

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

16. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Property located at 1355 Commissioners Road West (formerly 1349, 1351, 1357, 1361 Commissioners Road West) (SPA17-024)
 - Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – advising that they have discussed this application with staff and have no concerns with the information that staff has presented in the staff report; asking the Planning and Environment Committee to approve or recommend the staff report; providing more detail with respect to the minor variance application that they have submitted, but has not been accepted because of the changes to Bill 73; indicating that there are two aspects to the minor variance, the first being the parapet height; pointing out the updated building elevation that they presented to staff; advising that the 16.5 metres that was applied through the site specific zoning was applied based on the building elevations that they presented to staff through the rezoning process; advising that that building design looks almost identical to the design presented in the staff presentation during the meeting; noting that the difference is that the previous design showed 8 foot ceilings and they have modified the building to accommodate 9 foot ceilings; advising that the two reasons for this are that the feedback from the market is that most people want 9 foot ceilings and the building will be a timber frame building and because the building is wood frame, there are different structural requirements for the building and the mechanical equipment cannot be accommodated properly in the ceiling heights at 8 feet; pointing out that with the change in the floor heights from 8 feet to 9 feet, that alone increased the parapet height; advising that even if you were to take the rooftop patio off the table as a proposal, they still require the minor variance to accommodate the parapets; stating that the main building height does meet the 16.5 metres but it is the projection of the parapets; noting that this was part of the Council resolution that they were required to provide the variation in the height and to increase the aesthetics of the building itself; reiterating that that is a component that, regardless of what they do with the rooftop patio, the minor variance is still necessary; advising that the parapets do not require any other variances, there are no additional side yard setback required above what they have provided as it is only once they are over the 18 metres and that parapet height is 17.3 metres so they are not quite a metre over what the current zoning allows for this; referencing the roof top patio, the fact that this building is a wood frame building, part of the safety requirements, the owner would prefer not to have barbeques on the patios; noting that it is not a Building Code regulation; providing an alternative, the developer is proposing to have a rooftop amenity space; indicating that they held a community meeting this week and there were 22 residents in attendance; pointing out that, of those 22, 6 were the adjacent property owners; there are 3 single family homes that will still exist in and around this area that will be surrounded by this apartment building as well as other condominiums; outlining that the rest of the residents that attended the meeting were all perspective tenants so they were interested in what was going to happen with the rooftop patio because, obviously, they have concerns, they still want to have the opportunity for barbeque space; outlining the details of the rooftop patio to the 3 adjacent property owners and the property owners indicated that they were quite satisfied with the design that they have presented; indicating that the property owners felt that they would have less impacts on their properties with people using a roof top patio that is higher up and is not as close to their property as the balconies are themselves; reiterating that they feel that the rooftop patio will be lesser of an impact on their own properties; indicating that there is a boardwalk and two sundecks with the remainder of the rooftop not accessible by the residents; advising that the requirement for the boardwalks is the stairways otherwise the access will be from the elevator; noting that that is a Building Code requirement; expecting most of the residents to access the rooftop from the elevator; advising that it is fenced around the boardwalk and sundeck areas so residents are not able to go to the edge of the building, there is no overlook; pointing out that they cannot see down to the sidewalk from this area; reiterating that the neighbours were not concerned from that perspective and that is why they are not here tonight because they were able to address their concerns; indicating that they provided the notification to all of the same circulation address that was presented to

them by staff; reviewing the sundeck option but they wanted to have this opportunity to determine that they can go forward with a minor variance if necessary once they get the feedback from the Planning and Environment Committee and Council; hoping to finalize the details of this; reiterating that they still need the minor variance for the parapet heights and depending on the outcome of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting, they will finalize the minor variance application and the details of that; pointing out that sundeck will not be open to the residents twelve months of the year, this is not intended for the winter months as they do not intend to maintain it during the winter months; indicating that it allows the residents to have some provision for barbeque facilities as well as maintaining the exterior façade without having all of the balconies littered with barbeques that can be seen from the street which is not the most aesthetically pleasing image; *(Councillor Turner enquires about the minor variance, the allowance for the minor variance itself to be heard, does that go to the Committee of Adjustment or does Council make the decision in lieu of the Committee of Adjustment.);* Mr. L. Pompili, Manager, Development Planning, responding that the decision is made by the Committee of Adjustment, it does not go back to Council; what has been requested tonight is the passage of a resolution allowing the applicant to make that application; *(Councillor Turner indicating that the Committee of Adjustment could still choose to decline the minor variance application as it is in their hands rather than the Council's.)*