

## Public Consultation Summary

Response	Number of Responses	Issues Identified
<i>I support this proposal</i>		
<i>Accept if one or two features were different</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential tenants (1)</li> <li>• Site design (1)</li> <li>• Boundary wall along east property line (1)</li> <li>• Increased traffic and on street parking issues (2)</li> </ul>
<i>Accept if many features were different</i>		
<i>Completely opposed</i>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential tenants (1)</li> <li>• Removal of green space to develop the parking lot (1)</li> <li>• Land use compatibility: residential vs commercial (2)</li> <li>• Increased traffic (4)</li> <li>• Property devaluation (1)</li> </ul>

1. **Issue: Potential tenants- if the proposed development is intended to seniors or to transient residents?**

*Applicant's Response:* the proposed development is intended for anyone and since being in the rental business, we are confident on our renters' appropriate conduct.

*Administration's Response:* Under the Zoning Bylaw the form of development is regulated and not the individual tenancy. The review and analysis that is completed by Administration evaluates the application on the basis of land use impact and compatibility based on form of development.

2. **Issue: Site design, removal of green space to develop the parking lot and future of the wall along east property line**

*Applicant's Response:*

1. We will comply with the landscaping requirements of the City.
2. There are separate entrances proposed for residential and institutional use.
3. The park area will likely stay as it is. We probably will not need that area for parking but, if required for zoning purposes, we need to alter the site design.
4. The fence will be painted and repaired but would not be removed at present.
5. All drainage standards will be met.

*Administration's Response:* Pursuant to subsection 56(3) of the Act, Council may establish conditions for discretionary uses based on; nature of the proposal (e.g. site, size, shape and arrangement of buildings) and aspects of site design (e.g. landscaping, site access, parking and loading), but not including the colour, texture or type of materials and architectural details. The Administration will require the applicant to ensure protection of two coniferous trees on the north fence line.

The redevelopment proposal meets the minimum landscaping requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

3. **Issue: Land use compatibility: residential vs commercial**

*Applicant's Response:* It is not a dramatic change in the neighborhood neither are we proposing a commercial development. The neighbourhood already has quite a number of uses which are not residential including this one which is institutional. Proposed bylaw amendment will allow us to introduce additional residences to the neighborhood. At this time, we are adding aesthetically pleasing 15 new micro-suites to replace 33 rooms which were previously used for residential purpose contained within the building and invisible from the street. The parking lot of the property would be used no later than any other residential property in the block.

*Administration's Response:* The property is proposed for development of residential units to replace the former dormitory rooms from the convent. Any future development on site must conform to the requirements of the MX Zone should the rezoning of the site be approved.

The location of the subject property in proximity to residential and surrounding land uses is consistent with the purpose and intent of the MX Zone.

4. **Issue: Increased traffic and parking arrangements**

*Applicant's Response:* The proposed development will generate less traffic than the institutional property. Besides, we are repurposing the existing building and there will be no new construction at this time. All uses, except for the micro-suites will be institutional and represent no change from the existing zoning.

*Administrations' Response:* The proposal will not result in any negative impact on the existing road network and on the capacity of 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The proposed development meets the minimum parking requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

5. **Issue: Property devaluation**

*Applicant's Response:* The building was vacant for several years and has been deteriorating. The building is now completely rehabilitated and brought back to service. Nothing lowers the value of property like vacant buildings. This proposed redevelopment will have very positive effect on property values in the area.

*Administration's Response:* The Administration does not foresee significant difference in land use impacts as a result of the change from institutional to mixed residential business land use. The Administration is not aware of any evidence that suggests that the proposed land use will necessarily have a negative impact on values of adjacent residential properties.