

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Property located at 1448 Adelaide Street North (OZ-8684)
- Alan R. Patton, Patton Cormier Ferreira, on behalf of the applicant – requesting the Committee to turn to page 78 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda showing a black, white and green aerial photo or location map; showing Adelaide Street and Glenora Drive on the east side of Adelaide Street and Willowdale Avenue on the west side and then it goes up to Tennent Avenue; showing the block that he is referring to; indicating that the building at the corner of Adelaide Street and Glenora Drive was a purpose designed dental office and through negotiations and cooperation with the City of London Planning Office, the parking was placed to the rear; noting that this had some objections from the neighbours on the local street; giving the Committee some history; indicating that the subject property is in red in his outline; advising that the property immediately to the north has front yard parking, there is a single detached house immediately to the north of that and then another conversion use at the corner of Adelaide Street and Tennent Avenue with front yard parking; indicating that the next block, on the north side of Tennent Avenue, is a commercial plaza, long established, without any deleterious effects on the neighbourhood with parking in front; stating that the plan that his client would like to have is one that simply provides three parking spaces in the front portion of the property; showing Adelaide Street; noting that his client agrees with the parking in the rear; indicating that for the ease of people who are disabled or need handicapped parking, his client would like three parking spaces at the front of the property which makes a lot of functional and practical sense, it is not out of character, it is not a first precedent and does not have an adverse impact on the neighbourhood; noting that it is a common feature of this section of a main arterial road and it will provide ease of access for handicapped patients as opposed to using the rear portion; advising that this section of Adelaide Street is clearly in an area in transition and he expects that you would see it in Ward 5; undergoing that application for a higher density in the future given its proximity to shopping and schools and the open space; asking, as shown in the site plan prepared by the applicant's expert in site plans that you allow those three spaces, some of which could be used for handicapped parking; *(Councillor Hubert enquires as to how accessible the building itself will be.)*; Mr. A.R. Patton responds that because it is a conversion it will have to be handicapped persons, which is part of the Ontario Building Code so there will be access provisions made for that; indicating that the interior of the building is an older one so there will be difficulties inside but there are people who attend; noting that this is a personal service establishment and there will be handicapped persons who need to attend; thinking that, on balance, it is better overall that places be accessible to the front door; *(Councillor Helmer following up, looking at the concept site plan on page 93 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda, which he believes Mr. Patton just had up on the screen, wanting to make sure he is reading this right, it looks like behind the building there are five parking spots and then there is a white triangle that is an entrance, wondering if that is correct, that there is an entrance directly in front of those five parking spots; referencing the black and white drawing that Mr. Patton displayed.)*; Mr. Patton responding that there may be a secondary access from the rear; noting that it is secondary only, not the main entrance; *(Councillor Cassidy confirming that there will be one residential unit maintained in the building, along with the commercial uses.)*; Mr. Patton responding yes to Councillor Cassidy's question.
 - Gerald Brahm, 1456 Adelaide Street North – expressing opposition to the parking in the rear being reduced from about nine feet down to approximately one or two feet; advising that that is not very desirable for the neighbourhood or for himself as there will be parking on the property line; expressing objection to the access to the rear is being reduced by about twenty feet to less which means you cannot have two cars passing each other as you need twenty feet to pass each other which means that there could be congestion in the backyard as people are entering and other people cannot leave so there could be

congestion in the backyard because of the lack of access to the back parking lot; indicating that he would much rather see the City keep it at twenty feet so the access to the rear would be proper instead of congested; expressing a further objection, not really for him, but for the people south of this property, there are three residential houses there and the parking is in their backyard technically and he believes that the Committee should look at that and have some kind of buffer at the minimum to protect those neighbours that back up on to them because you would not want to have parking in your backyard backing up against your house.