

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 27. Property located at 660 Sunningdale Road East (39T-09501/OZ-7638)

- Randy Warden, 205 North Centre Road – indicating that he has some familiarity with the area; advising that he has personally spoken to most of the residents who live south of this development, in the Garibaldi Avenue and Blackwater Road area, as well as the community who is south and east of the subject lands; speaking in the absence of anyone present from that immediate area, he would be remiss if he did not bring to the Planning and Environment Committee's attention that, in his opinion, there is a lot of fatigue with respect to the development in this area, particularly with what has gone on just south of the subject lands; and, indicating that a lot of concerns have been raised about the heightened traffic on Sunningdale Road as a result of all of the development.
- Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – indicating that they have been involved with this application since 2011; advising that this has been an ongoing development for approximately the last nine years; indicating that the original plan had a lot of new urbanism concepts incorporated into it and, over a period of nine years, a lot of those concepts have been removed and they have the plan before the Committee today; advising that, as they have worked through all of those iterations, which Ms. Nancy Pasato, Senior Planner, Development Services, went over all of the aspects of the plan that is being recommended by staff; indicating that they would like to note some of their concerns with respect to this plan; indicating that the original application that they submitted did propose a larger amount of commercial space for the various Blocks; noting that the basis for that related to the long-term viability of the main street business commercial district area; indicating that they prepared a detailed market study in support of the commercial that they had proposed; it being noted that that study, and through the discussions that they had with the market analyst, did confirm that a larger commercial anchor would be required in order to maintain the viability of that commercial development; advising that another component of that was also the high density residential block at the corner; indicating that the additional commercial, along with the larger amount of residential density both supported that business district commercial area; advising that, as was outlined by staff, both the high density residential and the large commercial blocks have been removed; advising that they have concerns with the removal as they do not feel that it is sufficient for the long-term viability of that; reiterating that they would like to see additional commercial there, but again, these are the comments that they have with respect to the plan; indicating that, based on the square footage that has been allocated to the red-lined commercial blocks, they are not quite at a capacity that will make efficient use of the land; providing the example, that from a planning practice, for every acre of land, approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial space can be accommodated on that block; indicating that, when you look at Block 50, which is the northeast corner of Street "A" and Sunningdale Road, the area for that Block is approximately two acres, whereas the commercial gross floor area has been restricted to 10,000 square feet; advising that, essentially, only half of that land is going to be developed for commercial given the gross floor area caps that have been proposed in the current zoning; reiterating that that is one of their concerns and they would like to go on record noting that the larger commercial Block was intended and proposed to anchor the three business district commercial Blocks that were incorporated into the plan and they do feel that without the anchor, they have concerns with the long-term preservation of the business district commercial blocks; requesting that the following changes be made to the draft Zoning by-law: Blocks 24, 25, 27, 51 and 54; relating to Blocks 24, 25 and 27, with the site specific zoning that has been proposed, as part of the new urbanism that they were able to maintain, they have asked for a reduced front yard setback of 3 metres for the house and a 5.5 metre setback for the garage; advising that, for the site specific zones, that provision has been left out from those various Blocks and they would ask that those special provisions be added to those five Blocks so that they are consistent throughout the entire draft plan of subdivision; appreciating that staff has worked with them with respect to the Open Space lands

adjacent to the two medium density Blocks along Adelaide Street North, what staff has proposed is to allow two Blocks the ability to incorporate the Open Space lands in the calculations for the zoning regulations, but the way that it is worded; reading “notwithstanding Section 3.9(2), the area of land so zoned shall also include the Open Space zoned lands in the Lot or Block of which they form a part for the purpose of calculating Lot area density, Lot coverage and landscaped open space”; however, the way that the plan has been redlined, the Open Space lands are no longer in the Block nor are they in the Lot; advising that either there needs to be a change to the red-line or a change to the wording of the zoning; reiterating that she realizes that staff is attempting to work with them on this, but, again, those lands are not included in the Block or the Lot so they are still not able to include them in the calculations so they are just asking for a minor change to address that concern; indicating that a holding provision has been recommended to be placed over the entire subdivision and it is a new holding provision for urban design guidelines; advising that that is a condition that has been proposed to be included in the draft plan of subdivision conditions; indicating that, from that perspective, they do not feel that it is necessary to have a holding provision requiring them to prepare urban design guidelines for the entire subdivision; reiterating that the draft plan guidelines already require it; indicating that the holding provision is redundant and not necessary for this particular item; asking the Committee to consider changing draft plan condition 14, which is a condition that they have recognized has been incorporated into a number of draft plan subdivisions, although this one, in particular, relates to the review of building permits prior to the issuance of a permit and that is for urban design review; indicating that in past instances, in their experience, the applications have all been reviewed by a qualified professional that has been retained by the developer themselves; indicating that condition 14, as proposed by staff, has outlined that the building permit drawings are all to be reviewed by urban design staff, which not only puts an added burden on their urban design staff, it does take the design review out of the developer’s hands and they feel that, even though this is not something new, this is not something that has been incorporated into any other draft plans, their client would like to retain the ability to review the building permit applications to ensure, from his own perspective, that they do meet the urban design guidelines that they will be required to prepare as part of the design studies of the draft plan application; reiterating that those are the four items in particular that they would ask the Committee to review and change as part of this application and for most of the other items, they would ask that the Committee recommend approval as per the staff report.