



Notes

Main St/ Nottinghill Dr – Neighbourhood Meeting

March 24, 2021

Zoom

7:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Councillor Scott Hamilton, Ed Novoa, Amy Slack, Oliver Kopacynski, Shankar Thurairajah, Victor Labreche, Ingo Schnuelle, Mojdeh Balkhi, Danielle Ratford, Al Allendorf, Manahel Polis, Terry Stang, Josh Leiderman, Sydney Kay, Allison Williams

Staff: Malcolm Duncan, Deanne Friess, Michael Campos, Katelyn Clayton

Developer Representative: Robert Walters, Cait Brock, Shane Morgan, Arash Mirhoseini, Kevin Brousseau, Liam O'Toole

Regrets: Julia Innis, Kati Najeb, Jenny Tran, Arvinderjit Kaur, Maninderjit Singh, Jasmine Kalra, Guramandeep Singh, Kamsha Uthayasankar, Amy Resendes,

ITEMS

1. Introductions

Malcolm Duncan welcomed everyone to the meeting, presented ground rules and introduced the staff and the developer representatives. Councillor Hamilton welcomed everyone to the meeting as well.

2. Development Proposal

Using power point presentation, M. Duncan explained the Planning Framework. He then acknowledged the concerns from neighbours that have been raised so far at previous meetings:

- Density and massing: too many units, buildings are too high
- Traffic: significant traffic increase



- Parking: additional parking on adjacent residential streets
- Child Safety: young families in the neighbourhood, development would pose safety concerns for children playing in the street
- Shadow Impacts: towers cast large shadows
- Access to Parks: not enough greenspace/parks nearby
- Secondary Plan: should be completed, application premature
- Crime Rates: increased in areas around commercial units
- Public Notice: Sign not visible, information difficult to locate online
- Commercial Development: nearby commercial uses are sufficient, more commercial uses are already being contemplated for the north side of Main St
- Property Values: decrease as a result of this development
- Previous Subdivision Agreement: Conditions should be carried over
- Privacy: Potential overlook from this development
- Small Pond: animal habitat impacted by development

Using power point presentation, Robert Walters discussed the revised plans for this development proposal.

- Reduction in total height from 12 to 6 storeys
- Reduction in dwelling units from 367 to 214 units
- Reduction in height facing Sparrow Ave from 6 to 3 storeys
- Elimination of ground floor retail in building A (under review)
- Reduction in building coverage and increase in landscaped area
- 2 levels of underground parking reduced to 1 level
- 443 parking spaces to 208 parking spaces (based on Stantec's parking study)

R. Walters explained that this location warrants intensification because it is on the corner of two roads. This will allow an increase in housing choices within the neighbourhood. Shane Morgan discussed the design of the buildings. The portion of the building fronting Sparrow will be 3 storeys across from single detached residential units. There is a more active street scape. S. Morgan explained that they have reduced the shadows with the smaller buildings. There will be minor impacts throughout different times of the year.

3. Roundtable Discussion.

Ingo Schnuelle began the discussion with raising concerns about the parking being reduced. The parking per unit is low. Suggested to increase the parking to minimum 1 space per unit plus the visitor parking space. There will be issues with visitors and not enough parking. Danielle Ratford included that most of the residents in the area have a minimum of 2 cars and parking on the streets is already packed without these buildings and other future developments to come. Arash Mirhoseini briefed on how they reached the parking ratio of 0.7. from a study in 2016. The 25% is required for visitor parking and is on the higher end of visitor parking compared to other municipalities. A. Mirhoseini thanked the group for the comments and will be looking to provide enough parking to address the comments. Group members echoed these concerns from I. Schnuelle and added that the development should keep the second level of underground parking to accommodate the concerns around parking. R. Walters explained that they would have to look at the cost and economics around keeping the second level of parking as that would be a large cost. Councillor Hamilton also suggested that more parking in Cambridge the better as there are not many people who use the public transit in place, cycle or walk to their destination. I. Schnuelle included that the Region of Waterloo conducted a study on cycling and looked at Coronation Blvd and received extreme backlash from the City as it is not a favored activity.

