

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 3493 Colonel Talbot Road – Zoning By-law Amendments (OZ-9032)

- *(Councillor S. Turner enquiring with respect to the façades and some of the neighbourhood characteristics, blanking on the name of the policy where they look to the streetscapes and how much of the façade of the house may be taken up by garage; noting that Mr. L. Pompilii, Manager, Development Planning, talked a little about the 50% maximum to that; in this he did not see offhand how much of the front façade of the garage itself facing the street would be allowed to take up of the total width of that house, the total front elevation of the house, would it be limited to any extent; seeing the garage amount, the garage doors themselves are limited in how much that can come out and how much it can be set back from the street but the actual width facing the street of the garage component.);* Mr. L. Pompilii, Manager, Development Planning, responding that generally, within the South West Area Plan, and within some of their infill policies, their regulations relate to that garage doors themselves cannot occupy more than 50% of the width of the lot, in this case, with the courtyard dwelling they have not included anything similar, there is no control over what that width at the street level can be, it is that projection from the main dwelling that they are regulating here; *(Councillor S. Turner wondering if there is any limitation to how many in a row would be available or could every lot conceivably be of this design.);* Mr. L. Pompilii, Manager, Development Planning, responding that through this recommendation there is no control in terms of specific lots; believing the developer in this case has indicated through their submission that they will control that so this is not on a lot by lot basis within the street but they will spread it out, the only other alternative that staff would have is to zone specific lots for this type of dwelling; *(Councillor S. Turner wondering if it would be possible in that zone overall to say that a certain proportion of lots, say 30% of the lots could have that design type.);* Mr. L. Pompilii, Manager, Development Planning, responding that they are creating a special provision zone as well as a specific policy within the South West Area Plan, they could put a percentage on that if that is desirable; believing that is the intent of what the applicant and the developer in this case is doing through their approval process.
- Scott Allen, MHBC, on behalf of the applicant – agreeing with staff's recommended Official Plan Amendments to The London Plan and the South West Area Secondary Plan to permit the courtyard housing in the Silverleaf subdivision; advising that they are largely in agreement with the zoning that has been proposed through the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment in Schedule "C" of the staff report; commending staff for their work crafting that Zoning By-law Amendment and they worked closely with staff and they had consultations with York Developments own builders on this matter as well and they do appreciate the effort that was put in; noting that this has been a challenging file; pointing out that, unfortunately, as Mr. L. Pompilii, Manager, Development Planning, spoke to it, there are certain disagreements they have on two specific items relating to the proposed regulations that were set out in Schedule "C"; firstly, City staff are recommending that the front garage façade, the courtyard drawings, incorporate a minimum of 25% window glazing and that is to avoid the blank wall designs and while they fully agree that blank wall designs are not appropriate, they are concerned that 25% is too high based on contemporary designs; indicating that based on their assessment, glazing in the range of 15% to 18% of the façade is appropriate for well-balanced contemporary house design as they identified in their letter; requesting that this minimum glazing be reduced to 15% recognizing again that it is a minimum and that there is opportunities for additional glazing; expressing concern from a proportionality perspective that too much glazing on a garage may not be an appropriate design for the broader house; secondly, City staff are recommending that the garage depth of the courtyard dwellings be

limited to eight metres from the main building to accommodate two car garages but not three car garages and this regulation is being proposed as Mr. L. Pompili, Manager, Development Planning, spoke to basically focus on eyes on the street and help activate the dwelling area and space in front of the houses; supporting these community based initiatives; however, in their opinion, a third garage bay would not necessarily undermine the intent of these design initiatives; additionally, as Mr. L. Pompili, Manager, Development Planning, spoke, a three bay design with a bonus room above the garage space is already permitted by the Zoning By-law, and would, in fact, not be affected by this particular Zoning By-law Amendment as bonus rooms are considered to be part of the main building, they provided a figure in their letter to illustrate that it is relatively difficult to distinguish between the various forms of L-shaped or courtyard housing regardless if they are or not permitted by the by-law; in light of that consideration, they would request that that maximum garage depth from the main building be established at 11.5 metres rather than 8 metres and that would permit two and three car garages in Silverleaf without the need for bonus rooms; advising that, in their opinion, this modification is appropriate for the development in context with this area and promote greater variation and streetscape design; mentioning with respect to Councillor S. Turner's comments, they would support an additional provision being added to that Zoning By-law Amendment to maximize the number of courtyard houses in the R1-8(5) site specific zone to 30% and that would therefore apply only to Silverleaf subdivision and that would help to not only provide greater variation in housing designs but also to distribute L-shaped housing throughout the development area; respectfully requesting that the Planning and Environment Committee endorse their three proposed modifications, two of which are illustrated in Appendix "C" that they included a modified version in their letter. (See attached presentation.)