

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

11. Properties located at 598, 600, 604 and 608 Springbank Drive (Z-8374)

- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning, on behalf of York Developments – indicating that the proposed development is located at a major intersection of two arterial roads; advising that the Official Plan identifies this site within a much larger area identified for high density; pointing out that some of those properties have developed at a lower level of development, more in the mid-rise but certainly there are some higher apartment buildings within proximity of this site; indicating that the original proposal was for a much taller building; pointing out that the site plan does reflect a very high level of coverage on the previous proposal through not only a combination of the building, the tower footprint with the two wings extending out with townhomes but you can see that there was a fairly large extent of surface parking and there was also a ramp leading down to the underground parking which was immediately adjacent to the property located at 614 Springbank Drive; advising that not only did they hear from the public on a number of concerns that they had with this development, this proposal also went to the Urban Design Peer Review Panel (UDPRP); receiving feedback from the UDPRP and some of the concerns that they identified was the amount of surface area on the site; outlining that the combination of having a resident meeting with a very large turnout, over 100 people attended the meeting; noting that the meeting was held August, 2014; summarizing the key issues that the public identified, such as the increase in the height and the density, the building character, the aesthetics and the purpose behind the reduction and the setbacks; noting that the purpose of the reduced setbacks was to move the building further away from the surrounding neighbouring properties and move them closer to the corner; pointing out that, on paper, it looked like a significant reduction in the actual setback in the by-law; indicating that there were concerns about traffic as that intersection has a lot of traffic; advising that there were concerns about adding more development in proximity to this intersection will just aggravate the existing situation; receiving comments about the remnant parcel at 614 Springbank Drive which is located immediately between this site and the existing six storey building; advising that there were efforts made on behalf of York Developments to acquire that site and that transaction did not conclude; indicating that they have one parcel that is remaining undeveloped; summarizing some of the work that has been completed since August, 2014, by York Developments and their consultant; indicating that one of the issues relating to the property located at 614 Springbank Drive was that, by not including it in this development, does it preclude opportunities for any future redevelopment; noting that the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, identified this as an issue coming out of the neighbourhood meeting; advising that the architect prepared a series of conceptual plans showing how the property at 614 Springbank Drive could redevelop through a range of uses, with townhouses, some small apartments and the zoning on the site is also Restricted Office so that site could also develop for some office use; outlining that they presented a number of plans showing that excluding that site would not necessarily preclude an opportunity for future redevelopment; indicating that AGM Consulting also provided preliminary servicing assessments to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact on existing municipal services as a result of this development; indicating that Paradym Transportation undertook an initial traffic impact study as a result of the change and the reduction in the total number of units in height; noting that they updated that traffic study but the reality is that Springbank Drive and Wonderland Road is currently operating for certain traffic movements at level of service “F” which is at the worst level of service that you can have; noting that that is what it is at today; outlining that the actual percentage of additional traffic that this development will generate is a very small percentage of the overall volume of traffic that is currently experienced in this area; reiterating that they went back and revisited that, did some further modelling; advising that they met, again, with representatives of both the Condominium Corporations that are immediately to the south of this site; noting that she is referencing Condominium Corporations 242 and 294; indicating that York

