

Thank you madam Chair and members of committee.

We support Staff's recommendation for the rezoning and special provisions for 1040 Coronation Drive as described in clause a, and we also support subclause 2 and 3 identified in clause b. We object, however, to subclause 1 in clause b and all the holding provisions requested to be implemented.

Our reasons for the objections are rooted in the fact that all the Holding Provisions are standard matters normally to be resolved through the site plan approval process, which leads us to the conclusion that there is a lack of confidence in the Site Plan approval process by the Planning Division. I also offer the following to support our position.

h-89 – for this holding provision regarding stormwater management, we object for the following reasons

- The Holding provision clause has already been addressed as the required report has been completed and the required downstream works, including SWM1 and SWM1B, have been built. Comments from the SWM Unit indicate that there are no capacity issues in the system.
- The comments from the SWM unit in the report are all issues which are frequently raised on a site plan application and will be addressed as part of the site plan review process.
- The SWM Unit did not request that a Holding Provision be required, the external works have been completed and so there is no rationale that h-89 be required.

h-90 – for this holding provision regarding the construction of Coronation Drive, we object for the following reasons

- Coronation Drive has been constructed as a fully serviced secondary collector beyond the entrance to 1040 Coronation Drive.
- The requested extension of Coronation Drive is not applicable to the subject site as 1040 Coronation Drive is not serviced by the street beyond what has been constructed to date.
- This Holding provision has been met and an implementation of the requirements of the City Engineer is already in a development agreement registered against the property.
- The developer is bound by the existing agreement and again the need for a holding provision is redundant.
- To impose this holding provision at this stage suggests that my client was ill advised at the pre-consultation meeting as the holding provision is totally unnecessary.

New h- – for this holding provision regarding water servicing, we object for the following reasons

- This is an issue that is being addressed as part of the site plan approval process. No development agreement can be completed until the water servicing conditions are in place and as a result, no building permit can be issued until the provision of water has been properly addressed. We do not need a holding provision to ensure this happens.
- My client has never indicated any interest of providing a private water system to serve the site. However, if there are Provincial regulations which must be met, obviously we will be compelled to meet the regulation.
- All the comments of the Water Division are conditions of Site Plan Approval AND can and should be dealt with through the normal site plan approval process. We do not need an unnecessary red tape step in the approval process when other existing steps are more than adequate to address the issue.

- h-91 – for this holding provision regarding urban design, we object for the following reasons

- This is a show stopper issue. The idea of a public corridor running through this site cannot in principle be accepted by my client.
- There is ongoing reference to the previous approved plan for this site but little consideration to the fact that a rezoning to change the uses on the parcel has been made and that the proposed development cannot facilitate some of the urban design issues being requested.
- The idea of a public pedestrian spine through the private condominium site is simply not acceptable. The Hyde Park Community plan does not identify this public corridor, so in the context of that document, the submitted proposed site plan aligns with the Hyde Park Community Plan.
- The subject site is a private development. There are concerns ~~that arise~~ regarding safety, liability, and maintenance responsibility for a public corridor through this site.
- The Community and Urban Design Guidelines for the Hyde Park Community ~~does~~ not provide specifics for public corridors and pedestrian connections through private sites and notes that any guidelines presented are *intended to be flexible and there may be several ways to achieve the desired design objectives. It is recognized that some sites may have unique natural features and development constraints or requirements.* It is our opinion that this development is constrained due to the fact that it is a private development without a previously established public corridor through it to facilitate a pedestrian spine.
- There is also concern in regards to the requirement to provide a vehicular connection to the future private laneway due to costs associated with construction, maintenance and liability of that lane.
- The subject site is the middle ~~of~~ three properties located between Hyde Park Road and Coronation. When the westerly parcel was created, the City did not require a pedestrian connection through the property. Likewise when the development agreement was approved for the easterly property, no provision for a public corridor was created. As a result, urban Design is asking for a public access route in a middle property which leads nowhere. This is not acceptable.
- Public access connections have been planned by means of a public lane to the west (already dedicated to the City) and north of the subject site. The lane could be developed to provide pedestrian access between Hyde Park Road and Coronation if the City ~~would~~ chose to do so.
- Lastly, the recommended Special Zoning Bylaw Provisions in Clause A, which staff are supporting, are based on a detailed Site Plan which shows no pedestrian corridor, has a specific internal design layout for the type of units proposed by the client and require specific zoning standards. To implement the design matters outlined in Clause B would require a different type of unit to be constructed, contrary to the business plan of my client. This would require the entire site to be redesigned which could lead to additional Special Zoning Provisions. It appears to us that while Clause A supports the submitted Site Plan with the required alteration of Zoning requirements, staff then recommends holding provisions and alternative design requirements which, in particular as it pertains to the pedestrian corridor, will require a total re-design of the site. A confusing situation to say the least.
- As there is no policy basis to require the requested public pedestrian connection from the commercial development to the west through the subject site, we strongly object to being forced to redesign the whole site and change the business plan for this development.

Considering this, it is our opinion that ALL the recommended Holding Provisions are standard matters normally to be resolved through the site plan approval process, which led us to the

conclusion that there is a lack of confidence in the Site Plan approval process by the Planning Division.

It is crucial to the success of this development that construction begins this spring and the implementation of these holding provisions will create significant delays.

We request that Clause A be approved excluding all the noted Holding Provisions and that Clause B be amended by the deletion of subclause 1.