

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

8. Property located at 1959 Wharncliffe Road South (39T-14502)
 - Scott Allen, MHBC, on behalf of York Developments – emphasizing that they are largely in agreement with the recommendations set out by the staff report and presented by Ms. Riley, Senior Planner, Development Services; indicating that there are, however, certain matters which Ms. Riley has alluded to which there is not necessarily agreement on at this stage; wishing to discuss these matters in more detail in front of the Committee; advising that, at the outset, he would like to provide the Committee with a brief overview of how this development evolved; pointing out that, as Ms. Riley had indicated, Phase 3 represents the third and final phase of the Foxwood Crossing development; advising that Phases 1 and 2 were predominately supporting low density residential units, the third phase provides for a much broader range of intensity and activities and collectively these various developments provide what, they believe, will be an excellent complete community that will have the opportunity for walkability as well as connectivity with transit systems; indicating that Phase 3 was developed with three organizing elements and these were generally discussed by Ms. Riley as well; advising that lower density uses would be promoted west of Savoy Street in keeping with Phases 1 and 2, more intensive mixed use activities proposed east of Savoy Street, including Community Commercial uses, which have been discussed and, as well, that there be open space elements protecting the core features on the site linked by various connections for pedestrian purposes; advising that the original application was submitted in June, 2014 based upon these design elements; noting that he will not go into detail, specifically on the plan; however, he wanted to draw attention to a couple of matters; outlining that, first of all, the mixed use component, which Ms. Riley discussed, illustrates the four commercial sites and blocks located along the Wharncliffe Road corridor; indicating that, secondly, there is a large open space block located in the northwest corridor, which encompasses an existing woodlot; pointing out that, in the original design, there was a proposal for residential units or development immediately west of that woodlot in an area that functions as a remnant farm field or farm lot; following quite a bit of discussion with staff, ultimately, there was a revised draft plan brought back to staff based on a lot of consultation, discussion and analysis of certain concerns expressed with the original plan; outlining that, as noted on this Figure, it is clear that the proposed residential area further to the west of the open space block has been removed; noting that this area is now being dedicated for parkland purposes; advising that, additionally York Developments acquired a strip of land immediately west of the site to function as a pathway block linking that open space block with the public parkland located to the south of Bakerville Street; indicating that, as an outcome of these modifications, the number of residential lots being proposed declined by fifteen and the amount of open space proposed for this site increased to 3.8 hectares, which equates to a sixty-five percent increase over the original plan; pointing out that Ms. Riley has discussed several of the draft plan redlines as well as the related conditions; reiterating that they are generally supportive of a majority of the recommendations; however, there are certain outstanding concerns relating to, as discussed, the removal of the Convenience Commercial blocks; the proposal for 20 metre wide road ways for most local streets and the requirement for sidewalks on both sides of the local streets; indicating that he wants to quickly discuss each of these matters for the Committee's consideration; indicating that, first of all, as discussed, they envision that, collectively, the Foxwood Crossing subdivision would provide community commercial blocks as part of a broader objective to have a walkable complete community; pointing out that there are several merits that are identified on the slide which warrant consideration for the application of commercial blocks within this development; outlining that, first of all, the South West Area Plan permits these uses in the medium density residential designation which applies to the site; indicating that, from their perspective, the location of the proposed commercial site that is immediately adjacent to an arterial road is in keeping with the general objectives of the Official Plan for Convenience Commercial uses; estimating that approximately 1,000 households may

