

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

30. Beaufort/Irwin/Gunn/Saunby (BIGS) Neighbourhood Secondary Plan (O-8478)

- Sheila Scott, 372 Cedar Avenue – advising she is a long-term resident of this beautiful street; stating that this has been a long process for them and the Cedar Avenue/Wharnccliffe North community; thanking City Council and the Planning Committee for taking an interest in their concerns and helping them in their efforts; stating that they are now called preservation so she is preserved and happy to be that way; advising that they are happy they are going to be left alone but concerned about what is happening to their neighbours and other areas; indicating that it appears that changes have been made and that they have not been aware of the changes; noting a specific one that she is particularly aware of being the two houses at 350 and 354 Wharnccliffe Road North have not been included in the preserved area and been swallowed up in the central neighbourhood node; advising that she objects to this; indicating that she has spoken to Mrs. Gonyou who is one of the residents there; indicating that Mrs. Gonyou is unaware of this and has lived in the area for over 50 years and was quite shocked that this had happened without anyone contacting her personally to let her know that they were going to change the use of her house; stating that they have other concerns as well with the development creep; advising that everywhere they look things seem to be changing and not for the better; expressing concern about the process with this now that they have been presented; indicating that they did not have an idea of the changes when they were at the last meeting; advising that she thinks that some of her neighbours also have something to say too; addressing the parking issue, regarding the Neighbourhood Node, in the documents that she read, it said that there would be no surface parking; noting that this is for the commercial on the ground floor and residential above, it could be six stories; indicating that the parking is supposed to happen in neighbourhood streets; pointing out that the neighbourhood streets would be Cedar Avenue and Wharnccliffe Road North; indicating that Cedar Avenue has two hour parking on one side and no parking on the other, they have no sidewalks; advising that Wharnccliffe Road North has no parking on either side except for a small section of two hour parking near Western Road; indicating that she does not see how you can have a commercial establishment and not provide parking for your customers; realizing that the idea is to make the neighbourhood more walkable and she thinks that is wonderful but businesses are still going to have to have parking for their customers and she does not think that just saying that you can find parking somewhere in the neighbourhood is going to work; informing the Committee that Western Road is going to be widened to four lanes and the parking will end up in their areas and they cannot accommodate it.
- Christine Sorrenson, 384 Cedar Avenue – advising she is located right at the end on the woods at the back along the river; pointing out that they were here a few years ago; stating she is a realtor and she knows how it works; expressing disappointment that the 40 to 50 people they had two years ago became 30 to 40 then it was down to 25; thanking Sheila for knocking on our doors saying please come; indicating that as the changes are happening, some that we are not even being given notice of, we are getting less and less people and it's like the developers are winning just keep going hoping; reiterating that she works in real estate and knows how that works but hoping that it doesn't work; asking a few questions of the presenter; indicating that she has two plans, the BIGS Secondary Plan that came out in February 2015 and everyone received by mail and discussed in October, unfortunately she was not around; stating that she remembers the first one that was done by an American Company for \$20,000.00 US or was it \$200,000.00 US that they ending up throwing out thanks to Bud Polhill stating that it called her house a disheveled mess, stating that we were all here and we were

