

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

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

- Paul Hinde, Manager, Land Development Tridon Group of Companies and 2353034 Ontario Limited (a company under the umbrella of the Tridon Group of Companies) – expressing appreciation to the staff for their efforts as this has been a long, onerous exercise of discussions and dialogue back and forth incorporating the Neighbourhood Association to try to come to a solution which they are in support of the Staff's recommendation; noting that staff has worked effortlessly trying to accommodate, not only our concerns but the neighbours concerns, there has been a great effort that staff has taken in getting this application before you tonight, after many referrals back; as previously indicated, they are in support of the staff recommendation and although there are some outstanding issues, he reiterates what staff has suggested, that what is before Planning Committee tonight is a rezoning and the Tridon Group of Companies really needed to have a clear direction and a commitment of Council as to the redevelopment of this brownfield under-utilized site has an end field opportunity that is appropriate and acceptable on Council's behalf; noting that the zoning tonight, the acceptance of the recommendation for the adoption of the zoning by-law allows us to carry forward a very important stage, the public site plan stage, where we are going to be able to address a number of concerns that were constantly and appropriately being raised from the outset of the project as to whether this was an appropriate form of development through the infill and intensification; indicating that we have recognized that there is an existing cottage style house that is to be demolished and ultimately with the zoning by-law on 510 Central Avenue a five unit multi dwelling will be constructed; is it appropriate and desirable in the community relevant to the neighbourhood and the zoning by-law and the recommendations being considered, the site plan review authority and approval is going to ensure that there is an acceptable and desirable built form being developed on the property; further noting that in the terms of 609 William Street, this is just really a confirmation of the legal non-conforming use through the zoning by-law which is to occur in the existing building only, there will be no new development occurring on that site, it is only to bring office and a variety of types of office uses, retail uses back into the building, which quite honestly has not been used to its greatest potential; expressing that it has been many, many years since the departure of the Bob Martin Golf Stores, so we are hoping that the Planning Committee will provide a favorable recommendation to the staff's report tonight to Council, recommending the zoning; indicating that he fully understands and recognizes that there are a couple of outstanding issues, there is literally nothing in the proposed zoning by-law amendment that would cause difficulty in proceeding to the next stage in terms of coming forward with a site plan for consideration of the type of building; advising that roof lines are clearly finalized at the site plan stage not at the zoning bylaw stage, parking is something that is finalized at the site plan stage not at the zoning bylaw stage; we are looking forward to getting to the next step and hope to be putting in an application in the very near future to continue with this project to allow for the redevelopment that has clearly been an under-utilized and less than stellar unoccupied two sites for some time; indicating that the westerly drive that has been spoken about, is an existing driveway and has been in place since 2007, it isn't a new driveway that's being proposed, the purpose of wanting to retain that driveway is because two of the five units are accessed from the front of the building, Central Avenue, so by having one parking space dedicated to one unit; further indicating that it may very well be the tenant may have one car, but if it happens to be a husband and wife, it would be no different than an individual residing in a dwelling that has a single car driveway, he would have to park, it's not stacking one unit and another person's unit where that is prohibited in the by-law, it would just be the ability of having both of your cars parked on the same driveway; indicating that the issue we had with the suggestion providing parking coming in from the rear, you can see the landscaped area with two trees being shown on the plan, that is the only snow storage ability that we have at the rear of 510 Central, so all the brown area parking when the snow is plowed is going to

have to be stored and part of that area will be in that landscaped open space in the back of the property, so having a driveway coming in from the back just wasn't possible, further advising that having strictly one parking space whether we call it boulevard parking allowing one parking space or calling it a driveway its calling a zebra black and white or calling a zebra white and black it's a boulevard parking or it's a driveway, the only difference of opinion we are having is how long the zebra's tail is, further advising that would it allow for two parking spaces dedicated to one unit only, it could be one individual owning two cars, so he parks one of his cars in the driveway and the other one in the back, it didn't make sense, so we wanted flexibility; also indicating it is a site plan issue, it isn't a zoning issue; advising that you may recall the second planning report that was presented to Council had a very specific provision prohibiting parking on the west side of the building and we took great exception to that and articulated our concerns at that meeting; noting that it was referred back to staff for further dialogue, now what we have on our third planning report tonight is to leave it open and debate it at the site plan when we are looking at everything else that is site plan related not zoning related; asking that Committee refer the recommendation of staff and that the site plan issues will be ironed out at the site plan stage; indicating that the concerns of traffic hazards, as he has said, the driveway has existed for seven years, there is an individual, that we believe, resides in the neighbouring property who has been taking the liberty of parking in that driveway, we haven't really been enforcing it but it does exist now and to the best of my knowledge there has not been a catastrophic collision as a result of people pulling in or pulling out of that existing driveway right now, also indicating that it come down to semantics, coming down to if a zebra is black and white or white and black, it's a boulevard parking or it's a driveway, the location of that parking space is exactly the same; lastly, Irrespective of what we are going to be calling it, the fact is that the one or the two cars will be able to park there, will it going to be used for three or four, no it won't, because it is going to be dedicated to one parking for one unit, and all the other units will have their dedicated parking spaces at the rear of 510 Central and right in behind the adjacent property.

