fast enough to produce the urbanism to sustain healthy assessment growth in the area. We also remain concerned about how shadow impacts will be managed, especially with regard to Beasley Park, which contains our neighbourhood/community hub, and the planned John/Rebecca Park. We note that the new Downtown Secondary Plan protects other parks and public open spaces from further shadow impacts, but offers no protection to either of our parks and allows for 30-storey developments directly adjacent to it. We have been asked specifically if the introduction of a 30-storey maximum and roughly approximate height permissions in 05-200 will cause property-owners (particularly homeowners) to see MPAC dramatically reassess their property values ... i.e. will they be forced to sell to speculators/developers because they can no longer afford the taxes on their properties because of the proposed changes? We have only seen examples where this applies to non-residential uses but would like to be able to give a more definitive answer when asked. Second, the BNA is interested in building complete communities. That seems highly applicable in this case to the area of surface parking in the northeast quadrant of the Downtown Secondary Plan, though it also should apply generally as there are policies in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2006 and 2017 that speak to it. We don't see much specific policy language in the new Downtown Secondary Plan addressed to this and the UHOP has language, but it is weak. Now would seem an opportune time to consider strengthening the language that addresses building complete communities, and in particular add specific policies to require a minimum % of affordable and accessibility units, dedicated rental supply, as well as family-sized/suitable units. We note these policies could be complemented with policies that speak to community benefits or the use of Section 37 of the Planning Act to achieve them. In relation to both of these points, BNA members have been clear that they want Beasley to remain an inclusive and welcoming neighbourhood and have consistently asked the BNA to take action on the issue of displacement of existing residents. They have asked the BNA not just to raise the issue, but look for and be part of solutions. We hope the new Downtown Secondary Plan will be an opportunity to advance their

Heights have changed along Cannon Street and along parts of Wilson Street to address the appropriate transition to abutting low density residential and low-rise built form. Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.

The revised Plan establishes more criteria for buildings to be evaluated against, such as shadow impact, wind impact and visual impact and establishes the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum threshold for height, which is further implemented by the Zoning By-law.

The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been

<b>Beasley Neighbourhood Association Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>concerns in an appreciable way. We look to the City to be our partner in addressing how to make and maintain "complete communities" as we experience the intensification called for in provincial plans and policies, as well as those of our own City.</p> <p>Finally, the BNA supports efforts to encourage transit use and active forms of transportation. That is, we are supportive of intensification and public investments directed at repairing damaged urban fabric and especially reversing the legacy of excessive accommodations for automobility in the past, which is reflected in downtown's surfeit of surface parking lots and over-built (in many cases one-way) streets.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Rob Fiedler Beasley Neighbourhood Association, Planning Coordinator</p>	<p>taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implement these policies.</p>

Corktown Neighbourhood Association – December 9, 2017 Comments	Response
<p><b>A summary of all comments received since the October 2017 – March 2018 release of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law</b></p> <p>Thank you for meeting with the neighbourhood associations on Tuesday, December 5 to discuss the Downtown Secondary Plan, especially with respect to the Downtown Hamilton Tall Building Study and Guidelines. We appreciate your clarification and comment on the policies that would prevent a developer from assuming "as-of-right" development. We are, however, worried about the message that the current draft Plan will send to the development community in terms of height, scale, and the lack of policy that informs community benefit and requirements (what residents will interpret about the scale and outcome of potential future developments in the downtown core). We are concerned about the lack of formal policy in the Plan with respect to complete communities, community development or benefit, and resident consultation. We feel the Plan needs to be inclusive and balanced, ensuring that all stakeholder interests are represented and protected. The current iteration of the Plan too heavily favours the interests of developers.</p> <p>Our specific interests include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Community and resident involvement</b> : At present, the formal and informal processes around site plan application, development, and approval do not involve mandatory consultation with communities and residents. We want this to be made a part of all planning processes.</li> <li>● <b>Community benefit</b> : What will developers offer to communities in the way of "benefits"? We are interested in the creation of a process whereby community benefit is formally entered into development negotiations and planning, to address the needs of all neighbourhood stakeholders, residents, and local businesses, and that community benefit language is plain enough for all residents to understand this relationship and it's outcomes.</li> <li>● <b>Preservation of rental units</b> : We are concerned that development will continue to favour "condominium" units , with a priority on real estate sales, leaving renters and low-income individuals at a disadvantage.</li> <li>● <b>Inclusionary zoning and affordable housing</b> : We want to see the Plan include zoning that is inclusive, to allow families, seniors, and low-income residents to live and thrive in our neighbourhoods at rates that are genuinely affordable based on CMHC guidelines.</li> <li>● <b>Density in areas that are adjacent to neighbourhoods outside the Secondary Plan area (mapped)</b> : The Corktown Neighbourhood falls within and outside of the Plan boundaries. We do not currently understand the relationship intended between high-density corridors and hubs that directly about residential neighbourhoods and low-rise residential buildings.</li> <li>● <b>Protecting heritage buildings</b> : The downtown core is home to some of the oldest neighbourhoods in the City of Hamilton, and many homes, features and businesses in the</li> </ul>	<p>The revisions to the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan include policies for creating a complete community, maintaining affordable housing and encouraging the development of family units. Additional measures have been taken to preserve our heritage resources. All development will be required to address traffic, infrastructure, design, and heritage concerns before any approvals are received. The proposed changes to the Zoning By-law implement these policies.</p> <p>Based on the existing policy framework, 30 storey buildings are permitted and greater than 30 storey building heights have been approved. The existing policies do not establish a maximum threshold for building height, and permits increases in height based on the submission of a sun shadow and wind study.</p> <p>The revised Plan establishes more criteria for buildings to be evaluated against, such as shadow impact, wind impact and visual impact and establishes the height of the Niagara Escarpment as the maximum threshold for height, which is further implemented by the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The revised Plan also provides clear direction to maintain, preserve and reuse cultural heritage resources. Additional protection has been provided through the implementing Zoning By-law, by requiring that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment be completed prior to any demolition or development within a Cultural Heritage Landscape.</p>

