



Notes

151 Main St – Neighbourhood Meeting

January 14, 2021

WebEx

8:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Councillor Jan Liggett, Melissa Campion, Nadia Koltun, Colette DeSousa, Kristen Barisdale, Kim Archer, Dylan Groves, Edward Brown, Maureen Pitterman, Jan Elder, Dan Walsh, Sandy Elliott-Tulloch, Paul Ashenhurst,

Staff: Elaine Brunn Shaw – Chief Planner, Colin Westerhof – Planning Technician, Jason Leach – Senior Transportation Engineering Technologist, Katelyn Clayton – Administrative Service Representative

Applicant: John Spina

Developer Representatives: Lindsay Chen, Petrina Cheung

Regrets: Deanne Friess – Manager of Development Planning, Adam Ripper – Project Engineer, Nelly Faria, Donald Bowman, Joey Salvador, Anne MacGregor

ITEMS

1. Introductions

Councillor Liggett welcomed everyone and advised she will be chair the meeting. Colin Westerhof introduced all the staff members present in the meeting. He then explained the rules and procedures for the virtual environment.

2. Development Proposal

Using power point presentation, C. Westerhof went over the proposal for 151 Main St. The applicant is proposing to construct a two storey addition to an existing four storey apartment building.

- The number units proposed to increase by 40 going from 78 units to 118.
- Density increasing from 250 residential units per hectare to 385 units per hectare
- No additional parking or amenity space is proposed. There are 67 spaces that

Staff

Without Prejudice



are proposed to be provided due to this site's location in downtown and close to the future LRT.

- Need relief of 50 parking spaces

C. Westerhof acknowledged the concerns from neighbours that have been raised so far:

- Building materials
- Servicing Capacity
 - Engineering staff has commented that there is enough storm sewer capacity and sanitary servicing capacity for the additional units
 - If this application is approved the developer will need to submit a Functional Service Briefing with the Site Plan application
- Building appearance being consistent with existing
- Engineering concerns
- Parking Survey
 - Parking Justification Report has been accepted by Transportation Engineering and has included recommendations for cash-in-lieu
- Amenity space requirements
- Affordable dwelling units
 - No affordable units proposed
- Cooperation between applicant and condo board

Parking/ Parking Survey

Transportation Engineering has accepted the Parking Justification Report and proposed recommendations. Their recommendations are as followed:

- Recommending the reduction of required parking based on the following Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures
 - Provide 36 secure bicycle parking spaces
 - Parking is to be rented 'unbundled' from units
 - Provide information regarding transit routes in the lobby
 - 19 parking spaces not exempt and must be paid for through cash-in-lieu
 - The money is to be used by the City to expand parking elsewhere

3. Roundtable Discussion

Councillor Liggett began the discussion asking for an explanation of what a Functional Service Briefing is. Elaine Brunn Shaw explained that it is a site specific

Without Prejudice



document that lays out the specific requirements for sanitary and stormwater. This has to be prepared by engineers. They look at the amount of capacity within the municipal road for sewer and how much the new development will add to that capacity. J. Leach explained that it shows there will be enough capacity for this development.

Group members spoke about their concerns regarding the parking for this development. Some concerns are that with more units and less parking this will cause a bigger issue of people parking on the street for longer periods of time. With people parking on the streets there will need to be more enforcement if people are parking past the allowed times. Concerns were also raised about how the traffic in the area would be impacted with more units. J. Leach explained that there are benefits to the unbundled parking. People looking at a unit would know if they had a parking spot or not. They would know ahead of time whether there is parking on the site or to look for an alternative which would be a parking pass through the City in one of the public lots. J. Leach also explained that the enforcement issues will need to be looked at and addressed. Group members further discussed the issue of people purchasing parking passes in City lots. Before the lockdown and pandemic, most of the City lots are full from businesses and people coming downtown to shop locally. Concerns that there won't be enough spots downtown if the lots are used for these developments. Group members expressed that there are other buildings currently being built and expressed concern that if tenants at those buildings need to also purchase parking passes there will not be enough for this development. J. Leach explained that the City's parking operations is showing that we have capacity in municipal lots for additional parking spaces for this location. In the future, as more developments come to the downtown, the cash-in-lieu will then be used to expand and build up the City's parking. Councillor Liggett asked what the parking availability is meaning how many spots have been taken and how many are available on a general basis. J. Leach explained that he will provide the information for the recommendation report with the 2019 information.

Group members asked Jason to provide more details regarding the parking permits on how much they cost and the lots most relevant to that location. J. Leach explained that all of that information is on the City's website. The lots that do have residential parking permits that are in that vicinity are Wellington South, Mill St lot and Water St S lot. People are permitted to park 24 hours with a permit and the rates can vary from \$70 - \$100 per month per permit depending on the lot. Councillor Liggett also addressed that since the LRT is coming, the parking requirements are not the same. She questioned whether it is a must that we look at LRT possibility for every current

Without Prejudice



project. Elaine Brunn Shaw explained that in order to increase the viability of the LRT there has to be transit ridership. We need to try and increase densities around the route to live and work in that area and reduce the reliance on cars so people rely on the LRT. Group members expressed that they understand the correlation with the LRT but expressed that the parking will remain an issue until the LRT. Group members also addressed the boards that will be placed in the buildings for transit maps, stops and information on transit in the City. There were questions regarding the timeliness and accuracy of the board and who would maintain it and at what cost. J. Leach explained that the specifics have not been worked out yet and that they would look at these logistics in the site plan process. Members not in support of the additional storeys based on the parking concerns.

In regards to the construction process, group members are concerned about the construction filth and not being able to enjoy their units and balconies. There are also concerns with how long people on the top floor of the building will need to leave their units for this construction. John Spina explained that the matters of construction will be addressed through the site plan process and once approval is in place, the noise and dust will be adhered to in regards to that by-law. Construction practices will be followed to minimize any negative impacts on the nearby residents.

Group members have asked to receive the site plan drawings and the site plan agreement before it is approved. E. Brunn Shaw had acknowledged that request and will be addressing that in the upcoming recommendation report for this development.

Councillor Liggett and E. Brunn Shaw thanked everyone for their time, participation and a successful meeting.

4. Next Steps

- Recommendation Report
 - o Scheduled for March 2021
 - o Report based on feedback from:
 - Public meeting
 - Councillor comments
 - Citizen Liaison Committee comments
 - Large neighbourhood meeting comments
 - Internal/external agency comments

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Without Prejudice