- Kate Rapson, Chair, Woodfield Community Association – indicating that the community neighbourhoods and the Association have been pretty involved with this application that was submitted in July and so far the community have agreed to a number of things; noting that there is an abandoned house that has been there for years and it is an eyesore so we are open to change; noting that they have agreed to a zoning change that allows a five plex where four is permitted, a two story building at 510 Central with limitation on height so it does not dwarf the entire cottage adjacent to it and to the immediately east, a design with two units with front doors facing Central and three off the back, with limited windows on the east side for a level of privacy, parking for five to six cars with an easement on the Waterloo lot, because it extends in behind 510 Central; advising that two driveways is kind of important, one in off Central which is the immediate east of 510 Central and that is the in driveway which goes by that little cottage that everyone talks about, and also the out driveway that goes through 609 William address, so there is one in and one out and also the one in allows access to all the parking in the back for 510; further noting that the community has also agreed to the retail use for 609 and understands that it was a grandfather type of thing so that is fine; further indicating that with some of the limitations that the community talked about, there is a school very close by and a daycare so we want it to have that community feel to it; noting that the developer has agreed to it wholeheartedly; and the demolition of the existing single family, little cottage that is there now, it's not in the conservation district but it is adjacent to it and is in the Woodfield community; further noting that the City has been really great to work with and have been really appreciative of their focus on the design to ensure that it blends in with the streetscape; further expressing that late in the game the developer tried and showed a new draft with a westerly driveway, so there would be three driveways on this one application now; noting that the developers say it will result in multiple cars stacked in the front so that if you drive along Central, especially in that area there is a lot of boulevard and side yard parking, there is all kinds of cars all over the place, so this is an opportunity to come and clean that up a little bit, starting with this one site; requesting that all parking go in the back where there is ample parking and she thinks there is twenty-four spots on the 609 William, which would be

easy access to 501 Central, and would allow for more green space in the front, with no risk of cars being parked all over the front and prevent the abuses to that single lane driveway that you see every day and on other properties, however the developer rejected that request by the community; also indicating that we offered two compromises, first was to have the driveway come in off 609 and sort of loop around the back of the house so it comes down the west side of the house and people could park there, and the other was that the westerly drive that is being proposed would be shortened so it really would only fit one car, both of these ideas were rejected; expressing that they want to hold their ground on the parking, it is like a small issue but then it isn't, we feel it speaks to the wider community issue for parking for multi-plexes and the use of front and side yards when options are available at the back, there is plenty of space back there; further expressing that they have accomplished a lot to date and it is a shame that this one issue remains unresolved; lastly, what we are asking is to approve the plan as the report is presented with one amendment, to state in the zoning that the parking for 510 Central there be no third westerly drive and that the two driveways are enough.

- Audrey Francis, 503 Central Avenue (representing the petitioners to the application) – expressing that there may be some repetition tonight but the neighbourhood is very passionate about their community; firstly, she wanted to thank the Planning staff for the time spent on this report and for listening to the community's concerns, many of which are set out in the staff report; indicating that since that last meeting of October 7th we have met with the Planning Department, the Developer and the Woodfield Association several times in an attempt to work together to bring this to a conclusion; noting that on October 7th the Developer requested that they be allowed to extend the driveway to the west of the property at 510 Central to allow for one parking space for the occupant at the front; advising that it was and still is the community's position that all parking for 510 Central Avenue should be at the end and that the front be all green space; advising that she has numerous emails in support of this, however, they wanted to make every attempt to resolve this to everyone's satisfaction; noting that in their attempt to provide alternate solutions, such as a driveway on the west side, entering from the rear up to the front of the building be put in place, that would accommodate both parties, this was flatly rejected; noting that the developer cited snow removal was the issue; further noting that they reluctantly offered the developer the one parking space that they requested at the front west side using a portion of the west driveway, the length of one car fronted with a flowerbed or landscaping to prevent parking on the lawn, this again was flatly rejected, again citing snow removal as the issue too; further indicating that the applicant finally admitted that their anticipated use of the westerly driveway was not for one car but two in the event that the unit had more than one vehicle; also noting that the community does not want a parking lot on the west side of the property, we currently have difficulty entering and exiting our driveways and the retention of the driveway at 510 Central, the jockeying around of two or three cars would only serve to add to the congestion and endanger the lives of the residents and pedestrians; indicating that this is a safety issue, these cars will clearly block the view of homeowners just backing out of their driveways, especially the cottage at 518; further noting that there is a fire hydrant six feet from the existing driveway at 510 and 10 feet from the street, should this driveway be allowed to remain and the vehicle parked on the street, the hydrant will be blocked off from any accessibility of emergency vehicles; further advising that the other concern is the retail allowable at 609 William, although we are not in total disagreement of it we asked that the retail used be limited and not include such things as head shops, medical or any other business that creates heavy traffic and late night hours; further requesting that lighting of the area be of a design that does not invade the privacy of the neighbours backing onto 609 William; lastly, we request that you accept the Planning Departments plan as presented with two amendments; that the westerly driveway at 510 Central not be allowed to remain and that all parking for the five unit building be at the rear and that the retail uses at 609 William Street be closely reviewed and restricted.
- Marcus Coles, 38 Palace Street – indicating that he lives on Palace Street which has a junction on Central which is pretty much right across from this development; expressing that what worries him is that currently coming out of Palace Street the sight lines are bad as it is; advising that if there is a west driveway in there, especially if it is stacked cars

and people are pulling in and out into what is almost the intersection for juggling purposes, it could become a safety nightmare amongst other things; further indicating that everything else that was bothering him has been addressed.