**Corktown Neighbourhood Association – December 9, 2017 Comments**

Corktown are more than 100 years old. There are a number of heritage buildings (designated or otherwise) that this plan does not adequately address protecting.

- **Design and “fit” with existing scale and architecture** : Our neighbourhood was built to a certain scale more than century ago. Though we recognize that this is no longer the scale of the City, we also want to ensure that designs and materials are consistent with, and help to preserve, our neighbourhood’s character.

We share similar concerns as our fellow neighbourhood association representatives. The policies in the Downtown Secondary Plan do not adequately address: the unique needs and interests of our communities; built heritage; affordable housing and financial barriers affecting those living in the core; and overall community benefit. We appreciate that there may be a strategic framework addressing the above implemented at a later date, but we believe these priorities must be woven into planning documents and policy in order to best serve residents.

We want to assure residents of the Corktown neighbourhood that their opinions will be heard, respected and included at an early stage as part of future planning and development processes. Policies to protect residents and their needs are an essential part of a healthy democracy, and a system that serves *all* communities ahead of development interest. We hope that the City will amend the current draft of the Downtown Secondary Plan to address these concerns.

The Corktown Neighbourhood Association respectfully submits this letter to meet the Saturday December 9 review deadline. We will provide a more detailed commentary in the next 30 days. We would like to extend our thanks to Steve Robichaud, and all planning team members for accommodating our request to meet and discuss the draft. We appreciate your time and consideration, and look forward to working closely with your team on future neighbourhood issues and developments.

Sincerely,

Corktown Neighbourhood Association

**Response**

The Planning Act establishes the process and the roles and for responsibilities how applications are reviewed. The revised plan provides a mechanism to guide, regulate and review development applications and hold them accountable to the objectives and policies of the Plan.

Durand Neighbourhood Association – December 10, 2017 Comments		Response
<b>A summary of all comments received since the October 2017 – March 2018 release of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law</b>		
<b>General Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Height proposals in the current draft are three to six times higher than those contained in the former Secondary Plan 2005 "Putting People First".</li> <li>● Inconsistencies in the Land Use Maps and the Zoning Bylaws Maps in the Draft Downtown Secondary Plan</li> <li>● Height maximums in the residential quadrant of Durand that has no vacant land or parking lots on which to develop without demolition.</li> <li>● No regard for the unique historical character of the Durand neighbourhood, the densest neighbourhood in the Downtown by permitting maximum heights which could encourage demolition of existing buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>Since the October 2017 release of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan the height schedule has been revised and the policy framework changed.</p> <p>Inconsistencies reflect existing building height, and existing permissions</p> <p>The revised Plan has changed the heights on the perimeter of Downtown, including the blocks along Queen Street, from High-rise 2 to Mid-rise to address transition and existing built form.</p> <p>The DTSP recognizes all of the existing Designated and Registered-Non Designated buildings in the Durand Neighbourhood on Appendix B – Cultural Heritage Resources. Additionally, Wesanford Place is recognized as a Cultural Heritage Landscape on Appendix B-1 – Cultural Heritage Landscapes and is protected by a Special Policy Area. The revised Plan provides clear direction to maintain, preserve and reuse cultural heritage resources. Additional protection has been provided through the implementing Zoning By-law, by requiring that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment be completed prior to any demolition or development within a Cultural Heritage Landscape.</p>
<b>Map B.6.1-2</b>	<p>The area west of Bay Street South and immediately west of James Street South is indicated to have Maximum Building Heights of 30 storeys. Although the zoning map allows 44 meters, equivalent to 12 storeys, we are concerned developers and the Planning Department will be more likely to allow the maximum heights indicated on the map. There is also the unnecessary confusion inherent in the dichotomy between the Maximum Heights indicated on the map and the proposed zoning bylaws.</p>	<p>The DTSP policies and mapping have been changed to identify heights in categories. The height categories have been amended to reflect that permission of up to 30 storeys may be permitted if all applicable policies can be met.</p>