Ed Novoa addressed the concerns regarding the traffic in the area. He explained that the area already has a lot of traffic generally around 4:30 p.m. and is backed up at the roundabout at Franklin Blvd and Main St. The traffic within the community will also increase with more density. With future developments also going in closely to this development, traffic will increase. Sydney Kay addressed her concerns regarding the traffic within this area and the main access point being Main St. Main St is a busy road already without all of these developments. S. Kay questioned whether a stop light would be installed to deal with the bottleneck of traffic. A. Mirhoseini explained that through the Traffic Impact Study that was done, it was determined that a stop sign is acceptable in the area based on the 2019 results with the higher density buildings. M. Duncan explained that Transportation comments regarding that study will be included in the recommendation report and City staff will work with the applicant to address issues.

Along with concerns for traffic, E. Novoa addressed the pedestrian traffic will also increase in the area with more density. With more pedestrians accessing the commercial spaces such as the South Cambridge Mall plaza, the current set up is not

safe enough for pedestrians. Possible bridges and flashing pedestrian lights will be needed in this area. Other group members agreed with this concern as there are already issues with crossing over Franklin Blvd to get to that plaza with less density. Councillor Hamilton agreed with the comments addressing the pedestrian concerns. He noted that as Franklin Blvd is a regional road it will be hard to get things approved. He stated that it would be good to know what Cambridge would be allowed to do there and if the region intensifies, what would future pedestrian crossing look like and sidewalks in the area.

D. Ratford expressed her concerns for wildlife and greenspace. There is a retention pond in the area that has wildlife coming to it every year creating its own ecosystem. It will be sad to see that disappear because of a development. In regards to the greenspace, Manahel Polis expressed that there is only 1 park in the area that is already crowded. If more families come into the area into these developments, that will increase an already crowded area. M. Duncan explained that we do not know the tenants that will be in this proposed development and that the city has amenity space requirements in regards to the zoning by-law. S. Morgan explained that there will be amenity spaces on site of this proposed development. Each building will have some rooftop amenities, main level amenities and personal balconies. Larger parkland facilities are out of their control but will be working with the city to contribute to that. R. Walters included that the comments back from the City's Parks Operations Division were that they asked for cash in lieu as there is not enough land to put a park in this area.

S. Kay expressed her concerns for the schools in the area. Moffat Creek Public School has limited enrollment due to the major traffic problems in that area. Chalmers Street Public School also has a lot of children enrolled there and is reaching capacity. If there are children living in this area in this new proposed development where would these children go to school. M. Duncan explained that the school board was circulated on this application and with part of this new development, there would be another public school constructed nearby.

Councillor Hamilton asked if there were any pictures to pin point material to see if it fits within the neighbourhood. He asked if there was any thought on the landscaping around the building and what that might look like. R. Walters explained that they have not looked at what the materials will be yet and those details will come in the site plan stage. S. Morgan explained that the goal is to make it as compatible as possible and want to make it work with the rest of the neighbourhood. I. Schnuelle asked how this



property would be managed over the years and who will manage the garbage pickup. M. Duncan explained that site plan approval would look at waste collection. It would be private garbage collection and would possibly be internal in the building. This would be managed through the condo corporation. The garbage storage would be finalized at the site plan stage.

E. Novoa asked if there was a centralizes place for these studies and resources to better understand the application and to better educate the neighbourhood. M. Duncan explained that the public can access the data and documents on the city's website at <https://www.cambridge.ca/en/build-invest-grow/current-development-applications.aspx>. The application will be updated once we receive the submission from the applicant.

4. Next Steps

M. Duncan 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
- Notice of Decision and Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) appeal period process

M. Duncan as well as Councillor Hamilton thanked everyone for their participation.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.