

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Comment Sheet - 354 King Street West Public Consultation

From: Rob Parsons

Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 1:35 PM

To: apaton@gpsgroup.ca

Cc: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Re: Comment Sheet - 354 King Street West Public Consultation

FROM: Robin Parsons

PART A: Hotel - Addition of 2 storeys

1. I am opposed to the proposed 2 storey addition to the hotel building.
2. I am opposed because the proposed revision does not adhere to the existing Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) and/or Strathcona Secondary Plan and/or Zoning Bylaw 05-200 (the Plans and Regulations) applicable to the site, and because the Plans and Regulations preceded the proponent's submission of its' application for amendments to the Plans and Regulations, and because the Plans and Regulations were established following extensive, deliberate community consultation and planning/review by City staff and review/approval by City Council in consideration of the long term viability of the Strathcona and Downtown planning areas.

PART B: Apartment - Addition of 19 storeys

3. I am opposed to the proposed 19 storey addition to the apartment building.
4. I do not foresee the specific ways that the proposed 19 storey addition to the apartment building will *directly* affect me. However, I am concerned about the potential *indirect* effects; see response to #'s 8. & 9. below.
5. I note that the proposed 19 storey addition is very similar aesthetically/architecturally to the approved original building rendering and the aesthetics/architecture of the proposed 19 storey addition is not of concern to me.
6. I have no concerns regarding the impact of the proposed 19 storey addition on sun/shadow or wind at the pedestrian level.
7. I note that the transportation study concluded that intersections surrounding the site "will operate at acceptable levels" as a result of the proposed 19 storey addition to the apartment building combined with the proposed 2 storey addition to the hotel, therefore the impact of the proposed 19 storey addition on traffic and transportation is not of concern to me. However, the proposed 19 storey addition combined with 2 storey addition will result in a deficiency of parking spots according to the Plans and Regulations applicable to the site.

8. & 9. The proposed addition of 19 storeys and 2 storeys to the approved buildings does not adhere to the current Plans and Regulations applicable to the site, therefore approval will diminish the intent and effectiveness of the Plans and Regulations, and will set a precedent for subsequent development proposals which do not adhere to the Plans and Regulations. Each subsequent application for amendment will add additional burden to City staff and City Council and neighbourhood residents, all of whom must then review and respond to such non-adhering amendment proposals.

Furthermore, the proponent's public consultation presentation suggests that the proposed amendments should be approved because they would be permitted within the adjacent downtown zone on the east side of Queen Street, across the street from the site. I suggest that if the proponent is seeking this rational, then the proponent should have chosen a site which is located in a planning area/zone which permits the proposed amended development without requiring application for amendment.

Also, the proponent's public consultation presentation lists 7 bullets (page 29) which justify the requested height increase and parking modifications according to key planning points. Certainly, a development which conforms to the Plans and Regulations (e.g. the previous approved 10 and 6 storey development) *does* support provincial planning policy and the general policies of the UHOP; hence it receives approval without further process. However, the proposed amended development application and the public consultation presentation do not acknowledge the extensive planning,

consultation, review, and approval process which preceded the Plans and Regulations. The proposed amended development does not conform to the Plans and Regulations, therefore, I suggest that in the context of the long term viability of the neighbourhood and the City, it does not support provincial planning policy and the general policies of the UHOP.

Finally, according to the presentation, the proponent submitted a proposal for 25 and 11 storeys to the City's Design Review Panel in 2017 which would have required amendments to the Plans and Regulations. So, the proponent revised the development to 10 and 6 storeys. The latter revised development received conditional approval in April 2018, a foundation permit in July 2019, and final approval in October 2019. Construction began around mid 2019. Then, the proponent submitted application(s) for zoning amendment(s) in December 2019, which proposed 25 and 12 storeys, similar to the original 2017 proposal. I expect that the addition of 19 storeys and 2 storeys would require significant revision to the engineering drawings and designs for the foundations and utilities for both buildings. Therefore, the design underlying the issued foundation permit and construction which has taken place since then must be implementing a foundation which will accommodate the proposed taller buildings. A design which was approved in July 2019, prior to application for the proposed height additions. This implies that the proponent's process of initial consultation with the City in 2017 for non-permitted taller buildings, then revision of plans and approval for shorter permissible buildings through 2018-2019, then application for the taller non-permittable buildings in December 2019, several months after foundation permit and construction commencement, has been disingenuous and of questionable intent and merit. If the proponent would have simply proceeded with application for the original 25 and 11 storeys in 2017, he would have better represented himself, and the City and residents would have been better served.

Thank-you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed development at 354 King Street West.

Sincerely,
Rob Parsons

On Saturday, April 4, 2020, 06:45:02 p.m. EDT, SCC President <strathconacommunitycouncil@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Strathcona,

GSP (Vrancor's consultant) has provided the following information to us (below) in lieu of a face to face meeting for public consultation. This is now posted on their website for review (info below). As it stands we need to review and respond by APRIL 17. The SCC has asked them in an email today to extend the response time until May 1 so that anyone who may need alternative means to respond can have more time to do so. Please, I ask that if you know someone who doesn't have internet access and would want to be involved, that you provide them this information via the phone, or by dropping it off in their mailbox.

The contact information for GSP is:

Ashley Paton, B.U.R.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Planner

GSP Group Inc.
905 572 7477 ext. 2
apaton@gspgroup.ca
162 Locke Street South, Suite 200
Hamilton, ON, L8P 4A9

MESSAGE FROM GSP:

In light of COVID-19 and the expected social distancing measures that will likely be in place for the coming months, we wanted to continue towards a public consultation strategy that allowed for thoughtful engagement despite not being able to meet with the community face-to-face. We believe the best way forward to allow for the community to express their concerns/questions for us to consider and respond to is the following:

- A PDF of a powerpoint, similar to the one that would have been presented at the Community Open House, will be uploaded to the project website

(<https://www.gspgroup.ca/active-projects/354-king-street-west/>). Our typed speaking notes will be provided next to each slide as well. We will be posting this presentation on **Friday, April 3rd**. If people do not have a computer or require accommodations, we ask that they contact me via phone or email and we will work with them to ensure they obtain a copy in a suitable format (i.e. audio recording). If people provide their mailing address, we can also mail a hard copy of the presentation/comment sheet to them.

- A PDF comment sheet will also be available on the website. Residents can respond by completing the form or typing their responses to me via email to me (apaton@gpsgroup.ca). We ask that all comments/questions be sent to me by **Friday, April 17th**. I will send a confirmation email, confirming receipt that it's been received, to each email I receive.
- We will record and summarize all comments/questions received (and will distribute to the consultant team to provide their comments/responses). We won't respond to every question received but we will prepare a response document with answers and responses to the recurring questions along with how we plan to address the common concerns. We hope to have this response document up on the project website by the end of April, after considering the concerns and questions with the owner and the consultants.

We explored the option of a webinar and other online engagement methods but felt the method outlined above would allow for a more accessible format and would allow for more fulsome engagement and time for us to thoughtfully respond and discuss with the project team in lieu of meeting face-to-face.