

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

9. Property located at 2081 Wallingford Avenue (SP14-038425)
  - Doug Stanlake, Stanlake Consulting, on behalf of the applicant – advising that this is what the site currently looks like in terms of the sales of the units and the reason that they are here is that this property has been on the market for now almost four years; indicating that there has been extensive efforts by Rembrandt in order to sell the units; noting that the units that are identified are those that are identified in yellow on the graph; advising that the property has basically stalled in terms of being able to sell additional units out of this site; pointing out that they have had some good discussions with staff trying to come up with a solution but we just find ourselves at a point where we agree to disagree on points which is why they asked for the referral of the matter to the Committee today; reiterating that the reason that they are here is because Rembrandt has been unable to sell those units which abut Wonderland Road and the principle reason that purchasers give as to why they have no interest in purchasing those units is because there is no visual barrier between the unit and Wonderland Road; advising that traffic is very dense and has increased substantially since Wonderland Road has been approved; providing some commentary about the roundabout which has been installed; noting that there has been a change in the pattern of the traffic in the area, with a lot more heavy trucks, which also generates more noise in the area; indicating that the change that they are looking for is the change in fencing along Wonderland Road; advising that Rembrandt does have a lot of experience in trying to sell these back to front units; showing a photograph of a development that Rembrandt received approval for and has been built and has been successful; noting that it is a townhouse development, it has the orientation that meets sight line and placemaking principles; outlining that the same principles that you use for townhouse development are not necessarily principles that will work for selling single family homes which back onto an arterial road; discussing Wonderland Road elevation, which is what Mr. Conway, Landscape Planner, has outlined as built and showing a photograph of what it looks like, with the porch out front; advising that there is a short distance between the property line and the front face of the porch; noting that it is approximately four metres when it is built out; outlining that, in the front yard, in order to meet Provincial standards in terms of noise attenuation, considerable effort has been made, with added vegetation surrounding the courtyard at the front; showing a photograph that illustrates a gas fireplace that has been installed in the courtyard, there are hookups for barbeques and an outside area with a cover over it; advising that considerable efforts have been made to try to address placemaking in a variety of things; indicating that Rembrandts' efforts to date, in trying to sell these units; reiterating that it has been on the market for almost four years now, since the original design approval; noting that the past two and a half to three years, the models have been built in place as a type of aggressive marketing plan; indicting that the total lack of sales is because of no privacy fence along Wonderland Road; noting that that is the bottom line that they keep hearing from all potential purchasers; advising that Rembrandt has given significant financial incentives and other types of financial arrangements to try to make use, pulling on their experience that they use when trying to sell other front to back units; indicating that they provided enhanced landscaping, a little bit more than what is shown on the approved site plan, as perhaps some way of trying to immunerate the difference between not having a fence that meets the privacy, trying to use landscaping to do that; noting that that has not been successful in generating these sales; indicating that Rembrandt has also employed sales representatives that have had significant experience in dealing with these back to front issues; reiterating that, despite all efforts, there have been no sales of these units; outlining that the agreement that they have had with staff, as Mr. Conway, Landscape Planner, has outlined, they generally agree that there has to be some type of fencing to assist in the sale of these boundary units; believing, in principle, staff believe that they are a solid privacy fence is one way of getting the issue resolved; noting that the staff report does indicate that they have accepted, in principle, the alternative that Rembrandt