Durand Neighbourhood Association – December 10, 2017 Comments	Response
<p><b>Map B.6.1-2</b></p> <p>The corridor on James Street between Main Street and Charlton contains several designated heritage buildings including the former Bank of Montreal, St Paul's Presbyterian, a National Historic Site as well, the Stone Row Terraces between Bold Street and Duke Street as well as several character supporting and character defining buildings as identified by the Downtown Built Heritage and the Durand Built Heritage, planning documents to help city planners in developing Secondary Plans etc. Currently building heights along this corridor on the west side are 2-4 storeys with the exception of James Street Baptist. These building heights should remain rather than the 12 storeys proposed. This will preserve the pedestrian streetscape which will enhance the unique historical character of our corridor which includes, commercial, retail, housing and the medical and health related businesses. Furthermore, based on past experience with James Street Baptist, we fear other properties along James Street South could become victims of "demolition by neglect" allowing developers to build tall buildings.</p>	<p>The revised Plan has changed the heights on the perimeter of Downtown, including the blocks along Queen Street, from High-rise 2 to Mid-rise to address transition and existing built form.</p> <p>Only the Chateau Royale is designated as Downtown Residential. The remainder of the James Street South corridor between Main Street and Charlton Avenue is designated either as Downtown Mixed Use or Downtown Mixed Use – Pedestrian Focus to recognize the commercial nature of the corridor. The Designated and Registered-Non-Designated buildings have been identified on Appendix B – Cultural Heritage Resources. Additionally, a portion of James Street south of Hunter is identified as a Cultural Heritage Landscape on Appendix B-1 – Cultural Heritage Landscapes</p> <p>This area is currently occupied by a number of mid-rise and high-rise buildings. Any new development must conform to the policies of the DTSP including meeting specific shadow impacts, transitional and urban design criteria. The Downtown Residential Designation allows for the range of housing forms that exists in this quadrant of the Durand Neighbourhood, and is proposed to be amended to allow for some local commercial uses, which is currently not permitted.</p> <p>The heights have been tested against the policies of the DTSP and the Tall Building Guidelines. A Holding Provision applies in the Zoning requiring that any development proposals greater than 44.0 metres (12 storeys) provide all of the necessary studies to demonstrate how the proposal meets the policies.</p>
<p><b>Map B.6.1-1</b></p> <p>The area west of Caroline Street to Queen Street South, Main Street West and Hunter Street West is identified as "Downtown Residential". This area is totally occupied with a variety of housing stock including affordable, City Housing Hamilton, 2 ½ storey homes and 3 and 4 storey walk ups as well as high-rise. Included in this quadrant are retail and commercial buildings. There are currently no vacant parking lots on which to develop. With the proposed Maximum Heights of 79 – 81 meters, the unique character of this quadrant would be drastically altered.</p> <p>Durand Neighbourhood Association would prefer to keep options open for this quadrant and not restrict commercial or retail spaces. The Durand Neighbourhood Plan specifies this area as suitable for commercial/retail and mixed use.</p> <p>Durand Neighborhood Association would appreciate the following considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A "Site Specific Policy Area" for the quadrant of Queen Street South, Hunter Street West, Main Street West and Bay Street South. The exception would be Wesanford Place as it is already identified as a "Site Specific Policy Area". This would include reducing the height currently proposed in this area from 77-81 meters to 44 meters, with the exception of the existing high-rise buildings.</li> <li>2. Reduce the proposed 12 storey height to the current heights on the James South</li> </ol>	<p>This area is currently occupied by a number of mid-rise and high-rise buildings. Any new development must conform to the policies of the DTSP including meeting specific shadow impacts, transitional and urban design criteria. The Downtown Residential Designation allows for the range of housing forms that exists in this quadrant of the Durand Neighbourhood, and is proposed to be amended to allow for some local commercial uses, which is currently not permitted.</p> <p>The heights have been tested against the policies of the DTSP and the Tall Building Guidelines. A Holding Provision applies in the Zoning requiring that any development proposals greater than 44.0 metres (12 storeys) provide all of the necessary studies to demonstrate how the proposal meets the policies.</p>

Durand Neighbourhood Association – December 10, 2017 Comments	Response
	<p>Corridor to the preserve and enhance the pedestrian and historical unique character of this street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Eliminate contentious inconsistency with Land Use Maps and Zoning Bylaw Maps. In 2005 the Durand Precinct heights and maps were consistent. They were at that time 4-8 stories and recorded as low to medium density.</li><li>4. Include a short historical context statement from the Downtown Build Heritage Inventory to acknowledge the unique historical character of the Durand's contribution to the city. (Section 6.1.12 Cultural Heritage Resource Policies)</li></ol>



Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
<b>A summary of all comments received since the October 2017 – March 2018 release of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law</b>		
<b>HHBA Comments – December 8, 2018</b>		
<b>6.1.2 Principles</b>	States that it is guided by eight planning principles but then goes on to define <b>seven</b>	Policy has been amended
<b>6.1.2. c) Principles – Make downtown living attractive</b>	This principle states that “increased densities along major routes into the Downtown shall support public transit”; this is a perfect example of why introducing more height along these identified routes will support this principle and overall public transit.	Noted
<b>6.1.4.2 GENERAL LAND USE POLICIES</b>	States that a “the City shall establish a Design Review Panel to provide an architectural peer review...” This panel has already been established and is a voluntary panel, therefore; this policy needs to be re-evaluated and defined for clearer understand.	Language of policy has been changed to reflect the existing Design Review Panel
<b>6.1.4.7 – 6.1.4.12 BUILDING HEIGHTS (GENERAL HEIGHT COMMENTS)</b>	We maintain our position that; in light of the urban design policies contained within the UHOP, the Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines, and the Tall Building Guidelines (to be ultimately approved), providing for <b>at least</b> Mid-rise development height along the primary corridors associated with King/Main Streets is both reasonable and appropriate. We maintain our position that Mid-rise development (at a minimum) along James Street north of Cannon Street should be considered.	King and Main Street are primarily Mid-rise
	James Street, King William and Main Street provide direct access to two GO stations including a provincially designated Mobility Hub to the north. While the need to respect heritage features is recognized, this does not preclude the ability to develop an appropriate, sensitively designed Mid-rise building. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We maintain our position that; the maximum height of buildings in proximity to a Transit Hub and/or train station should be Mid-rise (up to 12-stories) at a minimum. These are areas where we want to make the most efficient use of land and infrastructure and maximize the intensification opportunities pursuant to provincial policy.</li> <li>o The appropriateness of Mid-rise development along this strip has been demonstrated in a number of locations supported by Planning Staff, therefore; the same height permissions of the adjacent properties/buildings should be re-evaluated.</li> </ul>	Other considerations must be included in determining appropriate height, depth of properties, mobility hub guidelines, existing character of the area Council approved the James Street North Mobility Hub Study on September 24, 2014. The Study identified appropriate locations to direct intensification. The Draft Secondary Plan implements the findings of this Council approved document. Individual applications supported by Planning Staff and Council have been assessed on a site-by-site basis and the merits of the application have been reviewed against studies submitted and with planning justification. Developments in excess of the height permissions of this plan will have to provide the same justification and rationale.

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
	<p>Please see the attached marked up "Map B.6.1-2 Maximum Building Heights" which illustrates additional opportunities where height could be accommodated based on sensitive design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Establishing density and height along transit corridors and station stops is in keeping with provincial and local policy documents. During the consultation period for the Transit Oriented Commercial (TOC) Zones ultimately passed by Council on October 12, 2016, industry professionals encouraged the City to increase the height and density permissions of the TOC Zones. However, City staff responded they understood the rationale for considering additional height and density along the TOC Zones; these zones could not exceed the height and density permissions contained in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. This draft secondary plan process provides an opportunity to accommodate this additional height and density to avoid the missed opportunity that occurred in the TOC Zone process.</li> </ul>	<p>Heights have been reviewed and assessed based on the Transition in Scale, Public Realm, Tall Building policies. The Secondary Plan achieves and exceeds the minimum density targets for the Urban Growth Centre.</p>
<p><b>6.1.4.13 d) Tall Buildings</b></p>	<p>The definition for "Building Base" is different than the Revised (Oct. 2017) Draft Tall Building Guidelines definition for "Building base", therefore; this definition needs to be revised so that both documents use the exact same definition in order to avoid confusion. The red identifies the difference in the below definitions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Draft Downtown Secondary Plan (pg. 7) defines "building base" as:</b> "The lower storeys of a tall building which are intended to frame the public realm and contains streetwall heights that respect the scale and built character of the existing context through design, articulation, and use of the ground floor."</li> <li>o <b>Draft Tall Building Guidelines (pg. 38) defines "building base" as:</b> "The lower storeys of a tall building which are intended to frame the public realm with good street proportion and pedestrian scale, articulated entrances and assist in the creation of an attractive and animated public realm. The building base is also known as the podium."</li> </ul>	<p>Definitions will be the same in both documents.</p>
<p><b>6.1.7 Downtown Mixed Use Designation (General Comment)</b></p>	<p>This section description has the following sentence, "The commercial and mixed use policies of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan are intended to support intensive, urban-scale commercial development." This sentence indicates that there is a <b>commercial</b> designation within the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan which is incorrect. Only in this section of the document is commercial development</p>	<p>*Downtown Mixed Use Designation has been renumbered to 6.1.6</p> <p>Revise wording in keeping with the designation</p>

