

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

16. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Property located at 447 Old Wonderland Road (555 Teeple Terrace) (SPA17-031)
- Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. – advising that when they presented the site plan to staff as they brought this application through the Ontario Municipal Board in 2015, there have been some minor changes to the building design but overall the development maintains the proposal that they presented to the public through the rezoning application in 2015; *(Councillor S. Turner pointing out that Mrs. M. Doornbosch stated that this is materially the same as what was presented in 2015 when there was an opportunity to come back at a public site plan meeting; enquiring if there were any amendments or changes in reflection of the public concerns or desires.);* Mrs. M. Doornbosch indicating that essentially they just implemented what was requested in terms of landscaping, fencing, there is a significant improvement to the exterior elevation of the building but outside of that there were no other matters that were required other than a Geotechnical report which they did undertake and they did determine that there was no retaining wall required along the east property line; noting that that was essentially why the Ontario Municipal Board remained seized for part of this, the site plan process was because there was discussion of a retaining wall but it is not necessary and it is not shown on the plan; *(Councillor S. Turner asking staff if they are in concurrence with the assessment of the retaining wall.);* Mr. M. Pease, Manager, Development Planning, agreeing that they are in concurrence; *(Councillor J. Helmer enquiring about the trees that are being planted as part of the landscape plan; noting that he zoomed in really closely on the drawing and he thinks he can read what is there but what is not clear to him, because he does not know a lot about trees, is how large most of these trees are expected to grow and what the canopy coverage would be once they are fully mature; stating that, as Staff knows, we just dealt with the urban Tree Planting Strategy and now he has a lot of questions about trees when we talk about site plans.);* Mr. E.L. Conway, Landscape Planner, responding that trees are important and he is glad we are talking about this; advising that there is more than one type of tree proposed on the site plan, on the east side there are conifers, varieties of pines that are kind of transparent rather than species like spruces or firs, in the parking islands, they are ornamental so as far as urban forestry or urban shade cover in parking lots, they will not do great but these islands are slightly undersized to the ideal size and they are pretty hostile environments but the trees that they are proposing there are pears and they will do well so there is a balance there; along the road there are large canopy shade trees and a variety of red maples and honey locusts, he believes; *(Councillor A. Hopkins indicating that the Wonderland Road Environmental Assessment is in the process; speaking of trees, are these trees going to be planted in an area where they may have to be removed as they widen Wonderland Road South.);* Mr. E.L. Conway, Landscape Planner, responding that all of the trees proposed along Wonderland Road South are on private property and there is a twenty-two metre from center road line road widening required from here that they are illustrating on the plan which is a very large for a road so he hopes not; *(Councillor A. Hopkins enquires about the buffering as she noticed that back in 2014 there was to be landscaped buffering of six metres and now they are looking at changes and wondering why the buffering has been reduced; trying to understand that a bit better.);* Mr. M. Pease, Manager, Development Planning, responding that as part of the Ontario Municipal Board discussion, there was discussion about this six metre buffer as well as the Site Plan Control By-law buffer of one and a half metres and ultimately it was left to the site plan process to resolve that; noting that on the plan there is a range of anywhere from one and a half metres to 4.7 metres and they have worked with what is in the by-law and also what was utilized on the site through the development of the site and they are sticking with what is in the Site Plan Control By-law and are also using some of the buffering methods that were implemented through this process.
 - David Hall, 439 Old Wonderland Road – advising that his property is right to the east of the subject lands; representing the Old Wonderland and Area Community Association which is the neighbouring community around this land; indicating that they have had some meetings concerning this proposal; advising that this proposal has caused a lot of concern within their community right from the beginning when the woodland was suddenly destroyed over a Christmas weekend in 2013, almost four years ago, with no real explanation given as to why that was done; stating that it resulted in a loss of privacy and concern from the whole area, it has scarred their community, their neighbourhood and they have been living with this for four years now; hoping that some sort of resolution can be resolved; thanking the Planning and Environment Committee for allowing this public participation; realizing that it is perhaps a unique situation to do this but he thinks it reflects the concern of the whole community regarding the future of what this parcel of land is; advising that there are some important decisions that have to be made and for some

