

1400 Baseline Rd

File No.: CI-20-A

Jan 30, 2022

Dear Madam Chair & Planning Committee Members, please accept this written submission of concerns.

My name is Linda MacMillan & I live adjacent to the property at 1400 Baseline Road. I've read the news articles, emails and reports as well I attended the Neighbourhood Information virtual meeting. I had hoped to speak with you today however day-time Public Meeting do not work for me. I do hope you read my written submission however that speaks to 3 Areas: **Sales Proceeds; Transcab and Location.**

SALES PROCEEDS:

There have been references to the need for a "pot of money" and a desire to address our concerns regarding traffic, sidewalks and lighting in the Fifty Road/North Service Road/Baseline Road areas and it has been **implied** that the sale of the 1400 Baseline property would give the City the funds to pursue signalization, sidewalks and lighting on the overpass.

My initial thoughts on that claim was that, if we as a municipality have to sell our public assets in order to put in sidewalks, there's a much bigger problem with our funding models & how our money gets spent.

Besides that thought, these statements are confusing because:

1. There already is lighting on the Fifty Road overpass... so we don't need funding for that.
2. Is it not true that HOW the money will be spent has already been decided by Council some time ago and that how the money is spent has absolutely ZERO significance to the planning principles to be evaluated when accessing an Official Plan Amendment or a rezoning?
3. Is it also not true that there already is \$350,000 earmarked in our Capital Budget for signalization at North Service/Fifty Road? The budget documents indicate \$90,000 has already been taken from our property taxes in 2018/2019? Why hasn't this work been done if the funds are sitting in an account?
4. Lastly, there is also an additional \$1.5 million sitting in the city's reserve funds for traffic projects on Fifty Road.

I do NOT believe that you HAVE to rezone 1400 Baseline to allow 9 stories in order for our area to get traffic calming.

Many of my neighbours have been writing for years about the traffic issues in our area.

It's rather suspect that the two issues are now being linked, especially when we've read our elected representative doesn't believe in speed bumps and that traffic calming supposedly is dangerous and creates road rage.

I did respond to a notification, issued by the city, to install speed bumps in front of my house at 1454 Baseline Rd. Speed bumps are not a solution in this specific location because the traffic that travels between Lockport Way and the main gate to 50 Point Conservation area are pulling trailers and boats. The constant clanging of chains and hitches is an encroachment to my personnel living conditions. I submitted a written response to the city with 5 possible solutions and not one 1 of those solutions were given any consideration. I spoke to the traffic coordinator personally and he had an excuse for each and every one. Blah blah blah. I'm not sure that city council considers input from the community that is my community which is the community I call home.

TRANSCAB:

1400 Baseline - is a remnant stock of vacant land in a sea of low profile car dependent lands in a Transcab area.

Even though we might get public transit sometime in the future, for obvious reason, this will not happen until after LRT & other transit priorities in the queue. Even if we do jump the queue it appears transit will terminate at the Winona Crossing Centre which is over a kilometer from this site it should be within 400 metres / walkable..

It's reasonable to conclude, the dependency on a vehicle will not change for our area. Either the new occupants will purchase their own cars or they will be dependent on Transcab which is a public service provided by a private entity. Transcab also introduces an exponential increase in the number of vehicles into the poorly functioning road network at Fifty Road/QEW.

Transcab is not sustainable. The Cost to city is close to \$30 per rider per one-way usage. A round trip is \$60 PER CUSTOMER round trip. Two customers in the same vehicle is \$120 cost to the city for **one daily round trip**. A group of 3 in the same vehicle and the city is billed \$180 per round trip. One person using Transcab 5 days a week for 50 weeks a year results in a billing of \$15,000 ! It's mind blowing to me that we would choose to increase the density with potential transit users with an insanely high cost model.

As well, Transcab is not Equitable. The cost to the customer is upwards of a 24% surcharge over our standard bus fares. Even our Golden Age seniors are surcharged!

In addition, the cost to all the property owners within our Transit Boundaries city-wide varies significantly from year to year because it is dependent on the number of users. From everything I've read, that is NOT the way to build and fund a transit system.

Transcab is Not Effective:

My daughter used Transcab. It Adds 4 to 6 hrs of travel time. Leaving from home in the a.m. it can take up to 1 hour for cab to pick up rider and drop them off at Jones Rd

The bus at Jones runs at 30 minute intervals which often resulted in missing one bus by minutes, and then waiting for another 30 minutes.

On her return trips home in the evening, the Trans cab driver would often wait at Jones Rd for multiple riders, this means waiting another 30 minutes for next bus which hopefully dropped off some other Transcab customers.

The Service is unreliable for working people! Many of us, including myself, drive to Eastgate to drop off and pick up transit users. And because Eastgate is where the B-line is planned to still terminate post LRT, people will likely continue to drive there because of the shorter bus intervals.

Location

I've also taken a look at other Higher Density Builds which were NOT supported:

Council didn't support a 9 storey at the corner of King St & Hwy 8 in 2016, beside a 7 storey and with 2 transit routes, so why would you support this 9 storey?

Council didn't support a 9 storey at the corner of James St N and Burlington St, adjacent to a 6 storey, so why would you support this 9 storey?

Council didn't support a 9 storey at the corner of Stonechurch and West 5th, within walking distance to Mohawk College and the A-line bus route, so why would you support this 9 storey?

Council didn't support a 9 storey at the corner of Main St W and Sanders Boulevard, near MacMaster & with public transit, so why would you support a 9 storey here?

A 4 storey on King St E in our Ward 10 also wasn't supported and everyone worked with the residents, Staff & City Council, to reach a settlement to reduce the build down to 3 storeys, so I don't understand why no one has spoken to us to try to reach a mutually agreeable settlement?

I've been told that those other 9 storey proposals have now been approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal & Council's opposition was overturned. I've also been told though, that those proposal were:

- (a) either on Primary Corridors or within 400 metres of a Corridor,
 - (b) serviced with conventional public transit
 - (c) fronting on an arterial road, and
 - (d) in the vicinity of other higher profile builds within the designated Neighbourhood
- It was for those reasons, the Tribunal decided 9 storeys were appropriate.

1400 Baseline is **not** serviced with conventional public transit.

1400 Baseline is **not** on or within 400 metres of a designated Corridor

1400 Baseline is **not** in the vicinity of an arterial road. The closest arterial road is South Service Road/Fifty and is separated by the QEW

1400 Baseline and the whole of the Neighbourhood, and the whole of the Secondary Plan area does **not** include any buildings higher than 3 storeys. The closest higher profile building is located 7.7 kms away at Green Road / Frances Avenue.

So why would Council support a 9 storey build here at 1400 Baseline Road?

For all the reasons I've stated, it is my opinion that this Official Plan amendment and Zoning ByLaw amendment should NOT be approved.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Linda MacMillan

Submitted via e-mail

dlcouncilonly@hamilton.ca
clerk@hamilton.ca