

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 13. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Property located at 515 Richmond Street (Z-8704)

- *(Councillor T. Park comments that a lot of the feedback that she received from constituents was surrounding the access to the laneway towards the rear of the proposal; wondering if staff had been able to negotiate with the applicant in terms of how that would proceed going forward.);* Mr. B. Turcotte, Senior Planner, responding that the agent for the applicant is better positioned to respond to any questions in regards to access; *(Councillor Park responds that from a staff perspective, conversations have been had and they will hear more in a moment.);* Mr. B. Turcotte responding yes, that is correct.
- Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Limited, on behalf of the applicant – indicating that they have had a chance to review the staff report and they have worked extensively with staff on this application and just some minor modifications to the design throughout the process to satisfy the comments that they have received through the various departments; answering the question with regards to that laneway, they have done some research on the laneway and from a legal perspective there are no easements registered over top of that laneway for the surrounding properties; stating that it has been a long established use by the surrounding property owners; advising that the current owner of this property, Old Oak Properties Developments, has been in contact with the lawyer that is acting on behalf of the Condo Corporation and is working to come up with some sort of agreement so that that can be addressed because it has been a long established practice and she does not think that anyone was aware that there was nothing in place to address the easements and the rights over that laneway; stating that they have on intentions of closing that off and they fully intend to maintain that space as it currently exists today and for use by the adjacent properties; expressing support for the proposed zoning by-law that is before the Committee; realizing that there has been some comments presented by the public in opposition of this but she thinks, to break it down into simple terms, these lands are currently zoned Downtown Area, they have as of right permission today for two hundred fifty units per hectare at a height of ninety metres; indicating that what they are asking for is three more stories, which gets them to one hundred one metres and an increased density to three hundred forty-two; keeping in mind that the Downtown Area designation that this land falls within permits three hundred fifty; outlining that while most of the apartment buildings in the Downtown Area, which the Committee has seen before them, some of which are under construction, they have been approved under bonus zones and generally those zones have seen anywhere from five hundred to over one thousand units per hectare; keeping that in mind, this site is still well below what you would typically find in the Downtown Area and from a density perspective is still below what is contemplated in the Official Plan designation for this property.
- Cassandra DeMelo, 707-155 Kent Street, on behalf of Condominium Board MCC126 and the property owners of 155 Kent Street – advising that her concerns are expressed by many of their residents; requesting the display of the picture in the presentation with the yellow highlights of Old Oak Properties; indicating that their building is almost completely encircled by Old Oak Properties with one exception, which is something that she will come to shortly in her discussion tonight; stating that they are going to be dramatically impacted by this building, if it is going ahead; appreciating that it is most likely going ahead and the question is simply whether or not they are going to get to add three more stories; however, they want to make sure that Council knows what their concerns are all the same; noting that there are a number of them; indicating that they submitted a letter to Mr. B. Turcotte, Senior Planner, on November 16, 2016, through their lawyer at Lerner, Mr. F. Tranquilli; advising that the first of their concerns is the impact of the proposed development that it will have on traffic along both Kent Street and Richmond Street, both predominant streets, especially Richmond Street; advising that her brain takes her to Richmond Street about five hundred metres south of Windermere where there is a new residential building and the traffic that is being caused by taxi's, for example, stopping at building, it is a two lane south bound lane along that building and you see constantly now traffic stopped in front of the building because there simply is not enough space between the building and the