people here tonight, the decision will be made and that is the end of it but for the rest of them in the gallery, they live with those decisions every day from now on; expressing concern that the right decisions are made; indicating that they have several concerns; noting that some of the concerns are minor and some of the concerns are quite major; pointing out that the photometric plan shows that one of the light standards, he believes, is in the wrong spot as it is right on the property line and he thinks that it should be on one of the islands; indicating that it was shown on the sheet that they received that it is right on the property line in the northeast corner; advising that that is an error that needs to be corrected, it cannot be on the property line, it needs to be further west; expressing concern with the northern property line, if they read the grading figures correctly, it appears that the property line will be one metre higher than the sidewalk in the lower left corner; advising that anybody who drives by there realizes that there is a hill there that is at least three metres high and the City property to the north includes that hill; something has to be done about the grading there as it is not just a metre high, it is way higher than that; believing that either a retaining wall has to be put in there or some serious grading; stating that there are trees in that area; pointing out that there is a very large tree in the northeast corner of the applicant's property; noting that it is at least eighty feet high and the trunk must be five feet in diameter; advising that this is not listed on the landscape design; indicating that they do not want to lose that tree, it is a beautiful tree, they want it kept as it adds to the character of the community; wanting to ensure that the tree does not disappear; pointing out that it has a large canopy which means that it has a large root system and any work that is done in that particular corner, they do not want the roots disturbed or the tree will die; if they put in a retaining wall along there, that is going to affect the roots; thinking that the best solution is to have a much larger slope into the parking lot; indicating that there is also a tree on the City property which is not as big but is very close to the property line and that tree, too, will be affected; something needs to be done there; wondering about the whole grading situation there; if you know the property on Wonderland Road South, it is on a hill, the lowest elevation is the bottom left corner and the highest elevation is in the top right corner where the condominiums are; believing there is a difference of five metres or approximately fifteen or sixteen feet; advising that they are not sure if the grading that is shown on the site plan is really correct as it seems to be that it is going to be gentle grading and they do not see how that can happen because of the slope of the land; indicating that Wonderland Road is quite high on the right side and it slopes down towards the left; indicating that his property is at the top of this, on the east side, and it is considerably higher than the sidewalk along Wonderland Road South; believing that some sort of closer examination of the grading needs to be done; discussing the buffer zone, at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing, the City pushed for a six metre buffer and the Ontario Municipal Board ruling was that this should be sorted out at this meeting and it appears to them that the City has caved on that; wondering what happened, why are we not pushing for the six metre buffer like we did two years ago; believing that just one and a half metres would be the grass behind his house, along the property line is not quite enough, especially with snow removal; relating to snow removal, the applicant has indicated that, at the far left of the property, where he was recommending that there should be a retaining wall, or more appropriately a longer slope, that that is designated snow storage and it seems to make sense that the snow plow would come in and just push everything back there but that is not going to be good for the vegetation around there with salt, drainage, erosion, etc.; advising that, with respect to parking spaces, that will be affected to; as we all know, these parking lots get full of snow with mounds of snow that take up parking spots; questioning the number of parking spots that are allowed for this size of building; pointing out that he has seen two different calculations offered by the applicant; stating that the original plan indicated that there would be one parking spot for every fifteen square metres of building which meant that they should have ninety-seven parking spots and they were going to go for eighty-five; advising that it sounds like the City has said "yes, let's go with eighty-five" and that, to him, sounds like some sort of variance and he does not know that there was an official decision made about that variance and he is wondering why they have gone to eighty-five parking spots; pointing out that the most recent site plan that they have received, he believes, says one parking spot for every forty square metres of building which means that they should have thirty-seven and they want eighty-five; noting that he does not understand these figures, it sounds like they are playing around with numbers; if they go with eighty-five, it sounds to him like it is twelve less than what they should have from what they originally saw and with snow piling up there, it is going to reduce the number of parking spots as well; expressing concern with truck traffic coming in, they do not want to see trucks stopping along Teeple Terrace as it is too close to a very busy intersection; thinking that there should be "No Stopping" signs along Teeple Terrace; noting that right now there is no parking but they want to see no stopping because, as they have seen with other medical places around town on busy streets, these delivery trucks will put on their flashers, they will stop in front of the medial building, run in their delivery and they are backing up traffic; wanting to see the trucks

