

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 447 Old Wonderland Road (Z-8962)

- *(Councillor S. Turner indicating that he has a number of questions as this comes to the Committee after a fairly lengthy history in several forms and arrives at this one now; advising that he was not quite clear through the report and even through the design, he recognizes that they are looking to retain the Office designation but are they looking to utilize that designation or is the building just supposed to be residential.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, responding that the proposed development is the four storey forty-one unit apartment building; in terms of the intent to maintain and bring forward those office permissions, she will defer that question to the applicant; (Councillor S. Turner indicating that he will ask when the applicant presents; in comparison to the previous application that was contemplated on this site, does she have a sense of the lot coverage, the setback from the rear lot line, the concerns that they heard from the residents at that time was a question of the adjacency on that rear lot line to the homes that were on Teeple Terrace and on Old Wonderland Road, it looks like it is being brought forward as much as possible but he is not sure if the breadth of the building has increased as well to come closer, the parking looks like it is right adjacent to that rear lot line all the way through and he was not sure if there is also an opportunity to bring that forward towards Wonderland Road at the northern parking lot area that is identified in the proposed site plan.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, responding that at the narrowest point, the minimum setback between the building and the abutting residential is 14.17 metres; as Councillor S. Turner mentioned, the building is pushed as far to the street as possible which allows for a buffer between the building and the residential, there is a 6.21 metre and 3.65 metre setback for a portion of the parking area and a 1.5 metre setback for the remainder of the parking from the adjacent residential; in terms of buffering and site design features that could be accommodated on site to mitigate any impacts of that distance, those are things that can be explored at the site plan stage; (Councillor S. Turner recognizing that in the report it states that a Traffic Impact Study was not required at this point, by comparison to the Office Commercial use, Medical/Office/Commercial that had been proposed, he thinks that there had been a traffic study proposed at this point versus the residential, does this reflect a lower intensity of traffic usage associated with that site or a higher one or is it considered to be equal.); Mr. M. Elmadhoon, Traffic Planning Engineer, responding that this will be a lower trip generator development and it is going to generate lower than when it was a medical development; (Councillor S. Turner confirming that that is if it retains its Residential only, if it becomes Residential and Office/Commercial then that would change it back almost to a similar traffic plus the residential impacts that were contemplated in the previous applications; wondering if that would be correct.); Mr. M. Elmadhoon, Traffic Planning Engineer, responding that there was a previous traffic study and what they required when that traffic study came in that they provide an eastbound side by side left hand lane to the development; Wonderland Road is undergoing now an Environmental Assessment to be widened to six lanes so Transportation staff does not envision that any increase in traffic will have an adverse impact on the surrounding area at all.*
- *(Councillor A. Hopkins asking about the footprint as they do not have a picture of the new building on the property and the question she has is the four storey residential building the same footprint as the commercial, does it occupy the same amount of land.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, responding that the foot print is similar, this proposed building is taller, the medical office proposed previously was two storeys whereas this is four storeys but the foot print itself is similar.*

- *(Councillor M. Cassidy indicating that she does not have any drawings in her report either; enquiring where will the entrance be for this building, is it off of Teeple Terrace or is it that connection to Old Wonderland Road.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, responding that you can see on the screen on the conceptual site plan submitted with the application the proposed access is off of Teeple Terrace; (Councillor M. Cassidy wondering if the new building would maintain that right-of-way out to Old Wonderland Road.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, clarifying that this proposed access, there is no access on the site currently, the access shown on the site plan is the proposed access to support this development from Teeple Terrace; (Councillor M. Cassidy wondering if there would be a right-of-way, she knows of places in her neighbourhood, for example, where there exists a right-of-way out to a cul-de-sac and that could at some point be used; wondering if they will lose any right to have an access out to Old Wonderland Road, another example is the 420 Fanshawe Park Road development, there was a right to access Donnybrook Road to the north but when they rezoned that site they put in a one metre buffer so that there will never be access to Donnybrook Road; is something like that contemplated here or will that right-of-way exist in perpetuity.); Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that on page 223 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda, the recommended zoning, the reason that is relevant is because that little sliver of land is not proposed to be rezoned, that will retain the R-1 Zoning and because they do not share the same zoning, you cannot have access through that site; (Councillor M. Cassidy expressing concern about the setback, early in the report it talks about Transportation staff not being in support of 0 and they originally recommended a one metre setback as a minimum and it is later in the report that they say that they are in support of 0.75 and she would like to hear from Transportation staff if there are any concerns going forward with that 0.75, there was a comment in the report about doors swinging out into the public right-of-way and that sort of thing so would there be entrances out onto Wonderland Road or Teeple Terrace where the reduced setback is contemplated; wanting to hear from Transportation staff that there are not concerns such as the ones that were raised because there does not seem to be a really huge difference between 0 and 0.75.); Mr. M. Elmadhoon, Traffic Planning Engineer, responding that initially Transportation had at least 1.0 as a minimum setback, there was discussion with the developer just because of the way the building is laid out and the size of the building and it did not work to have it 1 and Transportation agreed to have it 0.75, they thought this was reasonable, it is still better than 0 and they have also reviewed this with the Consultant of the Environmental Assessment of Wonderland Road to make sure that the right-of-way that they asked for on the setback will not impact the plans for the widening of Wonderland Road and it was ok as well; Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, indicating that the other reason for that 0.75 rather than 0 is to avoid the need for easements, for example, if there was an awning overhanging the sidewalk it would require an easement because now you are going beyond the property line and that little setback negates the need for future easements; (Councillor M. Cassidy confirming is the 0.75 from the current lot line or would it be after the road allowance; where is the road allowance and what would need to be taken when they do the road widening; how does that fit into the mix.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, indicating that the proposed 0.75 metre setback would be taken from the new lot line post widening; (Councillor M. Cassidy says that in the report it says that the requested restricted office zone includes special provisions to permit reduced front and exterior side yards; wondering if that requested restricted office zone including the special provisions was that what was awarded through the Ontario Municipal Board process.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, indicating that that is correct, the previous rezoning approved a 0 metre setback along both Wonderland Road and Teeple Terrace; they are carrying forward through this new application that 0.75 metre setback for the restricted office zoning as well.*

