

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 754-760 Baseline Road (OZ-9148)

- Councillor Cassidy: Committee, I am going to go to the Committee Room first, we have three speakers waiting to be heard in that Committee Room. I have a list here so I will start with the applicant or the agent for the applicant, Mr. McCauley from Zelinka Priamo Ltd. If you would like to go ahead, you have five minutes sir.
- Ben McCauley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Thank you. Good Afternoon. I would just like to first note we agree with staff's recommendation. Thank you to staff for moving this along. As you will hear briefly, shortly, there will be a number of comments that you will hear from the public. I would just like to note as well we are happy to exchange my information, the applicant's information, with the community members and the public to voice and hear their concerns through our subsequent site plan approval application and work with them as we move forward and make sure that we can address their concerns as appropriately as we can. That's all the comments I have for now. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. McCauley. I'll go next to Mr. Robinson. Go ahead, sir. You have five minutes.
- Ross Robinson: I live right next door to the proposed building. I have no concern, really, that the building is going to be built there. I realize we do need affordable housing in the city but I am just asking that the building be reduced in size from twenty-eight units down a bit, there is just not enough room to park twenty-six cars. You are asking for a zoning of the front yard depth of 1.1 metre, this is going to be right up against the sidewalk and all these mature trees, at least seven, eight mature trees, they are at least, I don't know, I have been there twenty-two years, they have been there and just as big. I'd like to get these fences also a little higher, they are proposing the fences at 1.8 meters, well, they are about twenty inches lower than my property and I've got a five foot fence now that I've got that I can see over. That's not going to make it, I'm going to be able to see all these cars parked and their garbage, by the way, is right underneath my kitchen window so I'm going to get the odor, I'm going to get the skunks, I'm going to get the racoons, I'm going to get all that. Anyway, that is basically my complaint about the building. If they want to make a bigger building, they should just buy my property and then they would have a big square there, they could do what they want. Anyway, thank you for your time.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much Mr. Robinson. Next I will go to Mr. May who is speaking for or on behalf of his mother I believe.
- Barb WestlakePower, Deputy City Clerk: It will be Mrs. May speaking.
- Councillor Cassidy: Perfect. Come to the microphone Mrs. May and you will have five minutes to address the Committee.
- Edna May: I have a number of concerns just like Mr. Robinson. His was a privacy and that was my last question but I might as well move it to the front. What are you doing about privacy to the existing neighbours? We are mostly single family, we don't have five or six different families in each building, we just have one and we all like our outdoors. We like to be in the backyard and now we are going to have this building looking over our yards. Where is our privacy? I'm with him, it should be a better fence. When they built the four storey building behind us, which they could conform to the height of the thirteen meters not this seventeen they want, they build a six foot fence for us for privacy. I think that is what we should have right now, too. Now we get back to we have done the height bit, they want seventeen meters, I read

that the existing is thirteen. Why do they need the extra? They want to change the front yard and the side yard and the rear yard. Right now the front yard is supposed to be eight meters which is reasonable, it gives you room for grass, it doesn't mean that when you are walking along you can reach out and touch the building. Right now it isn't even social distancing from the sidewalk. The rear is only six meters, the side yard is supposed to be eight meters also. That gives room for a lawn instead of looking at the building as you walk by. You will still look at the building but you will at least see grass. The parking has been changed from twenty-nine spaces to a parking rate of 0.9 spaces per unit and now it's supposed to be at 1.25. What are they going to do, jam them in there with a can opener? There will be no room to open your door hardly. I think that it should just stay the way that it is. Getting down to the last question I had, this density of 165 units per hectare, they are only asking for twenty-nine units. Why do they wish to tack this on? Is it so that if they buy up people's property like yours? What is a hectare anyway? Is that at least a city block? Anyways, it would certainly pay them to buy up everybody from all down Fairview to Rowntree to put in those 165 units. Right now we are beginning to feel like we live in a canyon. That would be another bowl to the canyon. I don't see why they need it if they don't need it for twenty-eight units. That takes care of all the questions I have.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thanks very much Mrs. May. I'll go to Committee next to see if you have technical questions before we close the public participation meeting.
- Councillor Turner: I think there are a couple of things that might be explained for the questions that came up there and perhaps, through you, the first question is the front lot setback, what would be the actual distance from the sidewalk edge to the building façade recognizing that it wouldn't be directly adjacent to the sidewalk?
- Councillor Cassidy: Ms. Lowery?
- Catherine Lowery, Planner II: Through you Madam Chair and looking at the site concept plan submitted with the application, the existing property line pre-widening is just set in from the existing sidewalk and the setback from the existing property line is three meters to the proposed building. Now they recommended 0.1 meter setback from Base Line being the front lot line as proposed would be from the ultimate road allowance post widening.
- Councillor Cassidy: Councillor Turner?
- Councillor Turner: Sorry. Thank you Ms. Lowery. I'm not sure if you cut out at the end there but the distance from the sidewalk then to the building façade would be roughly, it wouldn't be 0.1 meters, there would be more space. What would roughly that space be? That was a concern that we heard from the two presenters there.
- Catherine Lowery, Planner II: Yes. Through you Madam Chair, the existing sidewalk is approximately three meters from the proposed building.
- Councillor Turner: Ok. Thank you. So it is still about nine to ten feet from the sidewalk so there is some space, it is not directly adjacent there. Second question and I would imagine this is something that we might consider for recommendations before the site plan part, the concern about the placement of the garbage pad there which is directly adjacent to the neighbouring property. We have seen this in a couple of other applications before where they looked for the garbage collection site to be far away from the building but close to the adjacent residential buildings. Is there opportunity or has there been discussion about a better place than in the back?
- Councillor Cassidy: Ms. Lowery?