come in, make their deliveries however they do not see where the trucks would unload; indicating that they would like to see exactly where trucks would go and how do they turn around, are they going to stop at the entrance in the laneway there and then back up and we would hear “beep, beep, beep”, which would be especially disturbing for the people in the condominiums which are right beside that laneway and it would be dangerous trying to back out; advising that there needs to be some sort of turnaround in the parking lot for the trucks to go in, turn around and go back out again; expressing concern with garbage collection as there is no indication as to how garbage will be collected; indicating that if this is to be a medical centre, we assume that there will be biohazard materials to be picked up and that needs to be looked after as well; advising that they are not happy with the design of the building because it does not add anything to the character of their neighbourhood, it does not blend in with their neighbourhood; indicating that ninety-nine percent of the houses around the neighbourhood are brick, orange, red, brownish colour brick; stating that the proposed building is a dull grey, he thinks it is brick but it looks like concrete to him and it is not an interesting looking building, it looks like an elementary school building built in 1962 and he thinks it could be made a lot more interesting; it is a boxy looking building, there is nothing interesting about it; something needs to be done about the roofline to make it more appealing, blending in with the neighbourhood; reading a statement that the applicant provided from August, 2013, from their Urban Design Brief and they wrote about the design of the building “The design objectives of the project include establishing a built form and site design...” and they give several points here, one is functionally integrated into the larger community; indicating that he just talked about that, it does not integrate into the larger community; “2. It improves the quality of the existing pedestrian street environment.”; submitting to the Planning and Environment Committee that the woods were far better than this building, the woods that they took out; “3. This building maintains the privacy of the adjacent residential land uses to the east.”; advising that no, it does not; expressing concern about the privacy; stating that they finally got the applicant to put in a fence that was not indicated in the spring site plan; noting that they are putting in a 1.8 metre fence and they do not think that is high enough; going to leave that for his colleague from the condominiums to address; “This building enhances an intersection serving as the main entrance to the Berkshire Village.”; advising that in another point they call it a “gateway to Berkshire Village”; stating that he always thought that the woods were a gateway to Berkshire Village, a lovely gateway but now they have a dirt pile for the past four years and now they are going to get a concrete box and he thinks that they could do much better than that for making a gateway into Berkshire Village.

- Dave Rutherford, President, Middlesex Standard Condominium Corporation #502 which is located at 525 Teeple Terrace – indicating that the condominium is exactly east of the subject property; stating that there are several things that the previous speaker went over and they are backing him one hundred percent; indicating that these are not items that they threw out but privacy is one of the main concerns that they have because their proximity to the actual building itself, in other words, they are approximately six feet higher in elevation from where the elevation of the actual building is; noting that you have a two storey building there; advising that he is not sure of the exact height of the building but assuming that it is twenty-four feet and you have a situation whereby they are six feet higher than that then all of a sudden they are going to be looking into a row of windows right across the back of those properties which presents a privacy issue primarily because you are going to have people that are in there, doctors and even patients looking directly down into the backyards of the people living in the condominiums; pointing out that all of the bedrooms are on the back half of where the condominiums are as well too so there is a bit of a problem here; saying that the first presentation that the applicant put in has a chain link fence across the back and now he has put in a wooden fence and the height of it is going to be approximately five feet, five inches high; advising that the fence is going to need to be at least eight feet high to get any type of security in the back end of these locations; expressing that it is important that it should be a sound attenuation construction and the prime reason that he is saying that is because you are going to be ending up having a lot of noise coming off the top of the buildings regarding air conditioning units, heating units, etc., which are a major concern because, if you think about it, if you are living that close to that operation, you would be in a really bad situation from the standpoint of sitting there and listening to the noise levels; advising that the other thing that they had proposed is that perhaps there needs to be an attenuation boxing around the equipment to stop the noise from coming up and over top of the fence; pointing out that the situation with regards to people glaring from the second floor down into the property, they have a solution for that and very simply what they would like to do is ask that the applicant install frosted windows which would be placed right across the back, which would give him the light and give them the privacy that they require; thinking this is something that they should consider; advising that the other concern, besides noise and the attenuating fence that is absolutely a must as far as he is concerned, lighting would be the second area that they have to take a look at and what he is proposing is that at night, when the place is not

functioning, the lights should be dimmed down in some manor, in other words, if it is timers that cut off the series of the lights or whatever the case may be because otherwise, as he has already indicated, the bedrooms are across the back of the condominiums and he is suggesting that this is going to create a problem in regards to light levels that will be there and it would probably be a smart move if we get deflectors that will actually deflect the light back into the areas that are required, if we had a timing system that would reduce the amount of light that is being generated during the night hours and allow these people to sleep; expressing concern with the proposed signage, as they are very concerned that lit signs, if they are placed on the back end of the building, to attract people coming down Teeple Terrace; noting that when he says the back end, he means facing the condominiums; advising that that would be detrimental as far as they are concerned as it would be another part of the lighting pollution; submitting that any signage on the back or even on the south side of the building, which could reflect a certain amount of light, should be not allowed; indicating that the applicant can put all the signage that they want on the building facing towards Wonderland Road South; noting that he has no concerns with that; reiterating that he is talking about lit signage versus signage that has no lighting on it; reiterating that one of their concerns is to limit the amount of light that is being generated; pointing out that there are other issues that they can get into, everything from garbage; believing that the provision that is allowed is that they were going to allow for City pickup which he thinks is twelve bags per pickup; wondering what is stopping the applicant from putting in garbage bins; advising that two things that he really gets concerned about with the garbage bins are that they would be taking up additional parking which they are underachieving already and the smells and the odours that would persist as their residences are facing back on the lot.