put forward; however, there are issues that we cannot agree on; outlining that the principle issue is the height of the privacy fence; indicating that the height of the privacy fence, the difference that they have, is two feet, the difference between a six foot fence and an eight foot fence; advising that staff does not agree with Rembrandt's preferred fence, which is a solid fence, without any gates; pointing out that there are other minor issues that he thinks they can deal with and that deals with the landscape inset and the height of the inset, as shown in the staff's preferred option; showing a photograph of Rembrandt's preferred fence; indicating that it is a vinyl extruded product that you have seen through several locations throughout the City and he thinks the most visible one is the one on Veterans Memorial Parkway; noting that that type of fence was used, with some modification, as a noise fence, but this particular product is identified only as a privacy fence, although it does have some noise attenuation qualities to it; advising that the inset could be deeper to allow for more vegetation and there would be a number of vegetation inserts as illustrated on this graphic; advising that Rembrandt's preferred fence design is the 2.4 metres or 8 feet does provide the visual barrier; indicating that they have done a number of projections as to what the height would have to be in order to determine the appropriate height to provide the visual barrier that the customers are looking for; noting that 2.4 metres is the height we feel that gives the greatest opportunity for success in being able to sell these units; pointing out that if they added more vegetative inserts to provide a softer relief, to provide some more pedestrian interest as one would walk along Wonderland Road; indicating that it is consistent with the other type of fencing that is used in the Corlon or Sunningdale subdivisions; advising that, to the south of this property is a vacant land condominium; advising that it has a full masonry noise wall of over eight feet in height; pointing out that the next reach to that is north of that are a number of single family lots which back onto Wonderland Road and it, too, has a large noise attenuation wall, partially masonry, partially wood; advising that the third fence provides maximum security in terms of protecting, or as they have heard from other residents, the prospect of having gates only leads to potential security issues; indicating that staff would disagree with this and their comment was that you can always leave a permanent lock on the gate so you should not have a security issue; advising that the fence does provide a modest, as proposed, does provide a modest sense of noise attenuation because there is some sort of barrier between Wonderland Road traffic and the units themselves; advising that it provides the best option for success in their opinion; indicating that the reason that staff originally did not support Rembrandt's preferred fence was because they did not want to set a precedence for what might happen on the west side of Wonderland Road, that is, creating a corridor; indicating that if you look at the development that has already happened on the west side of Wonderland Road, commencing from Fanshawe Park Road North, you have commercial development, you then have a vacant lot where there is proposed to be a grocery store, the next unit, you have a number of industrial uses that happen on that site, next to that you have an institutional use, being a church, so those sets of uses right there, there would be no need for a privacy wall for any of those uses, the next property, to the north of the church, is actually owned by Rembrandt; advising that they are proposing another vacant land condominium and the design of it will have a window street; noting that, on that property, there would be no need for a privacy fence; pointing out that the property next to that property is a draft approved plan of subdivision and, contrary to what is in your package today, on the report, the outline on the location map shows lots have been proposed which would rear face Wonderland Road; advising that that is an error, the draft approved planned subdivision for the area shows a window street on the Vista Woods subdivision and, again, there would be no need for any type of a privacy fence because the window street has been established; indicating that the only little portion that would be left that would have any possibility for a future design is in the extreme northeast corner of the site and it is a very small stretch at all, with the proper design and proper approval, that would be the only area that there would be any possibility of having to have any type of privacy fence; outlining that they do not agree that would be sufficient rationale to refuse the fencing; identifying that, initially they said that they did not like the aesthetic appeal of the proposed fence and Rembrandt added more vegetation inserts to soften the area; advising that, again they have come down to a disagreement on height, which he has already mentioned; noting that the last thing is no

