

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

9. Properties located at 1065, 1069 and 1093 Margaret Street (Z-8575)
 - Ric Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc., on behalf of the applicant – indicating that part of the reason that they are at the meeting is because these are full and part lots from a plan that was registered back in 1872 so it is a historic plan; advising that, legal counsel, at some time in history, when his client purchased the house, it was merged in title to the rest and that brought it all into a merged title situation; pointing out that his client, who is in the audience, is interested in a plan to dispose of his assets and they need to clear up the title problem to sell the house and, while they are doing that, they cleaned up a few other things; indicating that he had requested, on parcel four, was that it be zoned so that parcel three could be added should there be a client to do that; noting that it had the LI-7 and LI-8 zones on it; pointing out that it may be worthwhile to leave those on without any reduction in area and frontage on them so that parcel three could be expanded without having to rezone; and, advising that he is not going to create a great issue or concern over that as some expediency is more important than delay is; (*Note: Mr. M. Davis, Planner II, responds to the query about parcels three and four.*)
 - Leo Johansen, 1096 Margaret Street – advising that his property is located directly across from parcel four; indicating that he has no opposition to the application; however, there are serious ramifications as to that particular end of the street; pointing out that it used to be, at the east end of the street, was CN Rail property and when CN sold it then the owners who bought it fenced the whole thing in and the street now ends directly at the end of the street; advising that there is a fence right across and parking is a serious problem; indicating that he has had a vehicle in there for years and he has extreme difficulty getting in and out of his property since the fence has gone up; advising that he needs access to the boulevard in order to be able to get into his driveway; and, noting that if any cars are parked, he cannot get in and out of his driveway with anything other than a small car; expressing concern with the ramifications relating to parking; and, advising that he is opposed to parcel four.