PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

14. Property located at 2397 Oxford Street West (Z-8608)

- Laverne Kirkness, Kirkness Consulting – indicating that Chantal Feltman, is a noted businesswoman in this City and she, with Steris Research, has won the City's Best Small Business Award, has been recognized under the Profit Top 50 Canada's Emerging Growth Companies, Profit W100 Canada's Top Female Entrepreneurs and she has been ranked ninth as Canada's Top Women Entrepreneurs; advising that there has been a lot of discussion about this application with staff and they have brought forward what they think is a pretty restricted form of home occupation given its context; pointing out that Ms. Feltman wishes to provide an employment environment for her employees that is a really second to none; appreciating that the staff put together a report that is very thorough and that is supportive of the expanded home occupation; hoping to use an existing facility and not adding new buildings or altering the site; advising that before she went to him or the City, she went to her neighbours, London Awning, Woodeden Camp and one rural resident, asking them how it would meet her efforts and in his report he put the letters that they gave to her that support the expanded home occupation; *(Councillor Helmer enquires that when it comes to the number of employees that reside in the dwelling, what precisely does that mean, is it concurrent on the site that, at any one time, there could be ten people);* Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner responds that it means how many people that are employed that use the site so when you are talking about a home occupation, you are looking for a very small number and the Zoning By-law prescribes that, a small number of employees and the intention is to allow for some flexibility for something, for example, a hair salon in the basement with one employee who is there contributing to the business but not allowing for a hair salon that you conventionally think of; indicating that, in this case, they are making an exception; believing that it does not set a precedent as the location is unique and the many other features of the application, the sit and the proposal make it unique; thinking that this is a reasonable approach given the circumstances to assist a fledgling business that will grow and move onto another location when it requires a site that is larger and more commercial in character; reiterating that that is the restriction that is currently on home occupations and the number of employees; *(Councillor Helmer indicates that he did not quite get what he is looking for so he is going to try again; this is the headquarters of the business and the staff is saying that if there are ten employees in the business that is the limit because it is located here, it is a home occupation and regardless of where these employees are working, it is ten people plus the person who lives at the residence; asking if eleven people in total is what it means);* Mr. Grawey, Manager, Development Services and Planning Liaison responds that there would be ten employees at that business that would be permitted to work at that premises at any given time in addition to the resident and they do not anticipate any employees beyond ten that would be permitted to work at that location; *(Councillor Helmer asks a question of the applicant; enquiring as to what the plan is; are you expecting more than ten employees or are you setting it just in case)*; Mr. Kirkness responds that there are currently ten employees and that is where they will work so there will be most of the work week, ten employees there; indicating that they also go and do monitoring so there is not necessarily ten people there but ten is the maximum; *(Councillor Turner enquires that if this was not a special provision zoning by-law amendment, would this have to change the Official Plan designation to a commercial property; and if this was normal conforming what would the normal process be to achieve that.);* Mr. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responds that even if this was commercial you would lose the ability to live there, if this was, for example, an office; indicating that the Zoning By-law and Official Plan do not have the marriage of an office and residential together on a site like this and so that is why the home based business was the best way to go so that the applicant can live on site and work there; reiterating that there really is not a normal, this is a marriage of trying to marry a couple of things that you would not find anywhere else in the Official Plan; *(Councillor Turner indicates that the other option is that the business exists within the accessory structure and the proponent*

lives in the residence component and you could sever the two and create a commercial parcel and a residential parcel.); Mr. Tomazincic responds that theoretically you could sever the parcel but then you would lose the ability to have a home occupation because there would be no home on the business side of the property; *(Councillor Turner responds that he is not looking to muddy it by any means, he is just looking if there was a normal course of action for this to occur they would have to be separated so it would not be a home occupation, it would be a commercial site and a residential site and the person just happened to live next door; and, indicating that this sounds like the most reasonable option to put forward.)*