

Council Chambers
October 5, 2009 7:00 p.m.

A meeting of Council convened at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury and Wettstein

Staff Present: Mr. H. Loewig, Chief Administrative Officer; Mr. J. Riddell, Director of Community Design and Development Services; Mr. S. Hannah, Manager of Development and Parks Planning; Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy Clerk; and Ms. D. Black, Assistant Council Committee Co-ordinator

There was no disclosure of pecuniary interest.

PLANNING PUBLIC MEETING

Mayor Farbridge announced that in accordance with The Planning Act, Council was now in a public meeting for the purpose of informing the public of various planning matters.

146 Downey Road – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (File ZC0906) – Ward 6

Mr. A. Hearne, Senior Development Planner, stated the proposal is a mixed residential development of various types and sizes, which includes a condominium project with a minimum of 29 dwelling units and a maximum of 60 units on the site. He stated the owner intends to retain the existing single-detached house and demolish or remove the garage and barn. Agencies have not as yet commented on the proposal. He advised staff will meet with proponent and the neighbourhood residents to address the various issues.

Staff will report back on:

- the feasibility of keeping the zoning R1.A in keeping with the rest of Downey Road;
- defining the zoning to be more restrictive;
- height restrictions;
- the need for a walkway and/or an alternative location within the plan;
- possible development on the east side
- the manner of garbage collection;
- the issue of overnight parking;
- drainage and run-off;
- safety issues as they relate to the pipeline;

- determining which trees need to be removed;
- the types of trees used for replacement;
- compatibility issues;
- Possible 3-D models;
- timeframe of meetings;
- topography diagrams
- reforestation timing and responsibilities; and
- feasibility of planting a diversity of native species within the City-owned triangular parcel of land.

Mr. Jeremy Grant, Vice-President, Planning and Development on behalf of the applicant, advised of the objectives of the application which include:

- create a pleasant place to live;
- meet City and Provincial policies;
- promote good design, architecture, environmental, site planning, engineering etc.
- minimize negative impacts on neighbourhood.

He then addressed:

- site description;
- parkland property to the east;
- trees evaluation, preservation, landscape & design;
- environmental issues;
- the flexible zoning approach;
- the range of housing types and choices.

He believes their development is compatible to the neighbourhood. He also stated that green and environmentally-friendly options are being seriously considered.

He advised they have consulted with City traffic staff and have been assured Downey Road is capable of handling even more traffic than this application would require. He also stated they are reviewing a terraced design.

Mr. Andrew McGillivray noted all parties could be satisfied if clarity is provided on the process of collaboration. He believes it would be best to have a formal session to address issues and not one-on-one meetings in order to avoid polarizing the residents.

Mr. Rob Moreland stated the bigger this development, the more environmental damage there will be. He advised that Teal Drive residents are concerned with the stormwater management and the possible increase of water draining onto their properties. He expressed concern for the retention of the trees. He has concerns that the root structure of trees slated to be saved could be damaged due to slope or construction.

Ms. Shirley Greenwood advised she has a petition signed by approximately 250 residents opposing the proposed development. She addressed concerns of the Milson Crescent residents regarding:

- the number of trees scheduled for removal;
- the effect of the proposal on the walking trail;
- the proposed building height
- dust and runoff control during construction;
- the loss of privacy of their properties;
- the lot sizes and lack of landscaping;
- damage that could be caused during construction;
- groundwater drainage onto their properties;
- effect of runoff on adjacent fields and wetlands;
- risks to the neighbourhood regarding possible damage to the pipeline; and
- possible use of the heritage home

She stated that this area is not slated for intensification under the Official Plan and the development must be consistent with the neighbourhood and not what is being proposed.

Mr. Wally Kowal, a neighbourhood resident believes the proposed development scenarios are inconsistent with the existing neighbourhood. He believes the height is excessive and is unacceptable. He also expressed concern about the large number of trees being removed. He wants more clarity of the zoning and would request that the restrictions be put in place now. He requested that Council not even receive the report and that a specific site plan be presented to City Council.

Mr. Adrian Dangerfield raised concerns regarding:

- increased traffic on Teal Drive and road safety;
- how snow removal/garbage removal and emergency vehicular traffic would be managed;
- inadequate parking facilities generating overflow onto Downey Road creating safety issues there;
- the proximity of the development to open water;
- heritage and environmental impacts and damage to the wetlands;
- erosion issues
- the buildings overshadowing current properties.

He stated that the development is inappropriate for seniors, because of inadequate provision of wider sidewalks, paved trails, and amenities; and inappropriate for young families due to lack of walking and cycling trails and schools being at capacity now. He then did a comparison of the R.1A Zoning versus the R.1C Zoning and stated he believes the R.1A Zoning is more appropriate. He requested Council reject the proposal.