ultimately locate within convenient walking distance of this site as this development progresses; believing that it is prudent to have additional lands zoned to provide for Convenience Commercial activities to service the needs of these future residents; indicating that they had also proposed, in their application, the site specific zoning that would limit the amount of retail use and focus the commercial activities on more localized personal services which we feel are in keeping with the spirit of Convenience Commercial activities; advising that they wanted to indicate that the corridor that has been proposed providing excellent land use transition between the intensive activities along the Wharnccliffe Road corridor and the low and medium density activities proposed internal to the site; envisioning that the site design itself would minimize the impact to adjacent uses as no direct access will be provided from Wharnccliffe Road South and no drive throughs would be permitted; requesting, respectfully, that the Committee consider modifying the recommendation that has been put forward by staff to allow for some level of commercial activity on this site; recognizing that their original proposal proposing four blocks and allowing approximately 4,000 square metres of gross floor area may have exceeded the expectations of the City and certainly, is in keeping with why the recommendation was to deny commercial activity at this location; pointing out that, as a proposed modification, we are asking for the Committee to consider allowing two commercial blocks near the intersection of Savoy and Wharnccliffe Road that would have a maximum gross floor area permission of roughly 15,000 square feet; advising that they feel that this modification is more in keeping with the objections of the South West Area Plan and the convenience commercial objectives of the Official Plan; expressing concern relating to the requirement to establish twenty metre wide road allowance; *(Note: Councillor Hubert enquires as to the width of the access off of Savoy; Mr. Allen responds that it appears that it is 8 metres based on their plan and he has discussed this matter with their technician, who indicated that this is in keeping with traditional commercial requirements for road access plus appropriate buffering or boulevards);* responding to Ms. Riley's concern that this access is too narrow, there is certainly the opportunity to move the institutional block slightly to the north, for instance, five metres to provide for more appropriate access off of Savoy; believing that that is an appropriate red lined response to that concern; relating to the 20 metre rights of way, they recognize that this is a City standard; notwithstanding, there are certain matters that they would like the Committee to consider as to why they propose a different standard; outlining that, first of all, the draft plan was designed with 18 metre wide rights of way originally based on the idea that this would be a more efficient design that would accommodate the types of services and functions required in this suburban location; advising that, secondly, they have some concern that a wider road way and a wider lane width may ultimately lead to vehicles increasing their speed; preferring a narrower right of way and lane width to promote traffic calming and finally the addition of rights of way widths that are required to produce the overall amount of land opportunity for land development and ultimately the marketability of this site; proposing that the Committee consider a modification to Condition 59 so that they would establish and maintain an 18 metre wide road allowance for all of the local streets with the exception of the western portion of Street "A", which would be widened to 19 metres and ultimately the plan would need to be redlined accordingly with modifications west of Lots 50 and 128; pointing out that this plan illustrates, generally, what they are proposing for that modification; advising that they are satisfied that this approach would address the concerns with respect to traffic safety and the activities associated with the road allowances for the subdivision; pointing out that, with respect to the issue of sidewalks being required on both sides of local streets, as Ms. Riley has mentioned, we understand that this is relating to a South West Area Plan policy which is identified in his slide and Ms. Riley has discussed; recognizing that this is not City practice, as typically, for local roads, a sidewalk is required on one side of the street particularly where that road is not lengthy; indicating that, from their perspective, the policy itself provides some flexibility with the use of the word "generally" in this statement to allow staff to contemplate alternatives to a dual sidewalk configuration depending on the circumstances and if it is considered to be appropriate, so rather than it being an outright requirement, other than the noted exceptions, which Ms. Riley discussed and noted on the slide, they believe that there is a broader opportunity to evaluate sidewalks as part of an individual development requirement; pointing out that,

from their perspective, the proposed dual sidewalk cross section is problematic for several reasons; indicating that, first of all, they do not believe that it is warranted given the traffic volumes and the pedestrian activity in this area would be relatively limited; advising that, secondly, there is considerable capital maintenance and environmental costs associated with the additional pavement requirements required for an additional sidewalk; pointing out that, finally, the driveway parking opportunities decline in these types of subdivisions with additional sidewalks resulting in potentially concerns with on street parking; advising that, as a proposed modification and comparison to Ms. Riley's proposed plan, they are proposing that Condition 66 be modified or that the Committee consider that and, as illustrated on this plan, that the current practices of sidewalk design be applied and single sidewalks specifically be provided on the longer local wider roads as illustrated in green; believing this is appropriate for pedestrian connectivity and provides an efficient design; indicating that, one matter that was not discussed by Ms. Riley, relates to Condition 67, which applies a requirement that construction of sidewalks be carried out in Foxwood Phase 2; pointing out that, as part of the approval of Foxwood Phase 3, they do not believe that this is appropriate given that it is applying a Condition to an adjacent subdivision that is also the subject of its own draft plan conditions and essentially encumbers this site; expressing concern that this approach may, in fact, not be in keeping with the *Planning Act* because it is applying additional works to external lands; requesting that the Committee remove that Condition; advising that they feel that the more appropriate approach to addressing the needs for sidewalks on Phase 2 would be to modify the draft plan of conditions of that subdivision as required; summarizing, they generally support the recommendations of staff provided that there are certain considerations for the identified concerns; reiterating that they are as follows: first, that they request that the zoning by-law be revised to permit some level of convenience commercial uses within this development to support a more complete community; secondly, that the rights of way widths be established at 18 metres or remain as such and the western length of Street "A" be widened; thirdly, that sidewalk requirements be established based upon current city practices rather than the South West Area Plan policy; fourthly, that Condition 67 applying to Phase 2 be removed; and, finally that staff provide a pathway concept concurrently with Yorks' submission of design studies which is in the spirit of Conditions 14 and 15; and, advising that, essentially, they would just like to have that matter noted as part of the official record. (See attached presentation).