Developments entered into a Letter of Understanding with both of those Condominium Corporations wherein they indicated support for the reduction in height and the reduction in development; pointing out that York Developments also agreed that they would provide additional fencing, provide mature trees along the south property line and maintain joint maintenance of any fencing; noting that there were a number of matters that were discussed and agreed to between York Developments and the two Condominium Corporations immediately to the south; advising that, at the request of the Planning Services staff, the architect updated a number of the viewshed studies that show what the views would be from the Condominium Corporations looking north towards this development; pointing out that there have been a number of design changes, the building height was reduced, the dwelling units were reduced, the townhouses were removed and the number of at grade parking spaces were also reduced which, in turn, resulted in almost a tripling of the outdoor landscaped amenity space, enhanced landscaping and hardscaping along Springbank Drive and Wonderland Road has been added and additional buffering to that property at 614 Springbank Drive; showing the site plan and indicating that there is a significant change in terms of the amount of hard surface, a much larger amount of greenspace on the site, there is a drive way and a through driveway through the site to allow for emergency vehicle access; pointing out that the ramp leading to the underground parking is moved to the centre of the site so that it is entirely moved away from 614 Springbank Drive and you can see that driveway itself has actually been angled over to provide for additional landscape buffer to that existing house; pointing out that at the bend of the internal drive, there is a dashed line that says “future access drive”, which references, in the site plan agreement that York Developments or the Condominium Corporation will allow for future access at such time as the property located at 614 Springbank Drive is redeveloped; noting that this should address any concerns about the redevelopment on that abutting parcel; advising that, for the short-term, this site plan has addressed the landscaping; noting that they have also presented to staff some cross-sections that are in the Staff Report that show a privacy fence along the west property line; pointing out that there will also be mature trees planted along the south property line; indicating that it is important to note that you can see that continuous line of trees along the south property line; pointing out that the underground parking garage has been set back six metres so that there is ample soil depth along that south property line for six metres in to ensure that these larger trees that are going to be spaded in have sufficient ground cover, that they are not sitting on top of a parking garage; noting that that was another design change that was made to ensure that the design commitments that York Developments had made to spade in mature trees could be done successfully; expressing support for the staff recommendation that this site is suitable for intensification; noting that it is close to transit, close to shopping and close to parks; further noting that those are all locational criteria in the Official Plan; indicating that the fact that this site is already designated high density lends to the appropriateness of this site for that use; noting that the height of the building has been reduced by five stories, it is appropriate for the surrounding area, the building has been oriented right at the intersection, which was the recommendation of the UDPRP; advising that the site also supports a range of mix of housing, with a fair amount of low density housing but what is missing is that opportunity for people who have lived in this area for some time that want to downsize and they may want to choose an alternative form of housing so now they have something within that immediate neighbourhood so that they do not need to move out of that neighbourhood; and advising that this development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, is in conformity with the Official Plan and implements the policies within the Official Plan for the high density residential. (See attached presentation.)

- Rick Tomaszewski, 9 Cherish Court – see attached communication.
- Barbara Fisher, 47 Cherish Court – indicating that her property backs onto Springbank Drive; enquiring as to what the consultation process for this thirteen storey building was; indicating that she was at the community meeting held in August, 2014, at Springbank Gardens; indicating that it was a large meeting full of angry people and she did not hear anyone supporting this proposal; pointing out that the next thing that she received was the notification; indicating that no one consulted with her about a thirteen storey building; enquiring as to how the Condominium Corporations were consulted, did each individual

person participate or did the City just go to the Condominium Board President; advising that she has a co-worker that lives in her neighbourhood, one block away and despite writing a letter of protest after the initial meeting, he was not notified of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting being held today; and, believing that there are a lot of people that have not been involved in this thirteen storey building discussion.

- Diane Armstrong, 614 Springbank Drive – indicating that her property is the shadowy little grey box beside the proposed apartment building; commending this Council for its interest in infill as she is a big supporter of infill but she is not a supported or putting arable land under concrete; indicating that when it comes to being in your backyard, you have to deal with it; understanding that their property is a viable development project on its own because it is almost half an acre; pointing out that, if this development goes ahead, they will still enjoy their property as they have for the last 45 years; indicating that they were there before Rosecliffe and before Wonderland Road went all the way through; noting that where Rosecliffe is, there used to be a farm; noting that they have been there a long time; expressing concerns about the practical nuts and bolts of protecting their property from noise pollution and air pollution; indicating that she has spoken with people in the Planning Services office and Members of Council about the potential installation of a solid wall and about landscaping; expressing happiness that the driveway has been setback and that access has been somewhat restricted; expressing concern with housekeeping matters such as snow removal, garbage collection, locations of the piles of snow; indicating that they would like assurances that the drainage issues will not affect our home; pointing out that they have never had problems with water in their basement, although there is a considerable amount of water underground running down toward the river; indicating that they have spoken with representatives from the Planning Services office and they have been helpful and very good at listening; expressing appreciation for Councillors Ridley and Hopkins input; expressing apprehension for the project but she is a realist and realizes that the project will probably go ahead; and, expressing appreciation for the amendments that were made.
- Dan McGillivray, 5 Cherish Court – indicating that the talk of public consultation is in question to him as it sounds like there were very few people in the Condo Corporation that were consulted and the rest of them in the neighbourhood just were not; advising that they are finding things out days and hours ahead of schedule; indicating that, for them to be learning about it in this fashion just does not seem right; advising that he attended the meeting in August 2014 which was a very effective meeting; noting that there was over 100 people in attendance and seeing the progress that was made by the developer as a result of that were well done; suggesting that we need to do that again; indicating that a small portion of the people in their community were approached and the rest of them were not is not working; recommending that another consultation takes place to help them better understand where we are going with this; and, pointing out that it is going from 18 stories to 13 stories and he hopes that it keeps going down in height.