roadway to properly allow cars to park; thinking that this building is going to run into a similar problem; pointing out that the traffic onto Kent Street as well is concerning to them because that is where their driveway lines up to, that is where they get in and out of their property; expressing concern about increased pedestrian flow along the west property line of MCC 126 or 155 Kent Street, as the impact of the proposal on the occupants view and exposure to the sun; appreciating Mr. B. Turcotte's comments regarding the shadow being only between 10:00 AM and 12:00 PM, the reality is that one fourth of their building is losing their prime site of things like St. Peter's Basilica, which is something that they paid for when they bought into the building, they wanted those views for themselves; expressing concern for the safety of pedestrians, owners and tenants given the increased traffic that they will be seeing, the impact of the proposal on vehicular traffic entering and exiting the existing parking garage and the effect that the development will have on access to bus routes, public spaces and the amenities associated within MCC 126; advising that these are a few of their more minor concerns; turning now to their most major concern which is something that has come up recently, and that is the assumption by Old Oak Properties that that laneway between MCC 126 and the businesses that you see lining Richmond Row are in fact owned by them, their research from their lawyer, Mr. F. Tranquilli, states that PIN 515, which is that area; noting that she stands to be corrected; understanding that this is a former unopened road which appears to be closed and declared surplus by the City in 1987 and 1988; advising that she does not believe that it is necessarily Old Oak Properties at this point; indicating that if she is wrong on that then certainly they have a prescriptive right over that property and that is going to impact their ability to do many things day-to-day in their building that they have become accustomed to doing over the last just under thirty years of being there; providing the example that their garbage pick-up comes through there, as it does for all of the Richmond Row businesses that you see lining Kent Street near Richmond Street; stating that all of their moving in, moving out happens on elevators located in that laneway; noting that temporary parking is also there for people who are just trying to jump in and jump out quickly into the building; advising that they are consistently taking care of that laneway as if it was their own by doing things like shovelling and salting and only recently has Old Oak Properties taken any interest in that laneway by filling a pot hole that they had asked them to fill for two years and they continued to claim that it was not their issue so to speak; pointing out that it is interesting to her that now, suddenly, they are claiming property rights over that laneway when before it seemed that they were not interested and now it is because it is going to benefit them greatly for the use of this building; noting that specifically it is the only way for their residents to get into this new building and therefore it is a major concern, not only for them, but for the people that are already there, who started there some thirty years ago; referencing the letter dated May 3, 2017, included on the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda is also from Mr. F. Tranquilli, Lerner, better highlights the issues and concerns that they have with respect to the laneway.

- Sonia Deter, 155 Kent Street – expressing concern with the proposed one hundred one metre tall building Old Oak is proposing; advising that, in their artist's rendering, you cannot even see their fourteen floor condominium building as Old Oak's building completely eclipses their building and the surrounding ones; advising that Old Oak owns the property all around their building and if their building is built their apartments will literally be in their backyard, actually closer; stating that they will have no privacy, no view and no sun as their tall building will eclipse them; realizing that this is not part of the proceedings tonight, but just to understand where some of them are coming from, Old Oak has rented them the bottom floor of their parking garage that is beside their building since 155 Kent Street was built and up until last year, they charged around one hundred twenty-five dollars a month per parking space; advising that last year they jacked up the price by two hundred dollars a month and now Old Oak charges them over three hundred dollars a month per parking spot; advising that owners and renters found cheaper parking Downtown but they still had to pay Old Oak the over three hundred dollar per parking spot and the Board of Directors at 155 Kent Street had no choice but to raise their condominium fees to include the three hundred dollar parking spots, which raised their condominium fees to over six hundred dollars a month; advising that previously parking was optional but now they are mandatory; indicating that the increase to fees because of Old Oak has dramatically decreased the sales of their units which has resulted in lower selling prices,

if sellable at all; advising that if the City allows Old Oak to build the one hundred one metre tall building their units will be completely unsellable, the high condo fees plus absolutely no view will completely cripple the salability; stating that it also seems clear to her now that they raised the parking fees so that they would be more open to cancelling the ninety-nine year lease that they have with Old Oak Properties; advising that, in their application, they also asked to add an additional storey to the parking garage which they would not need if they no longer rented the bottom of the parking garage; thinking that to have such a large building on Richmond Row will ruin the current quaint and unique qualities that have been part of Richmond Row for decades; indicating that she cannot imagine a large building right across and kitty-corner from the City's most beautiful churches plus there are a number of larger buildings going up within the same block on Talbot Street as well as the one on King Street; advising that the rental and condominium market will become saturated and that will be worse for Downtown in the end; stating that as someone who has lived in the core for over twenty-five years, she believes that the City needs to work on revitalizing the Downtown with more shops and beautification as we have lots of people living and working in the core already but they go to the suburbs to do all of their shopping; enquiring if anyone has studied the vacancy rate in the core yet; believing that the clear losers are all of the landlords that own triplexes and duplexes as the more apartment buildings that go up the less people are likely to rent a house; advising that currently there is a strong wind draft between their buildings and she knows that the study was done on Richmond Street but the wind is really bad behind the building, in between the alleyway between their building and Old Oaks building; wondering if this building would have any impact when they do not know where the rapid transit will be going; enquiring how you can approve something that could literally be right on the corner where the rapid transit might be.