- (Deputy Mayor J. Helmer stating because of the way the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is written, it is not totally clear to folks how many parking spaces are required under the different scenarios so he wonders if staff could speak to that; the way the Zoning By-law is written it says that it is conditional, it is going to be eighty-five parking spaces or this other number which has to be calculated by looking at the Zoning By-law; just as an aside because he had to go look up how to do that he thinks the numbering is incorrect, he thinks it is 4.19(10) not 4.9(10); believing that the range is something like between forty-one and fifty-one spots instead of eighty and that is a big difference and he just wants to clarify that for people if it develops residential how many parking spots are required and if it develops as a residential/medical/dental office building how many spots would be required because it is a very big difference between the two options.); Ms. C. Lowery, Planner II, responding that the parking reduction for the restricted office zoning was what was approved previously before the office development at that time and they are just carrying forward that approval exactly how it was through the Ontario Municipal Board; in terms of the parking that is required for the residential development they are meeting the minimum required parking, they require fifty-one spaces and they are providing sixty.*
- Michelle Doornbosch, Owner and Applicant – advising that she has had a chance to review the staff report that has been presented this evening and she has no concerns with regards to the recommendations by staff; expressing satisfaction with the special provisions and the minor modifications that they have made to the application that was submitted with respect to the setbacks and they have no concerns with that; providing some clarification through the discussion and the technical questions that were put forward to staff, she was actually the original Planner on file for the medical building back in 2013-2015 so she does have that history as well with respect to the previous application; confirming that the foot print for the building that they are proposing is slightly larger; indicating that it is a difference of thirteen percent lot coverage is what was proposed with the original office building and today they are proposing a twenty four percent lot coverage so it is a slight increase but at the same time because the parking requirement is so high for medical office uses, they had previously eighty-five parking spaces whereas now they are proposing sixty; advising that that has allowed them to significantly increase the amount of landscaped open space on the property; noting that, with the office building, it was thirty-four percent whereas today they are proposing forty-two percent landscaped open space so it has been an off set for the two; stating that by bringing the building closer to the street they have also been able to increase the setbacks from the parking area along the easterly property line adjacent to the residential properties and they have also increased the landscaped areas so that there is additional buffering along the driveways further than what was previously provided with the office use; indicating that they have definitely taken that into consideration and brought that forward in terms of dealing with the public and the comments from the residents in how they can move forward; providing another point of clarification and additional information with respect to the 0.75 metre setback, that setback and again, this is an irregular shaped property so the 0.75 metres is actually just strictly at the northwest corner of the building and as you head further south along Wonderland Road South, the building actually does get farther away; noting that was one of the things that they also discussed with staff that essentially that 0.75 is literally at one point only of the building and then increases as it gets closer to Teeple Terrace; *(Councillor S. Turner indicating that Ms. M. Doornbosch answered a couple of his questions, the thirteen percent to twenty-four percent is getting close to doubling, not just a little bit more; wondering what the difference is in the setback, Ms. M. Doornbosch said it was a bit of an increase in the setback from those rear lot lines, wondering if she knows what the actual setback difference is between what the previous iteration was and this.); Ms. M. Doornbosch, asking if Councillor S. Turner is referring to the parking setback or the building setback; (Councillor S. Turner advising that the parking setback looks pretty much the same but more*

the building setback itself from the rear lot line to the wall.); Ms. M. Doornbosch responding that just for clarification, there is a slight increase in the parking setback, it is a smaller area of the property that has a 1.5 metre setback and you can see that is behind municipal address 439; closer to Teeple Terrace adjacent to the condominium units at 525 Teeple Terrace they have increased the landscape area in that region by one metre and their building setback from the easterly property line is 14.2 metres at the closest point and it is a little bit different because of the jog in the property line; to the rear of 443 Old Wonderland Road, they are 14.2 metres, in the other area and that is the only other area that she can compare because the other building does not have that setback so they are looking at it is 22.75 and that would be from the northwest corner of the condominium block; advising that it is a comparison of 22.75 and they are approximately 20 metres, she believes because of the sidewalk; (Councillor S. Turner indicating that probably the easiest comparison based on the siting and everything is the southernmost edge of the building as it approaches Teeple Terrace because that would be apples to apples, the easternmost wall at the southern edge of the building compared to the lot line of the condominium corporation at 525 Teeple Terrace, Ms. M. Doornbosch said she thought before it was 25 and now it is 20 so it is actually reduced then, correct.); Ms. M. Doornbosch responding that yes, there is a slight reduction in the setback between the building but again the building is closer but the parking is farther away; (Councillor A. Hopkins getting back to is this strictly a residential building or is it commercial and residential.); Ms. M. Doornbosch responding that this is strictly a residential apartment building, the reason for the restricted office zone was so that they can maintain that if, in the event there was an application or an appeal brought forward by the public on an application moving forward they wanted to ensure that everything was consolidated because of the fact of the previous restricted office was not in full force and effect yet so they wanted to ensure that everything was covered off together should a resident appeal the application.