



Meeting Notes

355 Guelph Ave & 11 Fletcher Circle – Neighbourhood Meeting

April 7, 2021

Zoom

7:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Councillor Donna Reid, Irina Galarza, Walter Aguirre, Ish Ficici, Nicole Thompson, Gillian Hearn, Paul Hearn, Sam Grewal, David Ball, Lindsay Cline, Bryan Gordon, Craig Oliver, Markus Pantea, Victor Labreche

Staff: Michael Campos, Deanne Friess, Katelyn Clayton

Developer Representative: Dave Galbraith, Tyler Malott, Matt Morningstar, Jamie Montag

Regrets: James Peltier, Jose Sebastian, Nathalie Gallagher, Brandon Dietrich, Vittorio Rotondi

ITEMS

1. Introductions

Michael Campos welcomed everyone to the meeting, presented ground rules and introduced Councillor Reid, City staff in attendance and the applicant.

2. Development Proposal

Using power point presentation, M. Campos provided a brief summary of the original proposal and the planning framework applicable to the subject lands, and the development review process. The original proposal was to construct nine, three-storey street-fronting townhouse units. The units would be freehold and affordable housing is not proposed. The applicant intends to divide the existing properties into nine individual lots through severance applications to the Committee of Adjustment. M. Campos then acknowledged the concerns from neighbours that were raised at the public meeting on March 2nd, 2021 and through submitted written comments:

- Density and Massing: too many units on subject lands. Height should be similar to surrounding development (two storeys)
- Traffic: Increased traffic at intersection of Guelph Avenue and Fletcher Circle
- Parking: Lack of available visitor parking and on-street parking on surrounding streets
- Shadow Impacts: Three-storey townhomes may cast shadows onto adjacent properties

- Trees: Removal of 21 existing mature trees. Revise application in attempt to save trees
- Privacy: Potential overlook from this development. Location of windows and decks
- Property Values: Decrease as a result of this development
- Child Safety: Young families in the neighbourhood, development would pose safety concerns for children playing in the street or walking to school
- Drainage: Potential for runoff from development into adjacent properties
- Green Space: Lack of green space in front yards

Using Power Point presentation Dave Galbraith went over the revised concept that has not been submitted yet for review. The revised concept consisted of:

- 2 storey townhouse dwellings instead of 3 storeys;
- A minimum of 2 car parking spaces per unit. On Guelph Ave, the units have 2 parking spaces and 1 in the garage
- On Fletcher Circle, both end units (units 5 and 9) will have a 2-car garage providing 4 parking spaces. The 3 center units will have 2 parking spaces each.
- An increased side yard setback from the eastern property line from 3 metres to 3.95 metres adjacent to Unit 9. In addition, an increased rear yard setback for the units fronting onto Guelph Avenue to 17.5 metres.

3. Roundtable Discussion.

Ish Ficici began the discussion with concerns of how the units went from 3 storeys to 2 storeys and what that would mean for the sq. ft. D. Galbraith explained that the units on Guelph Ave will be elongated and that they will all have walk out basements. Craig Oliver asked whether the main living space would now be on the main floor with the proposed rear yard deck now being on grade or if the proposal was to still have the deck on the top storey. Concerns were raised previously about privacy with the deck being on the third storey. D. Galbraith confirmed that the main living space would be on the main floor and the deck would also be accessed from that floor. Walter Aguirre also expressed his concern for privacy, as well as the height of the proposed entrance on the side of the unit 9. His concern relating to whether the entrance would be at a higher grade than his fence. D. Galbraith explained that the door would not be above the fence. M. Campos explained that once the revised elevations have been provided then City Staff can review this concern.

I. Ficici also discussed the lack of greenspace between the driveways. D. Galbraith explained that there would be a landscape strip that would vary in size depending on the unit. I. Ficici explained that the small amount of landscaping in the front as well as the development as a whole was not compatible with the other developments in the area. Others expressed the same concerns that this was not compatible. M. Campos explained that the zoning by-law requires 30% of the lot to be landscaped and that this requirement will be looked at when the revised plans are submitted. Compatibility will also be looked at when the revised concept is provided. M. Campos explained



that these townhouses are considered low density not medium density. This dwelling type is permitted by the “Low/Medium Density Residential” designation set out within the official plan for the subject lands.

Markus Pantea expressed his concerns regarding traffic congestion and the number of proposed driveways that are to have access to Fletcher Circle. Others explained that this area is used for parents to park and drop children off at school and is already congested. Concerns were raised regarding how this development would increase the congestion in the area during school hours as well as visitors to the area. M. Pantea and others expressed that a sidewalk in front of these townhouses would give a buffer from a car backing out and children walking from school. M. Pantea, as well as many others expressed their concerns regarding the trees that are on these properties and how the developer will address that concern. C. Oliver added to the concern about the trees as they have been there for many years. C. Oliver suggested to reduce the units to 7 and keep the trees to provide privacy between developments. D. Galbraith explained that the landscape plan will be provided with the revised application. He explained that there will be additional tree planting proposed to replace the trees. The trees at the rear of the Guelph Ave townhouses will be maintained and serve as a buffer between the new development and other homes.

I. Ficici as well as others expressed their concern as to why 9 units would be permitted if the zoning by-law only allows for 6 units. They expressed that this isn't a minor change to the by-law. M. Campos explained that it does not comply with the current zoning provisions in place and that is what the amendment application is for. He explained that with respect to the official plan, the proposal does set out what is permitted and townhouses are considered low density which is what is permitted in this area. Although they are not compliant with the current zoning by-law, they are still conforming to the official plan at this time. M. Campos explained that through the recommendation report there will be explanation on how this development would be in conformity to those policies.

Bryan Gordon, as well as others expressed that the neighbours be circulated on the revised concepts and be able to comment before the recommendation report goes to Council. M. Campos explained that the revised concepts would be circulated to the commenting agencies as well as shared with everyone involved in the meeting. Anyone can call, email or set a meeting to comment on the revised application. With the comments, the recommendation report would be prepared and there will be a chance for neighbours to speak to Council prior to their decision being made.

M. Campos also reminded those in attendance that should they wish to be notified of the revised application and when the report will be going to Council, that they would need to send a written request by email asking to be placed on the mailing list.

4. Next Steps

M. Campos explained the next steps would be as follows.

- Applicant to make formal resubmission
- City Staff to compile and provide technical comments to applicant
- (If necessary) resubmission by applicant
- Prepare and present recommendation report to Council. Any changes to the



proposal prior to the recommendation report will be documented in the final recommendation report.

M. Campos as well as Councillor Reid thanked everyone for their participation.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05p.m.