

**Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT – 404 EDEN AVENUE (ACS2017-PIE-PLS-0004), prior to City Council’s consideration of the matter on 8 February 2017. The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of 22 February 2017, in the report titled ‘SUMMARY OF ORAL AND WRITTEN PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FOR ITEMS SUBJECT TO BILL 73 ‘EXPLANATION REQUIREMENTS’ AT THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF 8 FEBRUARY 2017 (ACS2017-CCS-OCC-0003)’. Please refer to the ‘Bulk Consent’ section of the Council Agenda of 22 February 2017 to access this item.**

### **Summary of Written and Oral Submissions**

#### **ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT – 404 EDEN AVENUE (ACS2017-PIE-PLS-0004)**

In addition to those outlined in the Consultation Details section of the report, the following outlines the written and oral submissions received between the publication of the report and prior to City Council’s consideration:

- **Number of delegations at Planning Committee: 3**
- **Number of Submissions received between 17 January and 8 February 2017: 2**
- **Primary arguments in support :**
  - 13 units is a balanced level of intensification considering the site’s proximity to a transit station and area amenities, and considering the mid-rise mixed-use developments existing to the north and west of it
  - Underground parking access will occur at the rear of the building, thus eliminating the need for vehicular access across the face of the building, reducing pedestrian conflict and increasing the viability of street landscaping
  - Extra visitor parking spaces are being provided beyond the minimal requirement to respond to existing parking concerns
  - Rear yard setback is greater than required to reduce impacts on adjacent neighbor and accommodate underground parking access as well as communal amenity space
  - Fourth storey is recessed from front and southerly edges to mitigate impacts on streetscape and adjacent lands

- Refusing this application to re-examine the Secondary Plan for the area would be inappropriate and unjust given the merits of this development and the fact that applications are to be considered under the policy framework in place when an application is made

- **Primary concerns and arguments in opposition:**

- Proposal is out of scope with existing development on the street and out of character
- Potential for increased traffic and parking issues
- Loss of greenspace
- Could open the door for more development of the same type in the area
- There is adequate rental development in the area to mitigate the need for this building
- Proposal has no relevance to what exists and would be permitted under the existing zoning
- A three-unit tri-plex within the accepted 10.7 m height and with retained greenspace would be more acceptable
- Proposal does not protect the R3 zoning of the area as was intended with the area's Community Design Plan
- The language used in the report is misleading and minimizes the imposition it would represent on the neighbourhood and its profound change in zoning and transition
- The new building will cause diminished light and space, obstructed views, and privacy infringement
- Proposal would result in triple density for the street
- Proposal is about money and not what the neighbourhood needs

**Effect of Submissions on Committee Decision:**

Debate        The Committee spent thirty-five minutes on this item

Vote:         The Committee CARRIED this item as presented

**Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:** Council considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision, and CARRIED this item as presented.