

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

12. Property located at 255 South Carriage Road (39T-08502/Z-8614)

- *(Councillor Hubert speaking to the drainage issue, confirming that this would drain into the stormwater management ponds that are almost immediately adjacent, wondering if this is correct.);* Mr. C. Smith, Senior Planner, responds that he does not believe that is correct but he believes that there is some routing and refers the matter to Development Engineering Services for a response; noting that it is routed somewhere; *(Councillor Hubert responds that we all know that water will flow one way or another and there is a phenomenal amount of stormwater management in that area.);* Mrs. J. Ramsay, Manager, Development Services and Engineering Liaison, responds that the existing condominium site, the minor flows for that site actually go through the existing storm system and head into a different pond, Pond 1, which is on the west side of Hyde Park Road; pointing out that the site, in its grading, drains towards this pond, Pond 1B1 and the original approval for the condo has a rear yard catch basin and a low point at the bottom corner which picks up and goes through that system to Pond 1, but then major flows are caught through that process; through the engineering design for the subdivision that surrounds it, they have looked at that specific catch basin to make sure that no new flows are contributing to that low spot and they are keeping the spillover elevation is remaining the same; they asked through the review that they had the consultant model the drainage going to that site that they had up to a one hundred year event and any ponding over that catch basin is within their design standards; reiterating that there is a low point there which will pond during larger events but they have maintained or improved on the situation from existing conditions.
- Ric Knutson, on behalf of the applicant – believing that the neighbours would like to speak to the Committee about a couple of issues; expressing concern with a condition on the bottom of page 152, having to do with some vague design standards that the condition is proposing to put into the Conditions of Draft Approval; stating that if he had testable issues he would be happy to meet them but he does not know what porch would be required by urban design or what windows would be required; noting that, as Mr. G. Kotsifas, Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and Chief Building Official, will tell you that every time they change windows, it changes the rooflines on a redesign there are many thousands of dollars in that redesign have to be done because they alter structural elements within the house; reiterating that if he had some defined criteria he would be happy to accommodate those; pointing out that there is a defined criteria relating to fencing and he is happy to live with that, outlining that the other more vague issues, subject to the approval of the Manager, may be fine today, might be a different manager and not fine tomorrow; asking that that be sent back for some clarification; believing that Mr. A. MacLean, Manager, Development Planning, is happy to see this revised design as it is very similar to what he proposed to the Committee in 2008 that they had some fairly significant discussions about; Mr. S. Galloway, Manager, Urban Design and Geographic Information Systems, responds that there are Urban Design Guidelines related to the area, the Hyde Park Community Design Guidelines, which give some guidance as to what is needed to occur; pointing out that the particular condition which is, in his understanding a standard condition that is used on subdivisions and it relates to ensuring that side lot conditions have a general upgraded façade, can include porches, can include windows but the intention is that they do not end up with large blank walls along those side lot conditions that front onto public spaces, this is a pretty standard condition that is used across the board.
- Madge Witzing, 15-1144 Coronation Drive – indicating that she sits on the Board of Directors of her Condo Corporation #611; advising that they are really pleased with the compromise that has come to light about the one floor condominiums to the west of their property; however, the residents are really not reassured about the drainage issues that they have in the area; advising that this area has been known to have high water levels and they are still experiencing high water levels in the area even though the services have been put in for the development behind them; outlining that one set of units to the west of

them have had a pond of sitting water for the last two years; stating that they have had issues with their maintenance crew not being able to maintain their properties because of the high water levels in their area; indicating that they would like to know what recourse is there for them, not only as residents but as a corporation and the financial impact that it could eventually have on them in the future because it could really be significant;

- Jim Milliken, 17 – 1144 Coronation Drive – stating that he is the one with a pond in the back for the past two years; indicating that he has spoken about this issues many times, they do a little bit but then it comes back and it never goes away; regarding the area at the top arrow, believing that it is going to be one-storey single family residences; Mr. C. Smith, Senior Planner, responds that it is not single detached, that has been rezoned to R-4-4, which allows for cluster townhome developments, but they will be one storey in height.