

**TOWN PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 26, 2021 – 6:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting**

PRESENT:	IN ATTENDANCE:
Juliana Barnard, Councillor Bill Thomas, Councillor Ted Fitzgerald, Member Rochelle Roberts, Member Stephen Johnston, Chair Wayne Talbot, Vice-Chair, Councillor Don Taylor, Member	A. Redmond, Secretary J. Fox, Director of Planning M. Dolter, CAO A. MacKinnon, Engineer A. Grant, Economic Dev Officer C. Connolly, Planner J. Lugar, LMH Properties C. Markides, LMH Properties C. Haliburton, LMH Properties C. Wallace, ZZAP Consulting Ltd

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, S. Johnston

AGENDA

On the motion of T. Fitzgerald 2nd W. Talbot, the agenda was amended to remove 557-573 Prince Street as the developer has requested additional time.

MINUTES

On motion of J. Barnard 2nd B. Thomas, the minutes from March 29, 2021, were approved as circulated.

**54-58 WALKER STREET
DEVELOPMENT
AGREEMENT**

J. Fox, Director of Planning and Development, presented an Application Briefing dated April 22, 2021, regarding a development agreement application by LMH Properties. The purpose of the application is to permit the development of a multi-unit residential development consisting of one 9-storey building containing 70 dwelling units.

J. Fox indicated that this proposal is currently at step one of the Town's development application process and once the applicant has had an opportunity to present its development plans to the Committee and once the Committee has had a chance to provide their comments, the developer is expected to identify what, if any, revisions will be made in response to the Committee's feedback, and at this step, PAC members are expected to provide direction to the developer regarding suggested changes to address public feedback and better conform to the Town's planning policies and objectives.

C. Markides with LMH Properties provided the Committee with an overview of the proposed development and stated that it's located within walking distance to shopping, parks, and playgrounds and advised that the Town's Municipal Planning Strategy encourages high-density development by development agreement in this area.

C. Markides indicated that this development would provide one, two, and three bedrooms with various unit sizes, with indoor and outdoor amenity space, including forty underground parking spaces.

Members expressed concern with the height and size of the proposed development being too large for the site and the number of proposed parking spaces not meeting parking ratio requirements.

R. Roberts stated that she favors high-density development within the downtown and appreciates the developers' plans to convert the main floor from residential to commercial for future use if necessary.

A. Redmond provided the Committee with questions and comments from the public during the live meeting, including site contamination testing, traffic, and affordable housing.

S. Johnston advised the developer that the proposed development would follow the standard process. The Committee would be looking for shadow analysis, cross-sections, renderings, and materials as we go through the process.

60 GOLF STREET
DEVELOPMENT
AGREEMENT

J. Fox, Director of Planning, presented a Staff Report (Step 3) dated April 21, 2021, regarding an application by Endurance Equities Corporation and Brentwood Developments Limited to construct a Multi-unit residential development consisting of one 8-storey building containing 76 dwelling units.

J. Fox provided the Committee with an update on revisions that have been made in response to feedback from members and staff, which included the removal of most surface parking; increased amount of landscaped open space; two levels of underground parking; increased setback from Golf Street; upper floors are stepped back from Golf Street; and reduction in the number of units from 80 or 88 to 76.

D. Taylor raised his concern regarding traffic flow and parking generated by the golf course and TACC grounds and asked if the Traffic Authority had reviewed the Traffic Impact Statement and if the Traffic Engineer had conducted a stress test.

A. MacKinnon stated that he did review the Traffic Impact Statement and advised that it is based on traffic generated by the proposed development and does not include the background conditions.

C. Wallace provided the Committee with an overview of their modified design process based on feedback from the Committee during his presentation.

C. Wallace advised that members and residents raised concern regarding traffic and parking supply in the area during the early stages of the application process and identified that there are implications from other land uses surrounding this development; and based on the feedback received, the developer was able to modify their design to ensure adequate parking supply

was available on-site and has provided over the one-to-one parking ratio requirement for this development.

