

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

18. Properties located at 510 Central Avenue and 609 William Street (Z-8141)

- Paul Hinde, Tridon Group – providing the attached presentation.
- Audrey Francis, 503 Central – providing the attached presentation.
- Jane Graydon, 518 Central – agreeing with what has been said; noting that the size of the building on the lot, in comparison to her own; expressing concern with what the building will look like as it is out of character for Woodfield, and advising that the fencing on two sides of her property is a huge concern; noting the following additional concerns with the proposal: parking issues, potential traffic and the preservation of healthy, mature trees, noting that it would be in line with City directives to save these; offering support for the recommendation of Planning; noting that despite assurances that garbage is not going to be stored externally, it is likely that it will be on the property somewhere; and requesting sympathy in design for the historical and architectural integrity of the neighbourhood.
- Hazel Elmslie, 42 Palace Street – advising that she is a person of interest in the circulation area of the application; offering thanks to B. Debbert, Planner, for her work; noting the historical progression of the application, and that a year ago the neighbours had agreed to a four-plex with a very different footprint for the site; requesting the maintenance of the R-3 zoning on the site; and noting that they need to avoid the traffic problems of people backing out on driveway on to Central, because traffic is already a problem – the entrance must be off Central, with an exit to William Street only; requesting a requirement for parking to be on the title of the property on 510 Central to ensure permanent dedicated parking on site.
- Kate Rapson, Chair, Woodfield Community Association – noting the requirements under the *Heritage Act* related to the design of the building, noting the property is immediately adjacent to the Woodfield Conservation Area; noting support for infill, and density and are supportive of the proposed 5-unit development (nine bedrooms, with R-3 zoning); noting concerns remain with respect to parking, that there needs to be no boulevard parking; noting support for the concerns of the neighbours; suggesting that many wrongs don't make a right, and shouldn't allow the boulevard; noting lots of parking is available in the rear; reminding that based on the historical nature of the area, many houses are historically accessed from the rear, noting the maintenance of rear access lanes in the area; acknowledging the efforts of the developer with respect to the design – massing, and step design of the proposal; noting they are supportive of the staff recommendations, recognizing the potential development and are focusing on a good design for the neighbourhood.