

Sent: March 21, 2021 10:01 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Zoning Bylaw Amendment Comments for Consideration

Hello,

We would like to convey to you our thoughts and concerns about the proposed development at the corner of King Street West and Paradise (Application by Urban Solutions Planning and Land Development Consultants Inc. for Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for lands Located at 804-816 King Street West, Hamilton - Ward 1).

We are long term home owners in the Westdale neighbourhood, having bought this house where we live now in 1991 (30 years ago). Over that time I have seen many changes in Westdale, some good but many not so good. One thing that seems to be a constant is the ever increasing level of student housing in the area to fill the demand of McMaster University's ever expanding enrolment and expansion plans. We don't have an issue with student housing but unfortunately it usually comes with little enforcement of standards that leave the community having to live under less than ideal conditions while absentee landlords collect rent and do little else. We think McMaster should look elsewhere for further expansions so that the housing demand in Westdale remains at a tolerable level and is in balance with those wanting to make a home here. Those benefitting from this current vision (if you can call it that) seem to be McMaster, developers, landlords and local politicians and all at the expense of the community that chooses to make this our home for more than 8 months a year. We understand that these concerns are outside of the comments you are looking for regarding this proposal but they are ultimately the driving force behind the project. As a long term residents of the area we would like to understand if the city has a future plan for balanced development or are we just leaving it to developers to plot our future in their best financial interest?

Returning now to the specific development at the corner of King and Paradise. We understand that the developer has certain rights with regard to that property but would hope that it would be in harmony with those of us who will be impacted by the choices made. When we speak to others who have chosen this area to call home (12 months a year and more than four consecutive years) there are a number of concerns we all have with the current proposal. Many of these issues were raised almost two years ago when Urban Solutions held an information session with the community to outline the proposed project. The fact that non of these concerns were addressed with the submission now at hand leads us to think that our opinions do not matter to the city or to our local Counsellor Ms. Wilson.

The following objections were made to the city planner and Counsellor Wilson almost 18 months ago:

1. The height of the building at 6 stories is well above the 3 story municipal bylaw and would be out of place in our neighbourhood. As city planners, it should be your role to protect a certain aesthetic within each part of the city. We would all welcome a development that works with the current bylaw. If this moves ahead as proposed it will tower over the houses next to it and cast them in shade for much of the day. It is also a privacy concern for any backyard functions at these homes. Just think about how you would like this in your back yard, try to put the community concerns at least on par or in front of the developer. The overall height and is the communities biggest concern. If this goes ahead as planned it will set a precedent that will be copied going forward, ultimately changing the nature of Westdale. If that is the intent of the city and a direction you intend to take this community you should be bold

enough to admit it and let your voters decide if they agree.

2. Parking is already a problem on Glen Rd between Paradise and Macklin and allowing this development to go ahead as planned with inadequate parking will make the problem much worse. As a bare minimum, the city should consider making street parking along this stretch permit only for houses located here and have the developer pay the city the annual fees for these permits. If not, the bylaw should be upheld and the developer should provide enough parking.

3. This residence is planned as a quad type of arrangement, that is to say multiple bedrooms sharing kitchen and dining quarters. We have a problem with the arrangement in that it is quite restrictive and will only appeal to 1st or 2nd year students. We can not imagine anyone other than this demographic being interested in this arrangement for rental housing. Shouldn't we be encouraging rental spaces that are open and inclusive? We think the local community would welcome more opportunities for seniors to rent in the area but this does not allow or encourage this. We understand that the current proposed layout reduces construction costs per resident and maximizes profit for the developer. Should this be the top concern?

As recent retirees we had planned on staying in this community for the foreseeable future. We have made it our home for more than 30 years. If however, this development reaches approval without any of our concerns being addressed we will seriously consider other options away from Hamilton. Others have also expressed similar views on our street. All we are asking is that you take a balanced view when considering this project and hear what we have to say.

Kind Regards

Stephen Waterfall & Evelyn Kuschnik