

Public Consultation SummaryTotal Responses

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Issues Identified</b>
<i>Completely opposed</i>	600	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density is too high</li> <li>• Traffic and pedestrian safety/ Alley is not suitable for an access.</li> <li>• Loss of heritage property/ more of the heritage building should be restored</li> <li>• Moving the structure is unnecessarily risky to the heritage property.</li> <li>• The building is too tall</li> <li>• Loss of mature trees on the property</li> <li>• Negative impact on surrounding property value</li> <li>• Loss of privacy of surrounding properties</li> <li>• Development does not fit the neighbourhood historical character</li> <li>• This will set a precedence for other rezoning applications in the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• The right of way should not be closed only to facilitate a development.</li> <li>• The neighbourhood is low density residential and a higher density does not fit.</li> <li>• There will be too many vehicles parked in the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• City should not have considered the proposal when it does not conform to heritage requirements.</li> </ul>
<i>Accept if many features were different</i>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the number of units</li> <li>• There should be more heritage structure maintained on the property.</li> <li>• Three storey apartment does not fit the area.</li> <li>• Addition does not match the existing Tudor style</li> </ul>
<i>Accept if one or more features were different</i>	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Architectural style needs to match the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• There should be less parking from the alley.</li> <li>• 16 units is too many.</li> <li>• Site should be redeveloped in some way as the house is not in good repair and is neglected.</li> <li>• There will be too many garbage and recycling containers in the alley</li> </ul>
<i>I support this proposal</i>	1171	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• House is run down, so it's good there is investment in it. Unlikely anyone will want to reinvest in a single detached home here.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for higher density to use the infrastructure and pay taxes, discourage urban sprawl.</li> <li>• Good mix of old and new in the design</li> <li>• Units will bring younger population or empty nesters to the area</li> <li>• City should not tell owners what they can do on their property.</li> <li>• It's good to allow flexibility for heritage properties, encourages others to invest in heritage</li> <li>• It's unlikely that anyone will want to invest to restore the single detached home,</li> </ul>
<i>Other</i>	10	

**Responses with Contact Information**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
Completely opposed	414
Accept if many features were different	13
Accept if one or more features were different	6
I support this proposal	274
Other	<u>7</u>

**Anonymous Responses**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
Completely opposed	185
Accept if many features were different	7
Accept if one or more features were different	13
I support this proposal	897
Other	3

**1. The proposed density is too high.**

Administration's Response:

Strictly based on zoning requirements a site of this size may be subdivided into three lots, and each developed into a single detached dwelling with a secondary suite for a total of six units. Therefore, the proposed development of 16 units proposes ten units more than could hypothetically be developed on a site of this size in the neighbourhood. Based on the requirements of the R1 – Residential Detached Zone. The proposed increase in density is a fundamental aspect of the proposal, which the Administration does not support. The density relates to the proposed additions to the heritage building, traffic impact, servicing, zoning, and policy related issues. No servicing issues related issues were identified in the review.

**2. Traffic and pedestrian safety; the alley is not suitable for vehicle access.**

Administration's response:

The proposed development is not of a scale that would require a traffic impact assessment. The Administration, using industry standards, would estimate two vehicle trips per day, to a total of 34 vehicle trips associated with the development. There would be no need to assess traffic signal changes or require changes to infrastructure to accommodate the development.

The Administration agrees that the lane is unusually narrow, likely because lots on the block are large, and most use front vehicle access. There is very little opportunity in the alley for vehicles to pass or pull over to give way to an oncoming vehicle, which may occur from time to time. If Council wishes to approve the development, Administration would recommend that pavement width of the alley be widened behind the subject property and surface parking be reconfigured to allow additional space for vehicle passage. If necessary, the alley may also be posted with one-way signage to avoid vehicle conflicts.