proposed fence; advising that Rembrandt's preferred fence is not pedestrian oriented; outlining that, on the drawing shown at the meeting, the redline is the curb of the now Wonderland Road redevelopment and the roundabout; indicating that, as you progress north on the site, the curb gets closer and closer to the units; pointing out that, at unit 21, the curb is only seven metres from the property line, so from the front face of the unit to the curb is only thirteen metres in width; reiterating that it is very close to the units themselves, particularly major arterial roads which is experiencing major volumes of heavy truck traffic these days; pointing out that there is a grade difference as you go from south to north; showing a picture that shows you the grade difference; noting that it is approximately two feet difference between the grade level of Wonderland Road and the grade level of the units at the south end of the development; mentioning this, because as this next illustration will show you, both of these schemes and graphics have been put together to show the units that actually have been built and the units themselves relative to grade on Wonderland Road are lower; advising that, in the alternative that Rembrandt has proposed, it does block out the visual aspect of being able to look out the windows at the units and not be able to see the traffic except for where the gates are; outlining that the gate provides direct access to the porch which has been constructed on these units; indicating that, on the City's proposal in coming back they are showing a six foot fence and as you can see, when this particular unit, when it is built as it is built, approximately half of the windows, you can see directly out and you can see the traffic on Wonderland Road; pointing out that these are the differences, if you add another section to the City's proposal, it will provide the visual barrier that they are looking for; adding that, because the objective here in trying to create a visual barrier, you have what the City has proposed in this location and almost forty percent of the reach of the fence, from one end of the property to the other, would have virtually no visual barrier; indicating that it is a four foot fence and why they are proposing to try to address the issue of needing a visual barrier with the four foot fence, they just do not agree with; relating to the depth of the insets, because they have tried to address through the alternative of a 2.4 metre wall and to provide the visual barrier that is needed, to try to be street oriented, a proposal coming back was that we will put in a gate; indicating that a gate will provide those who are walking, you will be able to see into the yard of the individual units; supposing that, if a property owner wishes to use a gate they would have to get approval from the condominium corporation in the future because the entire fence, in the arrangements, are the responsibility of the condominium corporation, not the individual property owner; noting that this will be their responsibility on a go forward basis; further noting that this is an issue that has been addressed; discussing the depth of the inset, and basically, we are talking, in this area, they are dealing with an inset in a yard that is very shallow; pointing out that it is only six metres from the property line to the front face of the unit; dealing with the very narrow six metre yard, by moving their barrier fence in by a metre and a half, you are encroaching into that yard by twenty-five percent; advising that if you take away what is already the two metre porch, you are really only left with a metre and a half of area to deal with; advising that, it is their opinion that the closeness of this inset fence will be a deterrent to future sales of the area; indicating that the 1.5 would be acceptable if the preferred fence is approved; noting that that is a fence with no gates; advising that they could inset a deeper vegetation area if that would be the pleasure of the City; however, the alternative fence, with the gates, they are of the opinion that the 0.6 metre space is ample space to allow for vegetation to grow in the area; indicating that the only difference that they have with the insets is the height; noting that they cannot agree on the height; further noting that they do not agree that four feet is going to give you the visual barrier that is required; indicating that they are very adamant that they have to go back to the eight foot fence; outlining the implications if they make no changes; advising that the improvements to Wonderland Road have resulted in more traffic, more truck traffic, that means more noise being affected by the property owners; advising that, since the boundary units cannot be constructed, as Mr. Conway did indicate, the expected noise barrier in the units themselves do not provide the noise attenuation that those units interior to the site would expect; advising that the neighbourhood is faced with uncertainty as to when the development will be built out and they are living in a constant construction zone, except for recently, when there have been very few units that have

been built; advising that they have concerns over the potential impact on the resale price of their unit and maintaining the existing value; indicating that there will be ongoing public relations issues with the developer and the City; indicating that, from the City's point of view, the implications are going to be basically dollars; advising that, with the inability to sell these units, you are losing out on approximately \$500,000 in revenue for the development charges fund, loss of revenue in building permits; noting that their estimates are that you are annually losing \$135,000 in taxes to date and approximately \$50,000 to \$75,000 in lost property tax; advising that, from Rembrandt's view, they simply cannot build without the units; noting that the development has stalled in terms of any type of significant sales; pointing out that, without a significant change in the fence, they simply cannot build the units to provide the noise attenuation for the other purchasers in the area; advising that the condominium corporation is already registered so the ability to try and change a house type, which has been a suggestion, is not going to happen, it is not practical; advising that they are left with single family housing which backs onto an arterial road; pointing out that there are obviously ongoing carrying costs; requesting that the Committee not support the staff recommendation; requesting that the Committee support Rembrandt's preferred solid fence with no gates and a height of eight feet, which gives it the required visual barrier and provides the maximum security for the development; indicating that if you cannot support the preferred fence, the alternative, with gates, at an eight foot height, with shallow vegetation inserts is what they would be looking for; showing a drawing of the development; and, noting that the bright yellow lots that are identified are the units that they cannot move under whatever means that they have attempted over the years. (See attached presentation and attached petition signed by approximately 14 individuals.)