- Catherine Lowery, Planner II: Through you Madam Chair the area on site that is proposed for the garbage is not actually intended to be long-term garbage storage. For developments like this garbage is required to be stored interior to the building. What that pad is, is merely a place where the bins can be rolled out to on pick up day for the collection. After that the bins are to be rolled back inside the building.
- Councillor Turner: Through you Madam Chair, thank you. I guess more to the point is that one day a week there will be the potential for odors to the adjacent property so to mitigate that to the greatest extent possible not having it that close to the adjacent property would be preferable. Is that something that was discussed with the applicant and is there a possible alternate location that might better suit that need?
- Catherine Lowery, Planner II: Through you Madam Chair that is absolutely something that was discussed at length through the process. The challenge with this site is the ability for a vehicle, a garbage collection vehicle, to come in and maneuver without backing up great lengths. The other challenge is moving it closer to the building, there is that building cantilever with the parking situated underneath. Through our discussions with the applicant this seemed to be the most feasible location for the collection pad.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you. I will address that further in the comments and recommendations. I think the last part of site plan was, I have kind of lost that, but I think there was still a couple of recommendations that we could make into the site plan process. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other technical questions? Councillor Hopkins and then Deputy Mayor Helmer.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Thank you. I have a quick question. I heard concerns around the loss of trees and the privacy part and also the applicant referring to further communications. First of all, what is the plan for the privacy and is there something that can continue that conversation? I want a better idea of understanding the fencing and what they are doing to mitigate the privacy for the residents in the area. My second question is, and I am not sure where this goes, was there a shadow survey done on this property as well? I understand there are some concerns about the use of the solar panels that are near this property.
- Councillor Cassidy: I will go to Ms. Lowery first.
- Catherine Lowery, Planner II: In terms of the shadow study, one was conducted as part of the Urban Design Brief that was required as part of the complete application. The findings of that study was that there wouldn't be any negative impact as a result of the proposed development. In terms of landscaping and fencing, those are matters that are typically addressed at the site plan stage, a future site plan stage. As for the fencing, looking at their site concept plan, the fencing proposed is currently at 1.8 meter high wood fence which equates to six feet.
- Councillor Cassidy: Great. Thank you. Deputy Mayor Helmer.
- Deputy Mayor Helmer: Thank you. I am wondering if, through the Chair, you could help me understand how the building face is going to align with the existing streetscape. So you have got buildings at 746 and 750 which are already set back from, and quite frankly, the road has already been widened on those properties and then you have got the residential properties that are further to the east on the other side of the road so how will this building, if it is constructed as designed on this site concept, how will it match up in terms of the overall streetscape and the front faces of those buildings?

- Councillor Cassidy: Ms. Lowery?
- Michael Tomazincic, Manager, Current Panning: Perhaps I could just jump in first. I am looking at page 208 of the Agenda and I will just give you a moment if you are able to scroll there. What we are seeing is the location of the proposed building and as Ms. Lowery mentioned it's three meters setback from the sidewalk but more to the point, just to the left of that image you can see the neighbouring property line and just the western, sorry the eastern portion of the adjacent building so this building will be set slightly in front of the existing building to the west. I am just eyeballing it, it's probably about four meters ahead in front of the existing building.
- Councillor Cassidy: Deputy Mayor?
- Deputy Mayor Helmer: Yeah, so this is not an insurmountable obstacle. For me, what I am getting from this concept plan is that the density is ok but the location of the building it seems a bit squeezed and I think the gentleman who spoke, I think he was trying to sell his property to the developer because it would make a square and I actually think the square would be a lot easier to work with in terms of getting a building of this kind of intensity onto the property in a way that fit in with the surrounding buildings and provide for not just a close connection into the sidewalk but reasonable landscaping out in front of the building. I'm trying to imagine what it's going to look like once the road is widened and I think that is the future state we have to be thinking about. What kind of room there will be for the vegetation, boulevard trees, things like that. I think it can work the way that it is designed but I think it would work better if there was more room in the back of the lot to the north frankly, if the property that the member of the public had mentioned. That can't really be the decision for the zoning, I think the intensity is good, I think the twenty-eight units and it is twenty-eight units, I want to emphasize that. I know that came up. I think it is confusing when we talk about units per hectare. Until I was on Planning Committee it had been a long time since I talked about hectares at all and that is not really something that is familiar to folks in their normal life. I think the twenty-eight unit building is pushed to the front because there is not a lot of room at the back for parking and access and that is because of the odd shape of the lot so I think an ideal situation would be if there was a big, square lot and the same kind of building was on there and it was a little further back from the future road widening. I can support it the way that it is but I do want to mention that I think that that would be better overall. I think it would fit better into the existing streetscape with the buildings that are already there. I know that the one has one that kind of protrudes out which is sort of what I was asking about, we can just see the corner of the one building at 750 but the other building that is further down for example has an entry way that kind of comes down a bit further out even than that and the residential to the east I'm not sure how that might transition to something else too but making sure we have a continuous streetscape that works well from an urban design perspective I think is important for when we are dealing with this particular building on the corner. I appreciate the members of the public coming out and sharing their thoughts. I do think it would be a bit better if it was further back but that is a bit of a site plan issue and I don't think that the way the site is set up, I don't think there is really a lot of options unless that other property were actually included in the development proposal.
- Councillor Cassidy: If there are no other technical questions, I will look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.