**3. Loss of heritage property; the property should be restored not redeveloped. Lifting and moving the historical structure is unnecessarily risky.**

Administration's Response:

The proposal has been reviewed in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines and heritage policies, and the Administration is not supportive. While full restoration of a property may be an ideal outcome from some perspectives, it may not always be possible. Changes to historic properties, such as additions, or adaptive re-use are allowable, but must conform to the Standards and Guidelines and other development policies to be permitted.

Administration does not support the applicant's approach to redevelopment, which includes partial demolition and removal of roof structures, lifting the remaining historical structure to a new location on the lot, and combining with building additions, as it does not represent a minimalist approach to heritage conservation. However, if Council agrees to the application, an engineer's report would be accompanied with the building and demolition permits to ensure there is a plan to ensure the structure remains intact.

**4. The height of the building is too high.**

Administration's Response:

An assessment of the height of the building is provided in the discussion section of the report.

**5. Loss of mature trees on the property.**

Administration's Response:

The City's Urban Forestry Branch commented that no City trees would be lost from this development. There is no requirement to maintain existing trees on site; however, protection

of existing trees would be encouraged. Landscape requirements may be fulfilled by a combination of newly planted or existing trees. The development would maintain a relatively high percentage of landscaped area. The Zoning Bylaw requires 15 percent of the site to be landscaped whereas approximately 24 percent is proposed.

**6. There would be negative impact on property values as a result of this development.**

Administration's Response:

Administration is not aware of any evidence that concludes that there will a negative impact on surrounding property values. The impact of the development on property values cannot be conclusively determined in advance and will be influenced by the resulting actions and perceptions of surrounding property owners and prospective purchasers.

**7. Development does not fit the historical character of the neighbourhood.**

Administration's Response:

As noted in the report the Administration agrees that the development does not suit the character of the neighbourhood and the historical requirements of the site and has a significant impact on the designation bylaw outside of "minimal intervention".

**8. This will set a precedence for other rezoning applications in the neighbourhood.**

Administration's Response:

This application considers rezoning of only this property. The decision will be based on the circumstances and information apparent to Council, and particular to the proposal on this property. Policy pertaining to increased residential density in the neighbourhood is not changing with this application. If any other applications are submitted for other properties they will be considered individually and within their own context.

**9. The right of way should not be closed only to facilitate a development.**

Administration's Response:

From time to time the City is approached to close portions of right of ways to consolidate with adjacent properties. These requests are considered on a case by case basis. A property owner interested in purchasing land is required to put up a non-refundable deposit, and a technical review is conducted to determine if the City has a need for the right of way. Sometimes there may be future infrastructure needs or there could be infrastructure within the right of way that needs to be protected, in which case the City would not sell the land. If there are no technical concerns then an application is formally submitted for review. Ultimately it is City Council's decision to close and sell the right of way or not. If it is confirmed through the review process that there is no need to maintain the right of way and deemed surplus to the City's needs, then Council typically closes it the right of way and it is consolidated with adjacent properties.

**10. There will be too many vehicles parked in the neighbourhood.**

Administration's response:

The proposal includes space for up to two vehicles per dwelling unit, which is double the City's requirement. However, some parking space may be lost if the proposal is approved and the rear surface parking lot is required to be reconfigured. On-street parking would be permitted along the north side of Hill Avenue, providing spaces for eight or nine vehicles. Parking is not permitted on Albert Street and most of the parking lane on the south side of Hill Avenue is restricted.

**11. The City should not have considered the proposal when it does not conform to heritage requirements.**

Since the Contract Zone amendment is required before the development may proceed, the heritage review is integral to the rezoning review. Any application for rezoning submitted in its complete form must follow the standard process and will be ultimately decided on by Council. It would not have been appropriate for Administration to reject the rezoning application based on concerns regarding heritage development. Property owners have an opportunity to apply for changes to bylaws that impact their property. Accepting an application for review does not mean that Administration supports the proposal. Administration's role is to evaluate a proposal through the review process and to provide a recommendation to Council.