



Notes

55 Kerr Street – Liaison Committee Meeting No. 3

January 11, 2021

Zoom

7:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Councillor Jan Liggett, David Thomson, Frances Seward, Karen Gordon, Sarah Chandler, Judy Major-Girardin,

Staff: J. Matthew Blevins, Adam Ripper, Jason Leach, Katelyn Clayton

Applicant: Jonathan Weizel, Morteza Alabaf

Developer Representatives: Eldon Theodore

Regrets: Deanne Friess, Manager of Development Planning, Robert MacKenzie, Richard Thomas

ITEMS

1. Introductions

Councillor Liggett welcomed everyone and advised she will be chair the meeting.

2. Notes from Meeting #2

J. Matthew Blevins reviewed the notes from March 12th 2020 Liaison Committee Meeting. A question regarding if the mail out for the RSVP notice to the neighbourhood could be given to residents outside the 120m radius. M. Blevins advised that the letters had already been prepared and an email notice would be circulated to the Committee. That email notice could then be passed to the residents further from the 120m radius.

3. Update on Development Proposal

Staff

Using power point presentation, Eldon Theodore presented the changes to the development proposal. The revisions include:

- Two 18 storey towers
- 445 units
- 35 parking spaces at surface level, 410 parking spaces underground
- 2 levels of underground parking
- Townhouse feel podium and tower at the back
- Ground floor amenities that still include a coffee shop and additional indoor amenity space
- A more traditional podium reflecting heritage characteristics
- The 45 degree angular plane of the building which helps with shadows
- Increase height of the elevated walkway
- Provided an updated shadow study
- Number of units
 - 13 Studio units
 - 75 One bedroom
 - 146 One bedroom plus den
 - 43 Two bedroom
 - 168 Two bedroom plus den

The improvements in the updated development proposal are as follows:

- Height is in keeping with height context of the downtown
- Reduction in density from 592 units to 445
- Reduction in levels of underground parking from 3 levels to 2
- Reduction in overall traffic
- Improvements in amenity to tenant ratio

4. Discussion

Applicant

E. Theodore explained that they compared the heights of the new proposal to other buildings in the area and they are similar in height. Some group members questioned whether that also included comparison in densities to other buildings in the area. Councillor Liggett asked staff to follow up on what the density is for those other buildings in comparison to the proposed development. Staff confirmed they will look into this for the recommendation report.



The group is in favor of development going in this area, but is questioning the reasoning what the justification is for requesting amendments to the current by-laws. E. Theodore explained that this property is within walking distance of the downtown core and it would encourage an increase in the number of people there. This proposal would be a great benefit to what the Official Plan is seeking which is to increase the density in the downtown. There is a mandate from the provincial level to encourage that growth. The group also questioned how old the current by-laws are and what the by-law for height is. M. Blevins confirmed that the by-law regulations was passed in 1985. He also explained that the by-law for the height is set in terms of meters and this portion of the city is a maximum of 34 metres in height.

Jonathan Weizel expressed that they have had preliminary circulation and comments for this proposal from the agencies and that the revised proposal has addressed any of those comments that were made.

The group questioned how Cambridge Street would be affected with the new Shadow study provided. E. Theodore explained that the study ensures that properties have an average of 5 hours of solar access per day. This meets the standard of solar access. They calculate that average between the spring and the fall solstice. Based upon standard practices of preparing these studies, winter is not included in the measure as places are mainly shaded during those months.

The group questioned what the impact on traffic would be without the LRT. Jason Leach explained that he would follow up on that request and confirm that with the new unit count as well. The group questioned what the impact of traffic would be with this development. J. Leach explained that the traffic study takes a look at the number of units in a development and what kind of trips the occupants will produce during the day. Transportation Engineers look at different sites to determine average trips produced. The report is then used to look at any impacts to see if any turn restrictions would be needed on the surrounding streets or any improvements in that area would lessen the impacts the development could have.

The group expressed concerns about the signs on the property to inform the public of the proposal keep breaking or being taken down. Group has asked staff if there was another way to keep the signs up but prevent them from being damaged or access to be taken down. The applicant indicated that they need some help from the community to identify if people are maliciously removing the signs and that they would replace the missing signs. Staff suggested that the sign could be placed on



the inside of the fencing to help reduce theft and damage.

5. Next Steps

- Notes to be distributed from this meeting to the Committee
- There will be another formal submission from the consulting team for the required agencies to review and comment
- Neighbourhood meeting will be held on January 27th virtually
- Recommendation report from staff to follow

Meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.