

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

20. Property located at 3260 Singleton Avenue (OZ-8606)

- Maureen Zunti, Sifton Properties Limited – indicating that Sifton Properties Limited is the applicant on this, the property is owned by someone else but they are in a joint venture agreement with the owner; providing additional illustration of the site plan and the proposed buildings; advising that there have been some concerns raised through the process; moving through this process based on an actual site plan and an application so it is not a hypothetical zoning; pointing out that they have already gone through the first phase of the site plan and have already gotten their second submission in; trying to work through some of these issues and, as Mr. Corby, Planner II, mentioned they did have a community meeting with some of the residents when they became aware of their concerns; showing pictures of the existing context; indicating that the top one is looking from the site across to Southdale Road to the residences; advising that there are already noise walls as was mentioned and there is quite a lot of vegetation so there is quite a fair amount of screening from that side; on the west side of the site there is already an existing development that consists of two to two and a half storey, and because they are on a slope, some of the units are effectively three storey in the immediate vicinity at a very similar height to what they are requesting; pointing out that Mr. Corby, Planner II, has gone through the zoning by-law regulations that they requested and to a large extent what they have requested is similar to a technical amendment to deal with the first phase because the overall site will actually be within the permitted zoning; noting that there is an R6-5 Zone on this site that has a special provision that allows for 55 units per hectare; reiterating that they would almost be within that amount for the first phase but they are slightly over it so they need the zoning to deal with the first phase with respect to the density; indicating that she is not going through the issues because Mr. Corby, Planner II, has gone through those; one of the issues that was raised in the written correspondence and at the meeting dealt with privacy and one of the things that they have tried to do is to provide extensive landscaping to the site plan; noting that the building design does not propose any balconies that will be facing Southdale Road or Singleton Avenue; reiterating that the distance between the buildings is quite extensive; showing an illustration of the spacing between the existing development and the proposed development so it is really quite an extensive distance; noting that you are looking at about 244 feet which addresses issues with respect to the visual impact; providing visual renderings of the buildings and there has been a lot of effort put into having buildings that are well designed, that address the street, that provide for landscaping; reiterating that they do not have balcony spacing; showing another angle looking to the southeast of the site from Southdale Road and the Springmeadow area; emphasizing street orientation and pedestrian access to the street to make it attractive; trying to provide a lot of landscaping through the site plan process to provide the additional screening so that it is a very attractive façade to the residents who will be living there, the area residents across and anyone driving down Southdale Road; looking from Springmeadow Road looking parallel to Southdale Road along the edge of the buildings and seeing that landscaped area; reiterating that they are trying to provide really effective screening and softening of the façade to address that request for the increase to the three storey height from the two storey height; *(Councillor Helmer indicates that they dealt with another part of this related development previously; recalling that it is right beside the church and enquiring if there is any concern that going up higher in terms of the maximum height near the road and whether it would interfere with the site lines to the church from the road.);* Ms. Zunti responds that she does not believe so as right now there are trees along the east side of the property and because they can have three stories on two-thirds of the site and that provides just as much screening of the church as anything closer to the front of the site would; noting

that, technically, they can build four stories on the latter part; believing that the Greek church is higher than three stories; noting that the dome is really the most visible landmark and that would still be higher than the development; pointing out that when you are driving along Southdale Road, the biggest view is when you are across from the site. (See attached presentation.)

- Derek Speller, 3225 Singleton Avenue – providing additions to what Mr. Corby, Planner II, has already stated; advising that he attended a similar meeting in October, 2015 relating to project 39CD-39509; noting that project is adjacent to this particular project; advising that it currently identifies the different lots and there is a roadway there but no building has begun on that particular project; outlining that the reason he was here then was that he was representing sixteen families concerned about the traffic flow into that project and other projects in the area; advising that, at the current time, and he has a list of them, project 33M-661, project 39005509 are ongoing on Singelton Avenue, the Tricar development where Singleton Avenue meets Southdale Road, where they are putting in new townhouses and a new high rise has closed off Singleton Avenue intermittently so they can do that particular work; advising that there is the East Forest Home, which faces this particular project and is ongoing; pointing out that they were just advised through the mail last week that the Bradley Avenue extension, which they have been asked for information related to that, which is south of Singleton Avenue, is going to come into play very shortly; expressing that the concerns that he and the sixteen families he represented had at that time was that the amount of residents that had moved in since they moved in in 2013 has increased incredibly, noting that there are many children in that particular area and there are many school buses that flow through that particular area; indicating that the one access for all these projects comes in off of Southdale Road, onto Springmeadow Road and then generates into Singleton Avenue; advising that this includes every type of construction vehicle that you want to name as well as some private cars of some of the contractors that work there; pointing out that, in the two and a half plus years that they have lived there they are not naïve enough to think that in a new particular area you are not going to get a lot of activity when it comes to construction but now the area has built up so much that they are getting over parking with all types of vehicles; reiterating that, as Mr. Corby, Planner II, mentioned, the no parking signs only exist on the roundabout on Morgan; advising that Singleton Avenue and Springmeadow have no “No Parking” signs and they have excess parking on weekends and they sometimes get overflow parking from the Greek church; advising that, with all of these projects happening, they are asking the developer to please ensure that these vehicles use the entranceway which Mr. Corby, Planner II, identified at the south end of Springmeadow and Southdale Road on this particular project; realizing that this does not address the other particular projects that he has laid out and the ones that are coming up; pointing out that the only street sign that they have at the intersection of Singleton Avenue and Springmeadow is a yield sign and based on some of the residents that live there now; they fear that, at that particular T-junction of Springmeadow and Singleton Avenue, there will be a serious accident; advising that, whether the “No Parking” signs or other things that can be done in that particular area can be made to happen, they are very concerned about the traffic flow; hoping that this particular project can enforce, as best as they can, not only the construction vehicles, but the cars and local cars of the contractor on site where the building is taking place; pointing out that, as Mr. Corby, Planner II, mentioned, there is a study being done related to traffic flow, relating to the parking signs, which has been identified through Councillor A. Hopkins; hoping to expedite that before this project gets underway; expressing that he is not sure if there is anything that the Committee can do about those two issues but that is their expectation.

- Dave Tenant, Builder – advising that they are going to make it as safe as possible, create an interim parking area where Phase Two is going to go by creating the entrance way off of Springmeadow; noting that this is the shortest route for the construction trucks to take and this is the best way to ensure that construction does not flow through the subdivision; using that area as both the stationary area as well as a parking area for the vehicles so they are not on the municipal road network. *(Councillor Turner responds to Mr. Speller's comments and indicates that the option for the "No Parking" signs, the restricted parking is available through the Parking Division; advising that you should make a request and they will send out a referendum to the residents on the block and if; more than 50% of the residents return the ballot and the majority are favourable, they will institute parking restrictions along that street depending on what you are asking for, it may be a two hour limit or something like that; noting that it is a fairly straight forward process.)*