- Bob Young, 2135 Wallingford Avenue – advising that he and his wife live at the corner of Wonderland Road and Sunningdale, which they sometimes refer to as the corner of chaos; indicating that they are approximately one hundred yards from the new proposed solid eight foot privacy wall; advising that they have lived there for a little over two years; providing some of the reasons that they are supporting Rembrandt's construction of an eight foot privacy wall; privacy to enjoy their new home, no gate entrance from Wonderland Road, security from intruders, peace of mind; reiterating not gates from Wonderland Road; noting that these gates negate the solid wall effectiveness; understanding that this solid wall also has a sound barrier feature as well; indicating that the new roundabout at Wonderland Road and Sunningdale Road is now moving traffic very efficiently; complimenting the City Planners on a job well done; indicating that the issue is that there is now increased traffic due to the building explosion in our north end; advising that they now have extreme noise that whips through their home making it very difficult to hold a normal conversation; indicating that this increased traffic is made up of gravel trucks, engine brakes, large construction vehicles gearing up and down, cement trucks and now transports using this to go north, he suspects, to Highway 7 and motorcycles, they are back; advising that the traffic continues from 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM; indicating that the pace of traffic and noise has increased thirty percent from pre-roundabout construction; understanding there will be a widening of Wonderland Road eventually; during the winter months, Mother Nature has provided us with an insulating snow covering to reduce somewhat the traffic noise; thinking about what a solid wall would do; indicating that there are privacy walls throughout the City, to name a few, Veterans Memorial Parkway, Meadowgate and Chelton, Wonderland Road from Sarnia Road to Fanshawe Park Road, west of Hyde Park Road and right next to the site, a large eight foot, probably nine foot, on Eagletrace Drive; advising that the proposed privacy wall of eight feet with staggered landscaping would be aesthetically pleasing to all; restating their need for this wall, it will provide privacy, peace of mind, security and sound attenuation; and, asking that the Committee please make their small community a sanctuary so that they may enjoy a better quality of life. (See attached communication.)
- Martin Foley, 2087 Wallingford Avenue – agreeing with everything that has been said by the area residents this evening; indicating that he does not agree with the development corporation here in this community; indicating that there should be an eight foot fence for security and privacy; advising that he owns his condominium, both land and home, so it is freehold and he paid over \$550,000 for it so they are not that inexpensive, they are expensive homes; outlining that they are proud of their homes and that they want to

make sure that their property values go up and if they do not get the eight foot fence, and these are not sold, their property values will not go up; expressing appreciation to the City for putting in the roundabout because it is fantastic; advising that Jane Bigelow's attempt to put a ring road around the city has worked out very well because Wonderland Road and Sunningdale Road are perfect roads for everybody to travel on from here to Clarke Road; advising that there are only four city street lights involved there in that distance versus fourteen on Fanshawe Park Road, so why use Fanshawe Park Road; and, recommending having all the traffic come up to Wonderland Road, along Sunningdale Road and you have the ring road that you all wanted.

- Ann Margaret Young Collins, 2031 Wallingford Avenue – expressing concern, as a condominium owner, is that the City has said that they will put in more plantings for some of the visual, to break that down; indicating that the challenge that she has, as a condominium owner, is that she is going to have to maintain that longer term; advising that she would rather put in a permanent solution, a privacy wall, that they will not have to maintain long term; believing that the insets and the little bit of landscaping they are fine with, it is when they are trying to use it as a visual instead of having the wall; and, requesting that the Committee consider that when they consider their proposal.
- Tony Marsman, Owner, Rembrandt Homes - advising that they have gone through a five year process and have tried everything that they could, they have tried to use their experience and they were not successful in making this design work; advising that it is as simple as that; outlining what is wrong, this is a case of placemaking going too far; enquiring who the placemaking is for; indicating that, for the people that live here, they do not like what they have; enquiring why we cannot give them what they can have, what they can have and should have; believing that the quality of life here has diminished a long way and it only takes a proper privacy wall, proper screening from the public, traffic that is there, to restore a good quality of life there; and, asking the Committee to listen to the desires of the people.