Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment, 1950 Scott Street, 312 and 314 Clifton Road

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/submissions

Number of delegations at Planning Committee: 2

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee and Council between September 16 and October 9, 2019 : 2

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Brian Casagrande, Fotenn Consultants Inc. (applicant) (oral submission)

- asked that his comments at the August 22, 2019 Planning Committee meeting be re-submitted for this meeting, as follows:
    - responded to Councillor Leiper's comments to provide some context in respect of design, transportation and affordable housing
    - noted that design improvements have been made by the architect in response to suggestions from staff and the Urban Design Review Panel, and that further improvements may come during the site plan control process
    - in terms of affordable housing, he noted that, as there is no affordable housing component within the development, the developer is contributing more that $1.5M in Section 37 benefits, much of which the ward Councillor has indicated will be put towards affordable housing
    - in terms of parking, he noted that the ratio is currently 0.9 to 1, which may decrease once final unit count is firmed up, and that this project is actually accepting a maximum cap on the ratio in the zoning, as well as taking on an obligation to provide one bicycle parking space per unit

Primary concerns, by individual **Cecilia Aplerin** (oral submission)

- didn't receive official notification that the item was being considered at the August 22 Planning Committee meeting, and by not notifying the

constituents, trust in the process is eroded

- intensification does need to happen immediately near the LRT station, and does not need to occur within a one block radius
- intensification should be done in a careful manner, with a carefully thought-out Community Design Plan to help create safe and attractive streets, balance the needs between pedestrians and motorized vehicles and increase economic vitality and resiliency
- the proposed development, because of its size, depth, width, height and massing, will have an adverse impact on the amenities immediately adjacent to the site, which have already been eroded due to three large abutting buildings
- there will be increased traffic volume in the area
- ten years of ongoing construction and intensification has eroded the sense of vibrant community
- would like to see the principles of the Westboro Community Design Plan respected, rather than allowing irresponsible building practices that undermine the intent of the Plan and the neighbourhood itself; asked that the committee refuse this application until the outdated Westboro Secondary Plan has been revised

Eileen Pike (written submission)

- the staff report did not consider sufficiently the disruption caused by stacking so many families on a small footprint without insuring that the site becomes responsible for the increased traffic it will cause
    - the proposal does not include parking for the significant number of delivery vehicles, meaning traffic and pedestrians on the south side of Scott Street will be impeded by illegally parked delivery trucks displaying four-way flashers; the project needs dedicated space at the front door for deliveries and taxi pick up and drop off
    - the proposed 13 visitor parking spaces is insufficient, based on local comparisons and on the changing nature of shopping by everybody, including condo dwellers; three of the ten spaces will frequently be occupied by building staff and others may be frequently occupied by contractors, delivery vehicles and such, leaving very few free for visitors

Barry Lifeso (written submission)

- purpose: the intended building use and occupant is unclear, making it difficult to provide meaningful, accurate comments
- parking: the proposed number of parking spaces is unclear; if the number of parking spaces is limited, existing traffic and parking problems in Westboro will be exacerbated; it is “elitist” to deny citizens who own or may own a vehicle from living near the LRT stations
- accessibility: more can be done to better support those with accessibility issues and to support Council’s priorities around the provision and promotion of infrastructure to support safe mobility choices, and the integration of the rapid transit and transit priority network into the community; this building could be linked with others (to be to be built along the south side of Scott Street) with an elevated walkway or tunnel, connecting them to each other and to the Westboro LRT station
- height: concerns about whether the City will enforce the proposed 21-storey limit, given it did not enforce the 24-story limit at 1960 Scott; the proposed 21-storey height of this building is in conflict with the Secondary Plan, and this and all future developments should be either limited to the Official Plans, or postponed until such time as the Plans are updated and accepted by the community

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:

Debate: The committee spent 25 minutes on the item

Vote: The committee considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision. The committee carried the report recommendations with a motion to:

a. amend the details of recommended zoning (Document 2 of the report), to include the following provision:
    - “A holding symbol is placed on the property and that holding symbol may only be removed once the Section 37 Agreement, or similar development agreement, has been executed, which must occur prior to Site Plan Control approval”
b. replace the location map in Document 1 of the report with a map indicating the “h” suffix in the zone code to represent the holding symbol.

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision and CARRIED the item as amended by Planning Committee, without further change to the report recommendations.