

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 122 Base Line Road West (OZ-9200)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Macbeth. Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Macbeth. I do have a technical question regarding the thirty percent affordable units, there is sixty-one units. Do we know the make-up or the mix of these units at this time?
- Travis Macbeth, Planner II: Thank you. Through the Chair, I believe it is forty-seven one bedroom and then there was two or three two bedroom, sorry, two or three three bedroom and then the remainder being two bedroom. Mr. Giustizia can correct me if I am wrong but the thirty percent applied would be thirty percent minimum for each unit type.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other technical questions? Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Thanks Madam Chair, I had an opportunity to discuss with Mr. Giustizia earlier but I am just curious about the bicycle parking and how that has changed so it's one per four units, what would normally be required?
- Travis Macbeth, Planner II: Through the Chair, I believe it is one per two but I would have to double check that. The rationale there being that generally people are inclined to keep them in their own units or that the storage that is available doesn't, in the same way that car parking isn't maximized, bicycle storage facilities aren't generally maximized so the one per four is, was deemed to be acceptable in other comparable buildings that the HDC have their affordable housing providers see.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you. I'll comment more later.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other technical questions? Wonder, Mr. Giustizia, if you were needing or wanting to add anything to Mr. Macbeth's presentation?
- Steve Giustizia, CEO, Housing Development Corporation: Through you Madam Chair, I just want to, those two comments just maybe quickly, I think the numbers were forty-seven, ten and four. I just want to confirm that and then .75 is the normal for bicycle but overall I just want to acknowledge and thank Committee and City staff. I think what you're seeing in front of you and Mr. Macbeth just did a fabulous job summarizing it, is our work that preceded our, our acquisition of this property last year by, by a couple of years. There was a couple of years of policy work that went into this and I think what you're seeing today is the, is the result of what can be done very consistent within both the existing land use plans and also providing for best use and intensity in form. So, with that Madam Chair I, I have my Development Managers, Kim Wood, the Project Lead and Brian Turcotte, the Development Manager who took the planning lead on this and we're here to answer questions should you need.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Giustizia. So now I will go to members of the public if there are any members of the public here for this application. Just check to see if you would like to address the Committee? I see somebody in Committee Room 5. If you just state your name and then you will have five minutes.

- My name is Mr. Oleg Kodolov and I am the owner of the units at 95 Base Line Road West which is in close proximity to the building and I have heard an overwhelmingly negative response from anyone I talked to about this proposed development and I notice the reason overwhelmingly negative response even in the document that I have read. There are many reasons for that but the main reason would be density and I'm not sure this can be addressed by making any minor changes to this project. Densities are too high already in this area and there is much emphasis on intensification but intensification is actually hurting residents by harming the ecology. It substantially reduces space between the buildings in the area where there's already very little space between the building and it increases the number of residents at a time when we need to think about more space even when the residents go for a walk during the time of Covid. I just suggest to the Council to find a less congested place for this kind of a project. I also ask the Councillors, if possible, to make sure that this area is not developed in future because there was already a project to develop this area several years ago. There was another different application and, at that time, it did not go through so I suggest to rezone it in such a way that nothing other than really tree planting is allowed in this area because it's a relatively, relatively narrow space in between the buildings which would definitely need for ecological reasons and I did read the application and I don't think congestion density concerns are addressed or even can be addressed in this kind of application and I really ask the Council to think about reasons other than intensification or issues other than intensification for the purposes of this project. For example, the application refers to a couple of small parks in the neighbourhood but in fact you have to walk quite a bit one little small parks and they're very small for the number of residents who live in this in this area and it's really an area of many apartments buildings, it's apartment building after apartment building, condo buildings, apartment buildings, various long-term care buildings, at least one long-term care building and really different residents including many retired residents who reside in this area do not have an opportunity to use a lot of open space. You really have to use your vehicle to drive to get to a good park and I would ask Council to think about issues other than intensification, no matter what the benefits of intensification might be. One issue certainly might be Covid-19 and necessity to have more distance between people even when they go for a walk as well as general, general issues of fresh air, regular ecological reasons. There are other reasons, by the way, presented against this project. You may refer to other submissions on this issue but this density issue and the ecological issue, I think, is the one that would be addressed and that's why I request to abandon, to abandon this project. Of course we all love the environment we can agree that we should reject the type of development that hurts both people and environment. It is very poorly allocated, that's the main reason, it really has to be somewhere else in a different part of the city, not where we have already so many different buildings and so I make recommendations to the full Council and to consider all the relevant reasons relating to density and environment cannot be addressed all relating to the health and wellbeing of people including many retired individuals living in this area relating to density as well as various other concerns being raised but those other concerns, even those, if those other concerns are addressed, for example, about potential changes in property values or crime rates in the area and various other comments that in fact you have online and I also heard about, from many residents, even if you address those concerns you cannot really address the issue of density and the damage to ecology that is being done and I strongly recommend to abandon the whole project altogether rather than, rather than make various changes to it. So I hope you will decide positively on this on the 29th. Thank you very much for attention.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you sir. Are there any other members of the public who would like to speak to this application? Looking in the committee rooms that I see on my screen and I'm not seeing anybody standing up, coming forward. Doesn't look there's any like there's anybody else who would like to comment from the members of the public so I will go to the Committee and ask for a motion to close the public participation meeting.