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
	discussed, therefore; the title of this section should be re-considered to change to "Downtown Commercial & Mixed Use Designation".	
<b>6.1.7.1 c) Downtown Mixed Use Designation</b>	This subsection identifies policies for a new Neighbourhood park, therefore; should be moved to the "Parks and Open Space Designation" for easier understanding and continuity of the plan.	<i>*Renumbered to 6.1.6.1 c)</i> This policy refers to the lands that are surrounding the Neighbourhood Park (now Community Park). The policy is not for development of the Community Park itself. The policy is for lands designated Downtown Mixed Use directly adjacent to the Community Park.
<b>6.1.7.2 c) Pedestrian Focus Streets</b>	This subsection appears to limit creativity of new developments to match or have consistency with existing development within the area. Although, the podium height and design would make sense to have policies on in relation to street wall height at the street line, therefore; further clarification is required in order to identify what aspect of the building is being discussed here.	<i>*Renumbered 6.1.6.2 c)</i>  The Downtown Heritage Character Zone Design Guidelines provide that the existing built form and streetwall height is consistent in the 3-4 storey height which is within the scale of human experience. The Guidelines provided the basis for the policies of Pedestrian Focus Street.
<b>6.1.8.1 e) Parks and Open Space Designations</b>	We maintain our position that clarification is required for when, how much and by whom does the 'design plans and public improvement programs' stated in this subsection get created?	<i>*Renumbered 6.1.7.1 e)</i> These are City Initiated plans
<b>6.1.11.1 b) Urban Design Policies</b>	Clarification is required for when, how and by whom does the "design plans and public improvement programs" stated in this subsection get created? A space is required between vi) and vii)	<i>*Renumbered 6.1.7.1 d)</i> These are City Initiated plans
<b>6.1.11.5 Views and Vistas</b>	While there is a new policy that states "The City shall undertake a comprehensive study to identify significant views and vistas in Downtown Hamilton..."; it would be useful to provide a map &/or add onto one of the provided maps the views and vistas that the City have already indicated to protected along with other views and vistas that potentially could be considered.	<i>*Renumbered 6.1.10.3-6.1.10.4</i>  The City has completed a Downtown Hamilton Viewshed Analysis which has determined the significant and protected views in Downtown. Appendix "C" Viewshed Analysis has been created with these views identified and where a Visual Impact Assessment will be required for development purposes.
<b>6.1.12 Cultural Heritage Resource Policies</b>	The title of this section should be changed to the following, "Cultural Heritage Resource & Landscape Policies" due to the fact that both topics are discussed and have policies within this individual section.	<i>*Renumbered 6.1.11</i> Consistent with UHOP terminology

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
	Subsection d) from the previous draft (June 2017) "The City shall demonstrate leadership by conserving municipally owned cultural heritage resources in the Downtown" should be added back to the revised document (Oct. 2017).	Policy is contained in UHOP Volume 1 Chapter B.3.4.2.1 a)
<b>6..13.13 &amp; 6.1.13.14 General Transportation Policies</b>	Clarification is required for when, how and by whom does the 'design plans and public improvement programs' stated in this subsection get created?	*Renumbered 6.1.12.14 These are City initiated plans
<b>6.1.13.14 i) General Transportation Policies</b>	Clarification of the reasoning behind the widening of sidewalk widths to 4m is required to avoid confusion and full understand of why this proposed dimension has been provided.	*Renumbered 6.1.12.14 a) 6.1.12.15 provides further clarification on width of sidewalks.
<b>Public Transit</b>	This section has been completely removed from the revised document. The previous policies informed scale, density and proper development type of a property within proximity to public transit. These policies should be re-considered to be added back into the revised <i>draft</i> Downtown Secondary Plan.	There was no section of previous policies titled "Public Transit"
<b>6.1.13.19</b>	This policy states that "...a 2.5m wide sidewalk shall be provided..." this contradicts the previous policy (6.1.13.14.i) where it requires a 4m wide sidewalk by Jackson Square where feasible. These two policy need to be re-evaluated to align properly with each other.	Policy has been deleted
<b>6.1.13.21 Rapid Transit</b>	This policy is a perfect example for why more height should be considered within these areas. Re-evaluation is required of proposed heights within the Rapid Transit areas.	Noted
<b>6.1.14.1 b) Infrastructure, Energy and Sustainability Policies</b>	We maintain our position that; clarification is required in order to avoid confusion during the development proposal process of whether or not the City will be advising ahead of time (during preconsultation) the following policy statement; "development applications approvals contingent on availability of water and wastewater capacity."	Renumbered 6.1.13.1 b) A functional servicing report may be required to determine the impacts and the availability of services to accommodate development. The policies indicate when a FSR may be requested.
<b>6.1.16.2 Area Specific Policy Area – Area B</b>	We maintain our position that; a specific maximum density of 705 units/ha is identified in this Section, it has been addressed through the Downtown Secondary Plan that no specific density targets (minimums or maximums) be provided. Therefore, the density target identified for Area Specific Policy Area B should be removed.	This reflects Council approvals for the subject lands
<b>6.1.16.4 c) Area Specific Policy Area – Area D</b>	This subsection needs to be revised from c) to a).	Renumbered
<b>TABLE B.6.1.17.1:</b>	<i>James Street Design Functions</i>	Noted

