

**From:** LBCC

**Sent:** Saturday, January 9, 2016 10:20 AM

**To:** Rybensky, Yvette

**Cc:** Johnson, Brenda; Partridge, Judi; Pearson, Maria; Green, Matthew; Collins, Chad; Pasuta, Robert; Conley, Doug; Johnson, Aidan; Farr, Jason

**Subject:** 101 Shoreview Place - PED 16010

Good Morning Yvette (and Planning Committee members)

On the surface, it appears that this proposal should be more intense subject to a more orderly and comprehensive review.

This application has created quite the ying-yang in our community. (We have 9 storey apt to the east, and 17 storey apts to the west, why are these ones only 6 storeys? Is it for the birds?

On one side increased intensification will have negative impacts for the city and for our community; and on the other side, the location might be an ideal location to more than double the intensification proposed; in other words a more financially prudent proposal.

As a neighbourhood association we have not reached a consensus which is better from an overall planning perspective however, in the current proposed format, we are formally opposing the application for the following reasons:

1. Impact to a Healthy Community (Strategic Priority #1) has not been substantiated.
2. Possibly better alternatives are available for overall enhanced sustainability. (Strategic Priority #2)
3. Community Confidence is lacking (Strategic Priority #3) due to Report to Council containing errors

It appears approval of this application is pre-mature in light of the significant studies that are being proposed to be undertaken during the Site Plan process rather than prior to approval of the Official Plan amendment. Some plans we believe that we agreed upon to be provided under the Sub-Division Agreement prior to grading.

While we can appreciate the fact that the regs force a time limit to bring these applications forward, we calculate this to be May 28th, 2016, and with the changes implemented with Bill 73, we believe the city can also extend this to August 26, 2016 under certain circumstances.

We are certainly not proposing that this application be tabled for that length of time. That would be completely unfair to the developer under the circumstances. We are however requesting that our specific questions and concerns/comments be addressed prior to approving this application and that perhaps a tabling to the next Planning Committee might be in order to allow all the stakeholders an opportunity for further discussions; due to the potential for increased revenues and a more orderly

development.

The specific concerns, comments and questions we have that align with the above 3 reasons are as follows:

(a) **Overall intensity** - The overall Green-Millen Shores development has grown significantly since the original OPA. The proposed number of units which garnered the initial OPA and ZBA, was presented to Council and the Public as 994 units. (1,415 units minus the 421 units in the existing 2 apt buildings). We knew that this was an unrealistically low number but with all the "minor" variances to date, the number of units has more than doubled. We're closing in on 2000 units now that have already been approved, without this amendment (for 468 units) and without another block zoned for a Mixed Use Commercial Apt building at an unlimited height restriction.

Ying and Yang - Intensification is good for tax revenues, but intensification in our greenfield space (outside of the built-up area) negatively impacts our mandated target of no greater than 60% of housing units built in these areas.

(b) **Overall density** - the overall Green-Millen Shores development was done when this land (part of Block 1) was at a much lower density. The Staff Report states this. However, the Staff Report does not provide pertinent details and/or all of this historical details. When this greenfield space was originally approved for development the zoning was amended in order to accommodate Stacked and/or Street townhouses only. (RM3-52) Any apartment buildings were suppose to be located on the lands to the south in order to provide views of the Lake; and not the lands to the north such as this one (and the other 2 apartment buildings currently being constructed). At the time of rezoning, the Staff Report presented to Council and the Public stated the density would be 47 units per hectare. This was lower than the 50 units required but was approved since the overall development from Green Rd to Millen road was proposed to be 62 units per hectare. It has grown significantly since then through various minor variances. Specific to this one section, the proposal before you is for 209 units per hectare.

Ying and Yang - Proposal is 4x denser which means it is clearly not an "urban sprawl low density" development, but it is in greenspace and it doesn't appear the higher densities have been proven to be sustainable with respect to Stormwater Management, Traffic Management and/or EIS's.

(c) The previous **Traffic Study** on file was completed when this was a much lower density. We believe it indicated a downgraded Level of Service to D's and F's at some intersections. It appears to us, that inconsistencies are present in Council's direction. Was there not a recent motion brought forward that our Level of Service should be a minimum of a C throughout the City? It seems illogical to us that Staff would recommend deferring the Traffic Study to Site Plan under these circumstances.

(d) **Traffic Analysis** - The prior analysis included the intersections of Frances/Drakes, Grays/Frances and Drakes/North Service Road. These intersections are not

recommended to be included in the updated Traffic Study (Page 19 of 31). Why? Increased traffic along the whole of North Service negatively impacts our ability to exit/enter our homes. Unlike the South Service Road, the North Service Road does not have any signalized intersections which have the benefit of providing stop/gaps in the flow of traffic.

(e) **Environmental Impact Statement** - Does the ESA / Hazard Lands, zoned P5, already include or exclude the required 30 m buffer. Has it been accurately depicted on Appendix D or do those lot lines (and reduced set backs requested) potentially need to be adjusted following receipt of an EIS. If yes, it appears that deferring this statement to Site Plan may result in unnecessary resources expended. Or is that why an 8 m side yard has been requested when a 12 m side yard is required in the overriding by-law? And what's with the birds? We can't find any mention of that in any of the original development proposal or documentation on the website.

(f) **Stormwater Management** - Shouldn't we be addressing this concern before approving further intensification? This is a floodplain correct? It was identified by other Staff yet Planning staff is recommending deferring - why?

(g) **Height** - This is a big ying-yang! The 6 storeys will never come in at 24 ms. We know this from experience on the other apt building in the same Block 1. The proposal was 4 storeys 11ms high. The completed built form will be the same 4 storeys but at a height of 18ms high. In light of this, why aren't we insisting on a build that will be less sprawl - higher with more green space? On first blush, that option appears to be a win-win-win. What are we not understanding here?

The above are our main concerns with the proposal. We also do have concerns about the information in the Staff Report itself but due to time constraints, we won't point out the specifics. Generally speaking Council hasn't been provided with a clear picture due to:

#### 1. Misleading Details

For example, Shoreview is described (and shown on Appendix A) as a thru road providing direct access to Green, North Service Road and QEW. It is a local road that runs off of Millen Road and will dead end prior to the west lot line of this parcel of land. There is, and will not be, any direct access to those roads mentioned in the Staff Report. (see pic below of Waterfront Trail)

#### 2. Omission of Details

For example, Shoreview Place (development directly south which we've shown a pic of below) which doesn't appear to have been considered in respect to "public views" on the lake; nor is there any mention of those driveway placements and reduced on-street parking due to that build.

#### 3. Pertinent Details seem to be buried in the Report.

For example, There's no mention that this is a greenfield development until page 10. Development proposals within the built boundary and outside of the built-up area (greenfield developments) by their nature require greater attention. It would be helpful for the recipients of these Reports to be made aware of this significant detail earlier on in their readings.

Thank you for addressing the community's concerns. Just to be clear, we're not opposing developing the lands. We're of the opinion the current proposal has flaws which perhaps can be addressed to make this a better development for the city, the developer and the community.

Respectfully,

Lakewood Beach Community Council

P.S Please feel free to add this correspondence on to the Jan Agenda as well as forward along to the applicant if you deem appropriate.

