

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 745-747 Waterloo Street (Z-8921)

- Michelle Doornbosch, Brock Development Group, on behalf of the current owner of the land – advising that they have had a chance to review the staff report; stating that they have no issues with what staff is presenting; believing that this is an appropriate use for this property; providing background, there is some concern from the public with respect to the use; indicating that this is one doctor who is operating this facility; noting that it is a plastic surgeon; stating that this is not a typical medical clinic that has a number of doctors or family doctors with an extensive amount of patients; advising that there are a limited number of patients and the plastic surgeon also has hours at the hospital so he is not in this facility at all times; indicating that they do not anticipate that there is going to be a parking issue here at all with respect to the use and they do have long term plans to stay here and operate their facility so they do not foresee that there is going to be an issue in the future; advising that the retail use did provide much more significant traffic than what this use will so they do feel that it is going to bring an improvement to the area rather than cause further issues to the Piccadilly community.
- Craig Martin, 735 Waterloo Street – advising that he is directly adjacent to 745 and 747 Waterloo Street, the chocolate shop; indicating that he has lived there for twenty years; stating that this feels like they are going back to the last time there was a minor variance; at that time, they worked through, specifically in regards from the hair salon to the chocolate shop and it was agreed upon that that property would be limited to a chocolate shop with a special zoning provision that it was an existing floor space and size and yet this property sort of crept, there is a Razzle Dazzle Cupcake shop in there; stating that there was an agreement at the time for a site plan to be done that was not enforceable in the end by the City; recalling when Ed Holder and Judit were speaking at the time in regards to this that he is a long-term tenant, he does not plan on getting rid of it and speaking much the same way that the new tenant is speaking; advising that when these changes occur it sticks with the property, not the business owner, so he thinks that needs to be identified, that it is not short-term; identifying that there are not enough spaces because there is a lot of in and out and there have been a lot of issues with the property that concern him that do not get directly addressed; stating that they have had a staircase built in between the properties and raised with no building permit; believing the new owner has started renovations without a building permit and that is being sorted out currently so this public participation is very frustrating for him because he has been here before and they are coming back to the same spot and this talk of expansion with enforceability has not worked in the past.
- Delilah Dean Cummings, Co-Chair, Piccadilly Area Neighbourhood Association – thinking it is admirable to encourage City planning that it is not carcentric and does recognize the ease of getting around this neighbourhood on foot or by bicycle; stating that the location is adjacent to multiple transit routes; however, current traffic conditions in the area do not make them feel hopeful that the outcomes for residents will differ substantially with yet another zoning change that permits inadequate parking on site; advising that residents have let them know that they have concerns including increased car traffic in an area that is already oversaturated with institutional traffic and on-street parking for non-residential use; indicating that the change in zoning also suggests that there might be a potential change in the duration of visits compared to the quick stops for retail shops; indicating that they asked if there was any planned on-site bicycle parking requirement and they were told there was not; stating that they have already accommodated and made so many changes to try and ameliorate the problem for residents; there is a parking limit on both sides of Piccadilly Street, a two-hour limit, parking meters on Wellington Street and on Piccadilly Street from Wellington Street to Richmond Street; extensive traffic calming at Wellington Street and Piccadilly Street, one way traffic on Kenneth Avenue and traffic lights at Waterloo Street and those were all put in place as a direct result of zoning changes that permitted conversion to private schools and day cares; advising that the traffic is generated by those institutional facilities in converted residential units that do not, themselves, have adequate on-site parking and drop-off, pick-up facilities and they have already had special concessions made regarding parking requirements; free on-street parking is also used by people who are

visiting nearby businesses and the staff of those businesses; indicating that residents report that cars are regularly parked in excess of the two-hour limit; stating that cars are parked blocking their residents driveways, in the driveways of residents and on the corners in violation of the no parking on the corner signs; indicating that drivers often illegally and sometimes dangerously circumvent the installed traffic calming at Wellington Street and Piccadilly Street and residents report people driving over curbs as well as onto boulevard grass; they regularly make illegal u-turns on Wellington Street immediately south of Piccadilly Street adjacent to Piccadilly Park; leaving residents and their guests often unable to find street parking near their homes; traffic site lines are poor given the volume of street parking and residents have reported people cutting across private property to get from their parked car to their destination; advising that this intensifies at regular morning and afternoon drop-off and pick-up times and because it is a mixed use area so they do have businesses in the area, which is great; advising that previous planning reports in this area have recognized that there is a multitude of impacts beyond just parking that stem from any zoning change; indicating that they have responded over the years, from 2002 forward, in 2013, 2015, and each one of those did recognize that there is inadequate parking for the uses; pointing out that as the previous speaker indicated, the zoning stays with the building, not the person who purchases it so if this person says that this is how they are going to use it and there is just going to be one doctor and there are rental units so they may need parking as well so sixteen spaces may in fact be plenty but residents are concerned that future uses of the same site will have a poor impact, again, on the community.