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
<p><b>MOBILITY STREETS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Harbour" should be changed to "Waterfront" for consistent reference throughout the entire plan.</li> <li>o "Along with King Street, one of two prime retail streets" should be added for consistency with "King Street Design Functions".</li> </ul> <p><i>John Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Support James and King Street retail area" should be moved to "James Street Design Functions".</li> </ul> <p><i>King Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Along with James Street, one of two prime retail streets" should be copied to "James Street Design Functions".</li> </ul> <p><i>Main Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Escarpment" needs to be removed.</li> </ul> <p><i>Wellington Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Mountain Access Route" should be changed to "Southbound arterial route through Downtown core; has Escarpment access" for consistency throughout the entire plan.</li> </ul> <p><i>York Blvd./Wilson Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "The 403" should be changed to "Highway 403" to avoid confusion for someone who may not be familiar with the area.</li> </ul> <p><i>Victoria Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The title needs to be changed from "Victoria Street" to "Victoria Avenue"</li> <li>o The entire Design Function should be changed to be consistent with Queen Street and Wellington Street Design Functions.</li> <li>o Should read as follow:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Northbound arterial route through Downtown core and to industrial sector; has Escarpment access."</li> <li>o "Eastern boundary of Downtown"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>TABLE B.6.1.17.2: TRADITIONAL STREETS</b></p>	<p><i>Hess Street Design Objectives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "...on remaining portions" needs to be removed.</li> </ul> <p><i>Hughson Street Design Functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Links Go Centre to Gore Park" &amp; "Linkage between Gore Park and Hamilton GO Station" are the same points, therefore; one point needs to be removed.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>APPENDIX H: LAND USE PLAN MAP B.6.1-1</b></p>	<p>We maintain our position that; this is a good map to show the views and vistas that the city is considering / wanting to protect.</p>	<p>Appendix "C" – Viewshed Analysis has been added to the Downtown Secondary Plan demonstrating the significant views</p>
<p><b>APPENDIX I: MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT</b></p>	<p>There are a variety of properties that should be reconsider for more height due to the policies found within the revised (Oct. 2017) <i>draft</i></p>	<p>Noted Height schedule has been revised based on</p>

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
<b>MAP B.6.1-2</b>	<p>Downtown Secondary Plan and as justified throughout varies comments in our issues/concerns listed above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please see the attached marked up "Map B.6.1-2 Maximum Building Heights" which illustrates additional opportunities where height could be accommodated based on sensitive design.</li> </ul>	full consultation submissions
<b>APPENDIX K: CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES APPENDIX B</b>	<p>There are properties that are highlighted in blue outside of the Secondary Plan Boundary that should be removed from this map.</p> <p>It appears that the brown "designated under the Ontario Heritage Act" properties are highlighted in blue; therefore, this should be added to the legend for consistency and to avoid potential confusion when reading the map.</p>	Map has been updated
<b>Section 10 – Schedule D Holding Provisions</b>	<p>Schedule D of the draft Zoning By-law identifies lands subject to draft Holding Provision No. 17. The purpose of this holding provision is to require a Functional Servicing Report, Sun/Shadow Analysis; Wind Analysis; and, a Visual Impact Analysis for development above 44.0 metres in height.</p> <p>It is our position that the aforementioned studies regularly form conditions of site plan approval. As such, Section 41 of the <i>Planning Act</i>, in relation to site plan approval, affords the City and public the necessary assurance that these important studies will continue to inform the ultimate built form. The use of holding provisions is intended to provide levels of control where control may not otherwise exist. The City already utilizes Section 41 of the <i>Planning Act</i> to secure these studies and should continue to do so.</p> <p>In the spirit of being open for business and ensuring lands are in a development ready position, Schedule D and Section 10 of the draft by-law should be removed.</p>	<p>The Holding Provision has been established so that there is an evaluation on the cumulative effect of Building Height prior to Site Plan. Should the studies find that there is insufficient justification for the proposed height the Holding Provision will not be lifted.</p>
<b>Section 5.1 – Downtown Zone General Provisions</b>	<p>Section 5.1 of the draft Zoning By-law incorporates the Tall Building Design Guidelines as zone regulations for any building exceeding 44.0 metres in height.</p> <p>This approach prescribes guidelines that will not be feasible in all instances and will result in a number a need for unnecessary modifications to the by-law.</p> <p>As you know, the number of modifications, regardless of the actually</p>	<p>These requirements reflect best practice and are appropriate for the implementation of the Tall Building Guidelines.</p>

