

Dear Councillors,

As the Chair of the Woodfield Community Association (WCA), I would like to ask that the special meeting to discuss 510 Central and 609 William Street, which is currently scheduled to take place before the Council meeting on Tuesday, October 14, be rescheduled to a later date due to timing issues and the concern that Council may be voting with some possible misinformation on one item (see below). While the WCA along with 49 petitioners in the neighbourhood, agreed to a number of concessions in this application (5 units, larger footprint, zoning changes, etc.), the revised report raises concerns for the following reasons:

1) We feel there are significant changes in the revised planner's report (dated Oct. 14) from the original presented on Oct. 7. The community is deeply concerned about the following:

- The original report, stated that the retail use at 609 William was not supported by the Official Plan policies. That clause has been deleted in the revised report and one added to allow for retail. It's a complex issue, as the property has had retail use in the past so was legal non-conforming. While the developer stated at the PEC meeting last Tuesday that the site currently had retail use, that has not been confirmed to our knowledge. What is confirmed is that Medway Stationers, who may have been the last retailer at this address, moved to another address over 3 years ago. This detail about Medway was confirmed by co-owner Ivan Smith on Oct. 10. We are not sure if Planning has this information. Given this, the question is 'what is the status of retail on this site' and 'what is allowed'? **We are concerned a decision by Council will be made with misinformation or incomplete details.** We request confirmation of current retail use (and future use) as well as clarification.
- Given this application includes two properties, 609 William and 510 Central, there are currently three driveways. The developer wants to keep all three. In the original planner's report, the westerly drive/lane was to be removed due to concerns about parking abuses/oversights by future tenants (the Oct. 7 Planner's report included the full rationale). In the revised report, mention of the westerly drive, was deleted; so we assume it will stay and there will be three driveways in total for this development which include two on either side of the 510 building. But we would like to confirm with Planning the full implications of the revisions. The community wanted the westerly drive removed for the same reasons as stated by Barb in her report.
- In the report presented on Oct. 7 all parking for 510 Central was to be located at the rear of the property. That clause has been deleted in the Oct. 14 version. Previously the developer wanted two front yard/boulevard parking spaces. We objected to this location for parking and Planning negotiated with the developer to relocate it at the rear where there are 22 parking spots. The developer seemed to initially agree, then later presented a plan showing the westerly drive used as a parking space. We are concerned that given the Oct. 14 report no longer states there will be **no** parking in the front, there now would be. The Association's position regarding boulevard and front yard parking is in line with the City's bylaws. In this case there are ample locations for parking in the back.

2) Following the meeting on Oct. 7, we were under the impression from the PEC there would be another consultation between the City, the developer and the neighbours regarding the PEC's feedback on the Planner's report. However there was no consultation with the community members and little time to schedule one. Due to the holiday weekend and vacations by key Planning staff, we were unable to get clarification on a number of points.

3) The previous item on last Tuesday night's agenda ran till almost 11 pm. Planner Barb Debbert had to rush through her presentation due to the late hour. The developer spoke for almost an hour, leaving limited time for discussion by the committee and the planners. Barb has worked very hard on this application and has been very helpful to the community. We feel Planning's efforts were cut short at this meeting and many good points from their Oct. 7 report not fully explored.

In all, the revised report dated Oct. 14 represents a dramatic change from what was presented Oct. 7 and represented extensive input from the community and developer. We continue to appreciate the efforts by all parties on the design of the building, given it is adjacent to a heritage district. However, we respectfully ask the PEC and Council to defer any decisions pending further clarification on these above points. The application has been open for over two years, another week is not too much to ask we feel.

Many thanks for your time and consideration of this matter which is of keen interest to Woodfield.

Please include this letter in the Council Agenda.

Kindest regards,

Kate Rapson
Chair, Woodfield Community Association

cc. Barry & Audrey Francis, who represent the 40 petitioners