

April 1, 2019

ATTN: Legislative Coordinator, Planning Committee

71 Main Street West, 1st Floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P4Y5

RE: Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment (UHOPA-17-041) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-17-090) Applications by John Barton Investments for Lands Located at 80 & 92 Barton Street East and 245 Catharine Street North, Hamilton, (Ward 2)

Dear Members of the Planning Committee,

I'm a proud resident of Barton St. East. I would like to firstly commend the work done by all stakeholders on this project in putting together a proposal that attempts to respond to the context and scale of the neighborhood while meeting the ambitions of the Setting Sail Secondary Plan. We welcome development that will put more eyes on the street and make the Barton Street East neighborhood a safer and more vibrant pedestrian environment.

To that end, I would like to express some specific concerns with regards to the site plan submitted as Appendix "G" (Page 1 of 5) in the staff report, and to also provide some constructive feedback.

- 1. Barton Street Public Realm.** The site plan shows a vehicular access to the Office Building directly off Barton Street. This is not consistent with other parts of the staff report which state that all parking and vehicular access is to be provided through the dedicated laneway between John Street and Catharine Street. This is also not consistent with the planning principles set out the Barton-Kenilworth Commercial Corridor Study and is generally undesirable on a high street where pedestrian activity is being encouraged. This will create an unsafe condition for pedestrians on Barton Street as there will be a higher volume of traffic.

In addition to restricting vehicular access to the office building from Barton Street the city should consider sidewalk bump-outs on Barton Street at all corners to calm traffic and to provide spaces for bicycle parking, benches, and waste receptacles.
- 2. Office Building Height.** No elevations (height statistics), street sections, or shadow studies were provided. The four-storey building could be as tall as 19m plus 5m for a mechanical penthouse with office spaces. Since the building is on the North side of the street this will likely cast shadows on the south side of Barton, potentially reducing the appeal for pedestrians. If the Committee is considering allowing more than the 4-storeys, efforts should be taken to reduce

the visual impact of the mechanical penthouse on Barton street and to reduce day-time shadows, such as by setting back the 5th storey from all side of the building but particularly Barton St. E. Secondly, the Building appears to the be set-back from Barton Street by 3m. Rather than changing the existing street wall condition, some of this area could be given back to the developer to create shop fronts that meet the sidewalk closer to the lot line.

3. **Traffic.** Speeding and parking on Barton Street are persistent problems that adversely impact the safety of its residents and pedestrians. This project offers both the city and the developer an opportunity to drastically improve the situation. Traffic calming measures need to be implemented by the city immediately. This should be done by removing rush hour and overnight parking restrictions on Barton Street between James Street and Victoria Street per the recommendation of the Barton-Kenilworth Commercial Corridor Study. This would allow current residents and patrons to park on the street thereby providing an interim traffic calming solution, but more long-term solutions such as sidewalk bump-outs on Barton St. are required. A sidewalk bump-out should be considered on the corner of Catharine Street and Barton as part of this project.
4. **Parking Numbers.** Close to 20% of Ward 2 residents use public transit as their main mode of transportation and close to 2% of Ward 2 residents use bicycles as their main mode of transportation. Based on the above it would seem that the parking unit ratio of 1.27 for residential required for this project is probably too high. The city should consider reducing this ratio for this development, and future developments in the area to 0.8 – 1.0, provided that outdoor amenity area ratios and bicycle parking ratios are increased. With respect to this development, the Green Amenity space beside Block B leaves much to be desired, particularly in an area of Hamilton that lacks access to park spaces. A reduced parking requirement would probably go a long way in improving the quality of the outdoor spaces. Lastly, the city should consider connecting the existing John Street bicycle lane to the Cannon Street bicycle lane to facilitate safe bicycle access between the proposed development and the waterfront.

Respectfully,



J. Alejandro Lopez, M.Arch., OAA