all insulted by the plan because it said that we didn't live there that there were no cars in the neighbourhood; indicating that she is a little emotional about this and stating that it's been a long process; indicating that she is looking at both plans and stating that they both have the same title BIGS Secondary Plan Area; one dated February 2016 and the other dated February 2015; wondering when there are amendments or major changes, how far does it have to be before it is an amendment so that all of my neighbours that didn't show up tonight know there is an amendment; indicating that the neighbours think they are safe and preserved like Sheila is saying when in fact we are not preserved; questioning how many changes have to happen before the neighbourhood gets another notice sent out or maybe changing the name gets changed from secondary to maybe third plan; asking what kind of changes do they have to be major or what is the law on that; G. Barrett responds; explaining that the secondary plan is what this whole process is and that the secondary plan is when we go through the process to put policies in place for a defined geographic area that are perhaps more directive and usually more detailed than the general plans in the Official Plan; identifying that the Official Plan is the overall planning document for the City and that the Secondary Plan is done usually for a defined geographic area to provide for more specific policies; indicating there is not third time, fourth time, fifth time; stating that with respect to the two maps the 2015 map was what went out, consultation, again in October, got more input; the final map that she is referring to reflects the comments that were received through all of those reiterations; indicating that is what the notice is all about, it is the process of putting something out, getting a reaction, getting some of those comments, putting a response to that and, in this instance, putting it out again, having a community meeting, getting some input, getting some comments, bringing that back and putting something out again to respond to that; speaking to the timing, and he is not sure what the speaker meant about less notice; advising that this went out well in advance of most Plans before a public meeting so that the neighbourhood would have an opportunity to look at it because the last time that they saw it was in October, 2015; reiterating that because they last met in October, 2015, and took the input that they received and then they sent this Plan out well in advance of this meeting; clarifying that her big question is that they are looking at the old Plan that they felt pretty good about, expressing happiness that someone had listened to them; enquiring as to when this new Plan come because no one in their neighbourhood knows about the changes; going over the changes, on the first one there are seven different intensifications; calling orange commercial because it means that when she moved from where the Loblaws is in Northcrest to her area because it is a quiet little neighbourhood, she does not want commercial in her neighbourhood because there are garbage dumps being picked up and banging and big trucks delivering stuff; advising that they are now bringing commercial in; pointing out that in one neighbourhood it just stayed where it was with the Mini Mart where there is already a little bit of commercial; advising that if you look at the new one, it does not have any different title, there is a new key, there are not seven keys anymore; pointing out that there are eight and the one that is missing is that they made it purple, only the Hollywood people it is intensification; pointing out that if you were listening to them at the meeting, how possibly could an extra key be put in without more discussion and tonight we are making a decision and in three days it is going to become a Zoning by-law; wondering how you could add one more key that is called intensification; indicating that her neighbourhood still has a lot of purple; noting that there are white crosses and white hatches; realizing that there is a developer working in the neighbourhood to change some of the properties into three storey walk-ups; wondering if that is the public that the staff spoke to that wanted to increase the intensification of the neighbourhood because developers want to but homeowners like them do not want it; pointing out that she does not like that the title is the same because if you are changing something, change the title; if you are amending it, at least put amendment; noting that if you have sold your house they put a little red circle where they need your initial because it brings it to your attention; pointing out that some properties went from purple (single family residence) to orange (commercial);

many of the residents have resided in their homes for several years; indicating that the single family homeowners have not heard that they will be in a commercial zone in the new Plan; pointing out that the properties located at 350 and 354 Wharnccliffe Road, you will see in the old one, the commercial area jogs down where those properties are along Western Road; noting that Western Road curves at that point; indicating that now the staff has drawn a straight line because it makes a nicer block; noting that it also increases the lot size which increases what you can build; expressing that she is against the high intensification and she is against the new key that was added just to do that; speaking to the apartment buildings at the end of their road, where Cedar Avenue swings around to Wharnccliffe Road, which is a beautiful area with a trillium garden; noting that this is not a rough area, it is beautiful down there and it has gone from purple to yellow (high density residential).

- Edgar Allan Smuck, 928 Western Road – indicating that his property fronts Western Road between Wharnccliffe Road where it turns and goes to the river and Cedar Avenue; expressing concern with the fact that he was unaware that major changes had been made to the map from the last meeting; advising that at the last meeting they were lead to believe that there would be eight storey buildings built on the front of the block and the idea of the eight storey buildings was to draw the students out of the converted dwellings, the houses that have been purchased by student landlords and converted to student use and to purpose built duplexes which in some cases house as many as ten students with five in each unit which has now been reduced to three in each unit by an amendment that was put through; thinking that we have lost sight of what the purpose of the Study was, if we go back to the initial Study that Mr. Smith, (Consultant), did, it was to deal with the concerns of the people in the Beaufort/Irwin/Gunn/Saunby neighbourhood, which later became known as the BIGS neighbourhood; pointing out that they saw these conversions to student rentals and to purpose built student housing and unfortunately, the students were unsupervised and there was a lot of unwanted behavior; indicating that is what Mr. Smith (Consultant) put in his report that he was going to try to deal with was to solve this problem of the unwanted behavior and the proliferation of the student housing; advising that we have not gone very far down the road, they have basically got a do nothing scenario here, we are just going to see the whole neighbourhood eroded; outlining that the idea at the previous meeting put forward by L. Maitland, Planner II, was that they would see high rise housing on the corridor which would draw the students out and now that appears to have gone by the wayside; reflecting on this commercial zoning and the fact that some other properties have been included, being 350 Wharnccliffe Road North; noting that he is not sure what he wants to say about that at this time; indicating that it appears that they still have not solved the problem of stopping the proliferation of unsupervised student housing; the idea of the high rise buildings was to deal with that issue where you would have a manager in the building and the students would be drawn out of those existing dwellings and no more new dwellings would be converted or new purpose built student housing would be created which would presumably save the neighbourhood; having to say that, at this point, this whole thing should be sent back to staff to be reviewed again; expressing concern with the previous Plan, in that at 934 and 936-938 Western Road were not included in the Plan to redevelop the front of the block; believing that like lands should have to be treated alike and that any kind of a Plan should include those two properties; pointing out that previously they were told that there would be commercial on the first floor of a high rise building, that makes sense; regarding the parking, he was going to say that if they are going to some kind of a high rise building, the parking should be at the front where the Plan was saying that the parking should be at the back; identifying that the reason that he was going to talk about parking for a moment is that if you are going to have students living in any kind of a high rise situation, his understanding is that this nineteen storey building that was built on Richmond Street has presented some problems and that it is so close to Richmond Street beer bottles are being thrown out the window and landing on the street and landing on automobiles; indicating that when you build