Ms. Wendy Powell was concerned about:

- proposal being incompatible with the Official Plan;
- the level of parkland dedication;
- destruction of trees and species at risk;
- the safety hazard of leaving up trees due to potential root damage;
- density levels; and
- the vacancy rate within the City.

She believes that 16-20 single dwellings would meet density requirements and be more compatible and less damaging to the environment.

Mr. Carl Keller, Secretary for the Kortright Hills Community Association, advised they would prefer to have a defined proposed zoning. He highlighted the following issues:

- density, height, and mass of the development;
- that the R.4 zoning could raise the allowable height of the apartment up to 8-10 storeys;
- the reduction to setbacks;
- privacy issues for property owners’
- the potential negative impact of stormwater;
- the problems the angled elevation creates;
- archaeological study findings need to be addressed;
- the net effect to the Downey Road well;
- the need for an independent traffic study;
- potential impacts on the pipeline;
- management of snow and garbage;
- emergency vehicular access.

He stated there are too many uncertainties to determine the cumulative effect the proposed developments would have on this site and the surrounding area.

Mr. Michael Carriere, a neighbourhood resident, stated he concurred with previous delegates regarding the safety issues. He advised that the concerns of the Teal Drive residents are:

- the loss of habitat;
- traffic issues on Teal and Downey;
- the proposed walkway may cause parking issues on Teal Drive;
- child safety and spillover traffic and parking;
- shallow setbacks on the townhouse proposal;
- loss of trees slated to be kept;
- the high building height encroaching on backyards;
- increase in traffic despite road capacity design;
- the need for an independent traffic study;
- a single lane being insufficient for rush hours;
- the effects on the water; and
- no opportunity for cycling.

He stated this area is not part of an intensification corridor and requests an appropriate transition with a high quality site design be provided.

Ms. Laura Murr expressed concerns regarding

- negative impact to natural features/ecological functions resulting from the proposed setbacks and construction
- the need to protect the creek;
- the lack of reference to the 2009 Heritage Strategy or the 2004 Hanlon Creek Watershed Study recommendations within the Environmental Impact Study;
- preservation of heritage farmhouse landscaping;
- the need for pre and post-development monitoring;
- addressing low flow conditions with the channel under the Teal Drive culvert to save the fish;
- the type of infill to be used;
- compatibility of proposal to existing homes.

She would like the developer to incorporate design elements that create a transition between the development and existing residents.

Ms. Susan Watson stated she wanted to show support of the infill development. She stated that increased density as proposed would:

- cost the City taxpayers less as more services would not be needed;
- enhance the stability of the neighbourhood and provide more continuity;
- bring more amenities such as transit, restaurants, and stores;
- minimize environmental impact to the trees and animals;
- get the most out of the proposed land and save other land as a valuable resource
- plan for a range and mix of housing and take into account affordable housing needs.

1. Moved by Councillor Burcher
Seconded by Councillor Findlay

Mr. J. Riddell

THAT Report 09-76 regarding a proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application applying to property municipally known as 146 Downey Road, City of Guelph, (File ZC0906) from Community Design and Development Services dated October 5, 2009, be received.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury, Wettstein and Mayor Farbridge (13)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

Carried

Mr. J. Riddell 2. Moved by Councillor Kovach
Seconded by Councillor Wettstein
THAT Council strongly encourage the applicant to work with representatives from the neighbourhood on the proposed application.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury, Wettstein and Mayor Farbridge (13)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

Carried

The meeting recessed.

The meeting reconvened at 10:10 p.m.

80 Frederick Drive: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (File ZC0905)

Mr. A. Hearne, Senior Planner advised the applicant is asking to rezone the lands from the existing Specialized R.3A-41(H) (Multiple Residential Holding) zone to the R.1D (Single-Detached Residential) Zone to allow the development of two proposed new single-detached R.1D lots. He advise the Committee of Adjustment consented to a severance to create the two lots conditionally upon the approval of the necessary zoning to allow the single-detached homes to be built. He advised the feedback from surrounding property owners and agencies has been supportive.

Staff will provide a list of the allowed commercial uses on the adjacent property and will provide the site plan for the "parent property" to show how this property will not fit into the bigger plan as it is zoned now.

Mr. J. Riddell 3. Moved by Councillor Billings
Seconded by Councillor Burcher
THAT Report 09-75 regarding a proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to allow the development of two proposed new single-detached R.1D lots on lands municipally known as 80 Frederick Drive, City of Guelph, being lands located in Phase 4 of the Westminister Woods East Subdivision (File 23T-02502), from Community Design and Development Services dated October 5, 2009, be Received.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury, Wettstein and Mayor Farbridge (13)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

Carried

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:19 o'clock p.m.

Minutes read and confirmed October 26, 2009.

.....
Mayor

.....
Deputy Clerk