

My name is Audrey Francis. My husband Barry and I have lived at 503 Central Ave., for almost 25 years. Our house is across the street from the subject property at 510 Central, and just two houses to the East.

I am here this evening representing the 49 Petitioners - some of which are here, and will speak - that objected to the Zoning Application as presented by the Developer

Speaking on behalf of my fellow petitioners, I would like to first say that we are passionate about our neighbourhood, community and streetscape.

We would like nothing better than to see a new building erected on the site at 510 Central to replace the derelict little bungalow that now stands and attracts unwanted guests.

We however, do not want to replace one problem with another.

*Make no mistake, the Developer refers to this as a ~~2~~ ~~floor~~ raised ranch*

We started this process January 18, 2013 when the initial application was received. The application was for a 12-unit apartment building to be built on the tiny lot at 510 Central, which housed a small single floor bungalow. The application also included converting the building at 609 William into 11 apartment units.

*this presented as a 2 1/2 storey bldg*

The neighbours objected to such a building, and spent numerous hours meeting, and negotiating with the Developer.

After negotiations and compromises being made by both sides, we believed that the issue had been resolved and as such *the neighbours* signed a document of understanding. We sat back, and waited to see some movement and activity on the site.

We were confused and very frustrated when we received an amended application at the beginning of July of this year. This application was for an entirely different development, which meant we were starting all over at square 1.

We have again made some compromises to accommodate the Developer but there are some items that we simply can't accept.

Let me make it perfectly clear.

With regard to the proposed building at 510 Central Ave., we still have concerns. We are concerned about the size of the proposed development on this tiny lot. We want to ensure that the design of the building matches and complements the heritage of the existing streetscape. We are concerned about the designated required parking.

As recently as last week, the Developer submitted additional changes to the design for the property of 510 Central. The Developers expressed their intent to retain the driveway on the West side of the property as of last Tuesday, September 30th.

This 11<sup>th</sup> hour change was never incorporated into any previous drawings or plans, or raised at any meetings. The renderings created by the developer which they presented to us on Sept. 4, showcased a green space at the front of this building. The existing driveway did not appear in the rendering.

We are totally against retaining the driveway as it will continue to cause parking problems, will impede traffic flow on and off Central, will negatively impact the streetscape, and present a hazard for pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

*The existing driveway was there to accommodate a single family residence,*  
The Developer has used "safety" as a reason for maintaining the drive. Safety can be accomplished by the provision of motion scensored lighting from the front to the rear. *not a multi-family*

*Paul. said - A car is parking there now -> Actually there are normally 2 or 3 from the Bldg next door*  
To squeeze a driveway beside this oversized building, which will accommodate a minimum of 2 vehicles – or more – goes against the recommendations of the Planning Department and the aesthetic of the neighbourhood.

*-bb said others have bldg plg -> Because our homes were build pre-automobile era.*  
We are totally opposed to any allowance for the drive to remain, and request you agree with the City Planning Department in **rejecting** the request. *New development should accom for proper parking for their bldg design.*

The Planning Department has got it right. We agree with their recommendations as follows:

Regarding 510 Central Ave:

- 1) That No boulevard parking be allowed
- 2) That a parking agreement between both properties is legally dedeed so that parking for 510 Central will always be part of the 609 William lot, no matter who owns each property
- 3) That an existing driveway on the west side not be allowed to remain
- 4) That the zoning does not change from R3 to R9,
- 5) That Zoning will reflect R3 with special provision in this case only, to allow a 5-plex – maximum of 2 bedrooms per unit in 4 units
- 6) That the Building height will not exceed 30 - 32 feet
- 7) That the Entrance to 510 Central and 609 William will be off of Central only, and so designated.
- 8) That the City Planning and Heritage Staff are working on a Design that matches our community and streetscape.

Regarding 609 William St:

- 1) We have been advised and insist that the allowance for this building to include office space, and medical etc., will NOT allow for a Methadone Clinic, or retail.
- 2) That the Exit from 609 William and 510 Central will be on William Street only, and so designated.

3) We understand a further facelift is in store for the exterior of the building, which will be more pleasing to the neighbours.

Central Ave. has become a very busy street both with pedestrian traffic, and vehicular traffic.

In order to maintain and preserve the uniqueness of our community and streetscape, it is imperative that we ensure that the concerns of those that live there are met.

We take pride in our homes. We value the character and heritage of our neighbourhood and it is essential that we do not lose that, just for the sake of development.

We respectfully request that the initial and amended application as submitted by the Developer in July 2014 be rejected, and the recommendations as presented in the City Planning Department's report and recommendations be approved.

We would like to acknowledge the support of the Woodfield Community Association, Jane Graydon, and all those in the Community who have assisted in this process.

Thank you for your considerations.