

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

8. Property located at 1551 Blackwell Boulevard
 - Maureen Zunti, Sifton Properties, applicant – clarifying a couple of points; advising that, as Mr. Smith, Senior Planner, Development Services, has indicated, this has been a very long and ongoing process and there have been a number of technical reports that have been prepared; indicating that, as Mr. Smith pointed out, there were two options presented in the past; noting that one required a retaining wall and one that required grading onto the church lands; advising that, both the City and the Church prefer the one that does not require a retaining wall; expressing agreement with the staff report; pointing out that Condition 16 that Mr. Smith presented has been a revised Condition as they have worked back and forth over things over the last week or so and even in the last couple of hours; expressing agreement with the revised Condition; indicating that they provided a revised agreement to the Church back at the end of March, 2015 for their review and hopefully they will sign that back; hoping to get that resolved in the very near future because, obviously, if they cannot reach an agreement with the Church to fulfill that Condition then that presents an issue; reiterating that they hope to obtain that agreement so that there will not be any need to consider reverting back to the retaining wall option; indicating that she is encouraged by the way things are going forward; confirming that the lot sizes, in case there is any confusion, the Notice that was sent out in November or December, 2014, the circulation showed the 50 foot lots so someone must have had a really old circulation notice, but they are all 50 foot lots except for the ones around the bend, the pie lots, which are larger; and advising that there should not be an issue with respect to the lot size; (*Note: Ms. Zunti was asked about the change from the higher density to the single detached housing and why the change was requested.*); Ms. Zunti asked for clarification of the question, whether it relates to the 13 metre versus the 15 metre lots or the original zoning that had the Neighbourhood Facility and the R-7 zoning; responding that it is a combination of market forces as there was not really a need for a retirement home or seniors housing on that lot and they had a number of builders who were very interested in the site for single family housing; advising that this seemed to be what was preferred by the existing neighbours in the neighbourhood in terms of having something similar to their own types of units and values; (*Note: Ms. Zunti was asked about the fencing, the black chain link fence that both parties are in agreement on using, instead of the board on board fence that is the City's standard*); indicating that the Church may wish to answer this question as it was at their request and they expressed concern that a standard wood privacy fence would provide a very lengthy canvass for graffiti and so they asked that it be a chain link fence she expects that residents will probably want to landscape that on their side with trees and shrubs to provide their own privacy; and, reiterating that it was at the request of the Church.
 - Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Limited, on behalf of North Park Community Church – stating that it has been a long process and they would like to thank both City staff and Sifton Properties for getting together to come up with a resolution to this matter and if endorsed by Council with the changes that have been suggested, then North Park Community Church would be supportive of that; indicating that there were two main issues, the one being the provision of access to the northerly side of the property to allow for future development to take place consistent with the Official Plan which is medium density residential and secondly to resolve the grading and stormwater management issues which are currently happening on the property to avoid any future impacts for flooding; expressing support for the Conditions, as amended; asking for the Committee's support on the revised Conditions; advising that they are available to answer any questions; reiterating that, as Ms. Zunti, Sifton Properties, said, they requested the chain link fence because they were concerned with the expansive row of board on board fencing as it does lend itself, perhaps, to some graffiti down the road and maintenance wise, who would be responsible for upkeeping it; noting that it is on the side facing the Church property but it is technically not their responsibility to upkeep it and they thought that by going by chain link that provided a better alternative to avoid

that issue; alternatively, they could look at landscaping on their side of the fence if it is a board on board fence, which might deter graffiti from taking place but the reality is that that was their concern for the fencing; (*Note: Mr. Froussious was advised that there was some concern from one of the Committee Members on how it will look from the Church's perspective.*)

- D. Stanlake, Stanlake Consulting, on behalf of North Park Community Church – answering the concerns expressed about the black chain link fence versus the board on board fence; indicating that they have seen what long expanses of board on board fencing looks like, throughout the City, and they are concerned that it will become a palette for graffiti; indicating that there is a Condition in there that says that the property owners will be responsible for the maintenance; noting that the only way that you are going to do that, probably, is to file a complaint with the City; indicating that the idea of having chain link fence is a common fence used to secure the division between city parkland and single family housing, it does not lend itself to graffiti and it does provide an opportunity that the Church can participate in having landscaping on their side in order to provide the privacy that perhaps is necessary; pointing out that the Church really does not have a full idea of what type of use is going to occur on those rear lands and if it is occurred as residential development, you really do not want a six foot board on board fence separating residential lots; and, noting that, if it is multi-family, that would be a different scenario but until they know that there is a better way of addressing the fencing issue, the privacy issue, than a board on board fence. (*Note: There was discussion about how a black chain link fence is not as visual to the human eye. There was also discussion about the residents that currently reside in the area, and future residents, have been asked how they feel about this matter. There are places in the City that there are long fences, such as in Ward 5. There were questions about the berm, who is obligated to construct and to maintain the berm. There were questions about the road access into the Church. There were enquires as to whether or not there were complaints with the earlier development of the subdivision and the area where it abuts the extraction site. The Staff advised, and Ms. M. Zunti, Sifton Properties, concurred that they have not heard of any issues or complaints. Councillor Salih indicated that there are noise and dust concerns in that area, which is in his Ward. There was an enquiry as to the height of the fence. Staff advised that it is consistent with City standards.*)