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
	<p>planning merits, influences decision makers' perspective on any given proposal. Further, the City has the necessary planning tools to evaluate deviation from the guidelines and staff should have the ability to do so without having to amend the By-law.</p> <p>Accordingly, we respectfully request these tall building design regulations remain only in the Guidelines and be removed from the draft Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>This matter is subject to an OMB appeal. No changes are proposed through the Downtown Zoning process.</p>
<b>Parking</b>	<p>The proposed changes to Zoning By-law No. 05-200 present an opportunity for the City to incorporate the HHHBA submission and subsequent appeal of Zoning By-law No. 17-240 in relation to the new parking regulations brought forward as part of the Commercial and Mixed Use Zoning By-law Review Process and we recommend the City utilize this opportunity to address this concern.</p>	
<b>Tall Building Guidelines</b>		
<b>Study Boundary (pg 1)</b>	<p>The following sentence from the previous plan (June 2017)..."In such instances, the recommendations and policies of these plans prevail"; should be added back.</p> <p>The description of the hybrid tall building should be revised to remove the following wording "on a low-rise base or podium". This statement should be removed because both point tower and hybrid buildings require podiums, therefore; this statement adds confusion.</p> <p>We maintain our previous recommendation that this is supposed to be a "Tall Building Guidelines"; therefore, reference to low and mid-rise building guidelines should not be discussed in both the tall building study and guidelines.</p>	<p>UHOP Policy already exists</p>
<b>Site Assessment &amp; Building Types (pg. 4-5):</b>	<p>Below the chart providing "Recommended frontage, lot depth, # of storeys and height" there is an * note stating that "some sites may not be able to comply with the guidelines, and therefore still will be considered inappropriate locations for tall buildings regardless of the lot dimensions". This statement is very restrictive and implies limits to creativity, rewording is required. The chart and asterisk contain what is "recommended" and "estimated values" yet being unable to comply results in an inappropriate location for tall buildings.</p> <p>Therefore, we maintain our recommendation that it is inappropriate to have a guideline document where proposals are deemed to fail an</p>	<p>The description adds perspective for Tall Building Development and is not meant to guide low/mid-rise development</p>

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
	<p>appropriateness test for not meeting "recommended" values when these values are based on estimates.</p> <p>We maintain our recommendation that this section also leaves out 2 Character Areas that were previously identified in the <i>Draft Downtown Secondary Plan</i> (June 2017) which are significant and should be addressed.</p>	Text has been updated to clarify that lots may be considered inappropriate locations
<b>2.0 SITE CHARACTER &amp; LOCAL CONTEXT</b>	<p>On the legend (pg.8) the colouring for existing parks and building footprints is not legible, this needs to be revised so that the colours are distinguishable.</p> <p>Hess Village Character Area and King William Character Area have not been in the revised (Oct. 2017) <i>Draft Tall Building Guidelines</i>. This implies that tall buildings would not be considered within these areas. We maintain our recommendation that these two Character Areas need to be added to the Tall Building Guidelines to establish a design precedent for the areas.</p>	
<b>2.1 CHARACTER AREA FRAMEWORK</b>	<p>This section states that the primary built form to be seen throughout this Character Area is low to mid-rise. This contradicts the revised (Oct. 2017) draft Downtown Secondary Plan where, as seen on the Maximum Height Map, the major of properties within this Character Area are midrise. Therefore, we recommend that the word "low" be removed from this section of the Tall Building Guidelines (seen in the first paragraph and in b)).</p>	Character areas have been deleted. The policies have been integrated into the appropriate Land Use Designations.
<b>2.2 PRIME RETAIL STREETS – JAMES ST. &amp; KING ST.</b>	<p>We maintain our recommendation that; the map used for this section (Pg. 11) does not show the King Street details in the same way that James Street is shown here. The map should be revised to show King Street as well or remove this map entirely.</p>	Text has been revised to align with the building height permissions of the DTSP
	<p>We maintain our position that this section states the opportunities and best places for new tall buildings within the Downtown but a lot of the land is already developed. The only potential is a redevelopment of Jackson Square. Therefore, different Character Areas should be considered for greater opportunities for tall buildings.</p>	Map has been deleted
<b>2.3 DOWNTOWN CORE (CIVIC PRECINCT)</b>	<p>The grey colour used in the maps (pg. 15) needs to be the same colour used in the legends.</p>	noted
<b>2.4 THE GORE</b>	<p>The last sentence in the last paragraph of this section suggests a limit of development to midrise development even though the majority of the property depth ranges would suggest the opportunity for point towers that are created with strict provisions and setbacks. This</p>	Legend changed to match map



Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
	should be re-evaluated to be more inclusive and less restrictive to the potential for properly designed tall buildings.	
<b>2.5 MAIN STREET CORRIDOR</b>	We maintain our position that subsection d) is a confusing guideline, therefore; is requires a further description of what a "...20m wide rhythm..." means to avoid misinterpretation of requirements.	Text has been amended to reflect the possibility of Tall Building Development
<b>2.7 John Street/Rebecca Street</b>	The James St. North Mobility Hub Study recommendation of 4-6 storeys along the James St. North corridor was based on the Urban Hamilton Official Plan but due to updates being done on the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan it provides the opportunity to accommodate additional height and density within this area. This area has great potential to make the most efficient use of land and infrastructure while maximizing the intensification opportunities that are normally seen within a Mobility Hub area.	Text amended to add clarification for intent. The intent is that the building façade be broken up after 20 metres to avoid large slab walls.
<b>3.5 TRANSIT PROXIMITY</b>	The definition for "Building Base" is different than the Revised (Oct. 2017) <i>Draft Downtown Secondary Plan</i> definition for "Building base", therefore; this definition needs to be revised so that both documents use the exact same definition in order to avoid confusion. The red identifies the difference in the below definitions;	Based on the Council adopted Mobility Hub study. The average lot depth wouldn't meet the minimums of the guidelines
<b>4.1 ANATOMY OF A TALL BUILDING</b>	<b>Draft Downtown Secondary Plan (pg. 7) defines "building base" as:</b> "The lower storeys of a tall building which are intended to frame the public realm and contains streetwall heights that respect the scale and built character of the existing context through design, articulation, and use of the ground floor."	All documents have been revised as needed to align definitions
	<b>Draft Tall Building Guidelines (pg. 38) defines "building base" as:</b> "The lower storeys of a tall building which are intended to frame the public realm with good street proportion and pedestrian scale, articulated entrances and assist in the creation of an attractive and animated public realm. The building base is also known as the podium."	All documents have been revised as needed to align definitions
	<b>c):</b> This guideline discusses setback requirements, therefore; it should be moved under the subsection <b>Setbacks</b> for consistency.	All documents have been revised as needed to align definitions
<b>4.2.5 PUBLIC – PRIVATE TRANSITIONS</b>	<b>k):</b> Spelling mistake; barrier free should be revised to "barrier-free" for consistency.	Section moved to Setbacks
<b>4.2.7 PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE OPEN</b>	<b>i):</b> We maintain our recommendation that in order to make sure that building design is "Bird Friendly best practice" Hamilton should have "Bird Friendly Guidelines/Standards" to follow and use to implement	corrected

Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association Comments		Response
<b>SPACES</b>	<p>on new development projects, therefore; this guideline should be removed.</p>	
<b>4.2.9 MATERIALS &amp; DETAILING</b>	<p><b>Pg. 61:</b> The left image on this page has a label stating "Upper levels: unique façade treatment for setback massing". This label should not be included within the "Building Base" section and should be moved to the "Building Tower" section (Section 4.3) as it deals with upper levels rather than base levels of the tower.</p> <p><b>Pg. 65:</b> We maintain our position that the picture in the bottom right corner is a weird example to exhibit setback towers, therefore; this image should be re-considered with the potential of using a more appropriate image that will clearly show what a setback would look like.</p>	<p>Direction has been provided in the Urban Design Section of the DTSP</p> <p>Reference changed to page 57 Image has changed to reflect the guidelines</p>
<b>4.3.2 PLACEMENT, STEPBACKS &amp; SEPARATION DISTANCES</b>	<p><b>j):</b> We maintain our recommendation that this subsection is related to the building base, therefore; should be moved to the "Building Base" section (Section 4.2).</p>	<p>Reference changed to page 61 Image changed to reflect guidelines</p>
<b>4.3.3 ORIENTATION &amp; ARTICULATION</b>	<p><b>b):</b> We maintain our position that the type of units are being referenced here need to be clearly identified (ex. Residential, commercial, mixed-use, etc.).</p>	<p>Subsection has been moved to "Building Base" section</p>
<b>5.1 STREETSCAPE &amp; LANDSCAPE DESIGN</b>	<p><b>Building Base:</b> This definition is different than the "building base" definition in the revised (Oct. 2017) draft Downtown Secondary Plan (pg. 7) as well as the Tall Building Guidelines definition (pg. 38). Please see page 2 of this document section "4.1 Anatomy of a Tall Building" for further details. This definition needs to be consistent with all other "building base" definitions throughout every document.</p>	<p>Section clarified to state residential units</p>
<b>6.0 GLOSSARY</b>		<p>Definition changed to align with the DTSP definitions</p>