D. Taylor questioned if any consideration has been given for the single-family dwelling located on Clyke Street.

C. Wallace indicated that the rear setback is significant from the building and stated that they intend to landscape that area and advised that additional buffering such as fencing or alternative landscaping is also available.

D. Taylor stated that buffering between the proposed development and Clyke Street be a requirement as part of the agreement and was impressed with the overall proposal and its design.

B. Thomas expressed concern regarding comments received from the public on the height and scale of the proposed development and wanted clarification on the Municipal Planning Strategy's interpretation and is concerned that it is not compatible with the single-family dwellings in the area.

J. Fox stated that the architect had done a great job by placing a greater visual emphasis on the first three floors by incorporating a three-storey podium with distinct finish materials while the visual impact of the upper floors are softened by having them stepped back from the street and using a lighter colour palette. J. Fox indicated that these measures will help to minimize the appearance of scale and help mitigate any potential incompatibility issues related to the scale of the proposal.

J. Fox advised that the Municipal Planning Strategy refers to adjacent properties when referring to compatibility and not properties that are located 200 or more meters away. He stated that it would be indefensible for him to give a negative recommendation based on the proposal's incompatibility with adjacent properties when there is currently no established pattern of uniform building sizes within the immediate area.

C. Wallace stated that the Town's Future Land Use Map shows that the compatibility surrounding future land use relative to the immediate adjacent uses are designated as general residential and general commercial, allocated for future growth in the area.

A. MacKinnon indicated that concerns were raised early in the application process regarding traffic issues such as volume and traffic speed from residents on Smith Avenue. A. MacKinnon stated that a traffic volume speed camera was installed on six local collector streets within the Town and provided raw data based on a span of seven days during the time frame of 9:00 a.m. until midnight. It showed that the average speed was 43 km per hour on Smith Ave, with approximately 1500 vehicles per day.

J. Fox provided the Committee with comments and questions that were received during the live meeting. Several residents expressed concern regarding the height, bulk, and scale of the proposed development. They felt

that it was not compatible with the single-family dwellings within the vicinity and the increased traffic volume and parking requirements.

B. Thomas stated that there could be potential issues with the proposed development not providing sufficient guest parking and was looking for clarification on the industry standard.

J. Fox stated that industry standard is moving from the one and half spaces per unit, and the trend is moving towards one-to-one parking ratio and advised that on-street parking is permitted.

A discussion followed with members regarding parking and it was agreed that the four surface visitor parking spaces would be sufficient for this project.

J. Barnard stated that the context has changed since the last approved planning documents and looked forward to the upcoming plan review process and advised that this decision is difficult to balance with our current planning documents.

J. Bernard asks the architect if they would consider removing a few stories from the proposed development as the height is the primary concern of the area residents.

C. Wallace provided an overview of their reasoning behind the proposal and specifically for a nine-storey building. He noted that the higher building resulted in a smaller building footprint which allowed them to reserve a significant portion of the site for landscaped open space. He also noted that the building's architectural design is intended to minimize the impact of its height.

C. Wallace stated that the proposed site is intended to be developed as high density and feasible for the developers and advised that the proposed development conforms with the Town's Policies and indicated that removing additional storeys from this particular design is not an option.

W. Talbot stated that a number of these policies are open for interpretation and feels that members and area residents have made their interpretation of these policies and finds it to be a difficult decision.

On a motion of R. Roberts 2nd by D. Taylor, it was recommended that Council establish a public hearing date and approve the proposed development agreement subject to the submission of a stormwater management plan, landscaping plan, and additional buffering on Clyde Street.

Motion defeated 4-3 (nay – J. Barnard, B. Thomas, W. Talbot, T. Fitzgerald)

NEW BUSINESS

No New Business

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion of S. Johnston, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

May 31, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.

.....
Secretary

APPROVED

.....
Chairperson