the buildings too close to the street, no one thought that was going to happen; believing that we have to rethink any kind of a high rise building that is going to be built too close to Western Road; reiterating that he is concerned that he was not told that there were changes made from the last meeting; advising that he thought the public would be discussing that Plan as he did not realize that it had changed significantly; reiterating that it needs to go back to staff to be reworked again and there is going to have to be another public meeting to discuss what has changed; noting that many people were not aware of these changes; indicating that another family contacted him this afternoon and he was quoting the previous changes to them, not the current change; quoting what they were told last October; thinking that there is an awful lot of people that maybe are not aware of exactly what is going on here and really need to be given an opportunity to speak at a public forum.

- No name or address provided - looking at where some of the requests are coming from, she has an issue with the timing and her understanding is that letters were to be received up until April, 2016 and these changes came out so it really was a short amount of time since this new Map came out; indicating that they were not aware of the significant changes; looking at where the requests have come from, she would like Council to be aware that it was Zelinka from London Property Corp. that a number of the requests came from; expressing concern that the requests are not necessarily coming from neighbours, they are coming from this Corporation; expressing concern about development as what they are proposing is across from where she is living; understanding that she is at the end of the street where there are going to be some changes but she does not want a large development corporation doing something with the houses that are across the street from her and also in other areas of this whole area, not just on their street but also some of the other areas; reiterating that these are not neighbours that have put forward these requests to become part of the central neighbourhood or civic corridor, it is a development company that has put in these requests that have now come into effect in this new Map; indicating that this directly affects her and the other neighbours and the neighbourhoods where they live.
- Racio Diaz, 8 Westview Drive – indicating that he is a former resident of 68 Gunn Street which is in the BIGS area; speaking from a student's perspective because he is a student at Western University; urging the Committee to consider that it has been proven that the higher quality of residence and living for students, the higher quality of treatment, and we need to acknowledge the fact that this is an area that is at risk of break-ins and robberies; noting that he experienced that as well when he was residing on Gunn Street; and, encouraging more engagement from the public will be a preventative measure for this.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Limited, on behalf of Ray Stanton – indicating that Mr. Stanton is a majority owner in quite a few properties; noting that a communication was provided to the Committee and is on the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda; commenting on four different sites; starting with 348, 361, 362 and 365 Hollywood Crescent – thanking staff for taking into consideration their comments on previous iterations of the Plan; advising that their previous request was for stacked townhouses to be added to the permitted list of uses; indicating that those have not been implemented in this Plan and they have requested that stacked townhouses be added; believing that since street townhouses have been added as a permitted use, due to the lot configuration and lot sizes, stacked townhouses would be a viable use in the area and if used correctly with site plan approval, they could have a wonderful streetscape in that area with appropriate intensification; discussing the property located at 370 Hollywood Crescent which is just to the north of the properties located at 348, 361, 362 and 365 Hollywood Crescent, this is an interesting property in that the two properties that are outlined, property two and then immediately adjacent to the north, the property highlighted in red on the map shown at the meeting, those are both owned by the same company, two separate properties but they function as one site; noting that they both have apartment buildings on them; outlining in the proposed land use schedule, they have different permissions on them; indicating that what they would like to see for site two would be to be included in the Civic

Corridor designation, which permits apartment buildings and so it can have the same permissions that it currently enjoys now; pointing out that from a functional standpoint it does not make a whole lot of sense to have the properties in different designations as they do function as one site, they have shared parking, they have a shared driveway, etc; discussing site 3, which is 18 Essex Street, which is close to the corner of Essex Street and Wharnclyffe Road North; indicating that it is adjacent to the Central Neighbourhood Node; requesting that this property be added to the Central Neighbourhood Node; indicating that, as with site 2, the adjacent property is also owned by the same company and if it were included in the Central Neighbourhood Node, site 3 would provide a larger lot for redevelopment of that site for a comprehensive development; discussing site 4, located at 46, 48 and 50 Beaufort Street, abuts two sites outlined in red; noting that those sites were recently developed there with stacked townhouses fronting onto Wharnclyffe Road North with an apartment to the rear; advising that his client has plans to consolidate these properties and develop them for a comprehensive development; advising that site 4 is proposed to be redeveloped for stacked townhousing as a result of the request of site 4 being 46, 48 and 50 Beaufort Street be included in the Civic Corridor designation; and, requesting that the Committee consider their comments before making a decision on the Secondary Plan.