



PUBLIC MEETING-2021-0003

March 22, 2021

16 & 18 Mill Street (Georgetown)

Minutes of the Public Meeting held on Monday, March 22, 2021, 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, Town of Halton Hills and Via Zoom.

Mayor R. Bonnette chaired the meeting.

Mayor R. Bonnette advised the following:

The purpose of this Public Meeting is to inform and provide the public with the opportunity to ask questions or to express views with respect to the development proposal. The Councillors are here to observe and listen to your comments; however, they will not make any decisions this evening.

As the Chair, I am informing you that when Council makes a decision, should you disagree with that decision, the Planning Act provides you with an opportunity to appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal for a hearing, subject to Tribunal validation of your appeal. Please note that if a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or written submissions to the Town of Halton Hills before the decision is made, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Town of Halton Hills to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. In addition, if a person or public body does not make oral submission at a public meeting, or make written comments to the Town of Halton Hills before the decision is made the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so. You may wish to talk to Planning staff regarding further information on the appeal process.

The Planning Act requires that at least one Public Meeting be held for each development proposal and that every person in attendance shall be given an opportunity to make representations in respect of the proposal.

The format of this Public Meeting is as follows:

- The Town will generally explain the purpose and details of the applications;
- Next, the applicant will present any further relevant information, following which the public can obtain clarification, ask questions and express their views on the proposal.

The applicant and staff will attempt to answer questions or respond to concerns this evening. If this is not possible, the applicant and/or staff will follow up and obtain this information.

Responses will be provided when this matter is brought forward and evaluated by Council at a later date.

SPECIFIC PROPOSAL

This Public Meeting involves applications by AGK Multi-Res GP Ltd., to amend the Town of Halton Hills Official Plan and Zoning By-law 2010-0050, to permit the development of a 6-storey, 52-unit residential apartment building at 16 and 18 Mill Street (Georgetown).

TOWN'S OPPORTUNITY

The Chair called upon the Town's representative, John McMulkin, Planner to come forward to explain the proposal.

The purpose of the public meeting is to provide a summary of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by AGK Multi-Res GP Ltd. for the lands located at 16 and 18 Mill Street in Georgetown. This Public Meeting is being held in accordance with the Mayor's Task Force on Public Engagement and the Public Engagement Charter.

The subject lands are located on the north side of Mill Street, east of Dayfoot Drive and in the urban area of Georgetown. The lands have an approximate area of 0.23 hectares (0.56 acres) and contain approximately 40 metres (132 feet) of frontage on Mill Street. The lands are occupied by a two-storey, 9-unit townhouse building (16 Mill Street) and a two-storey triplex (18 Mill Street), which are intended to be demolished in order to accommodate the proposed apartment building.

With regards to the neighbourhood context, surrounding land uses to the subject lands include: to the North a large parcel containing a single detached home (which is designated for future Medium/High Density Residential development in the Georgetown GO Station Area Secondary Plan) and CN railway tracks, to the East Town open space/natural heritage lands containing Silver Creek and single detached residential dwellings further east, to the South Kiyo's Car Service building and single detached residential dwellings and to the West Single detached residential dwellings and the 42 Mill Street redevelopment site (6-storey condominium apartment building currently under construction).

The applications seek to obtain the necessary land use approvals to allow for the development of a 6-storey, 52-unit residential apartment building including 2 levels of underground parking and increased greenspace. The proposed number of units is 52 residential units consisting of 26 one bedroom units and 26 two bedroom units. The size of the one bedroom units will be 612 to 700 square feet and the size of the two bedroom units will be 647 to 865 square feet.

The proposed height of the building is 6 storeys (22.5 metres to stairwell roofs), there will be indoor amenity space of 770 square feet within the first story. The entrance to the apartment building will be from Mill Street and there will be 70 parking spaces (1.34 spaces per unit) consisting of 18 surface spaces, made up of 13 visitor spaces and 5 resident spaces (including 3 barrier-free spaces) and 52 underground resident spaces (including 2 barrier-free spaces). There will be 2 spaces for bicycle parking and 1 space for loading. Should the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications be approved, the apartment building would require the submission of a Site Plan Application for approval. The Site Plan also illustrates 5 metres of road

widening along Mill Street, which would be required to be dedicated to the Town as part of any future Site Plan Approval for the property.

The site is designated Medium Density Residential Area and Greenlands in the Official Plan's Georgetown GO Station Area Secondary Plan and is located within the Plan's Mill Street Corridor Precinct. The Medium Density Residential Area designation allows low-rise apartment dwellings to a maximum height of 4 storeys and density range of 21 to 50 units per net residential hectare. The Greenlands designation permits conservation uses, passive recreational uses, and other similar uses. Refinements to the boundaries of this designation to facilitate development are only permitted through the approval of an Environmental Impact Assessment by the Region of Halton, as required by the Regional Official Plan. The Official Plan Amendment seeks to redesignate the site from Medium Density Residential Area and Greenlands to a site-specific High Density Residential/Community Facility Area designation in order to permit a 52-unit apartment dwelling at a height of 6 storeys.

The change from a Medium Density to High Density Residential/Community Facility Area designation would also require the density measure to transition from a maximum unit per net residential hectare calculation to Floor Space Index (FSI). The site-specific designation proposes an increase in maximum permitted FSI for the High Density Residential/Community Facility Area from 2.0 times the area of the lot to 2.11.

The Town's Official Plan states that the conversion of rental housing to condominium or other forms of tenure, or the demolition of rental housing, shall only be considered by Council if a minimum threshold rental housing vacancy rate of 3% is maintained in the Town. This policy is applicable as the 9-unit townhouse and triplex buildings currently located on-site are all rental units and the Town of Halton Hills currently has a rental housing vacancy rate of 1.9%. Any demolition of rental housing must be replaced through redevelopment in accordance with this policy.

With respect to the Greenlands designation, Halton Region staff conducted a review of the environmental features on and adjacent to the site (i.e. hedgerow) and determined that it does not meet the definition of a significant woodland contained within the Regional Official Plan. As such, Halton Region informed the Applicant prior to submission of the applications that an Environmental Impact Assessment would not be required to support redesignating this small portion to allow development to occur.

Credit Valley Conservation staff conducted a similar review and determined that any hazard lands associated with Silver Creek are located entirely off-site, with only small parts of the buffer extending to the property itself, which wouldn't prevent the redesignation of the Greenlands designation.

The site is zoned Low Density Residential One (LDR1-2) and Environmental Protection One (EP1) under Zoning By-law 2010-0050. The LDR1 zone only permits single detached dwellings. The EP1 zone does not permit any development. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment seeks to rezone the site from Low Density Residential One (LDR1-2) and Environmental Protection One (EP1) to a site-specific High Density Residential (HDR) zone in order to accommodate the proposed development.

The requested site-specific zoning provisions include: limiting the permitted uses to apartment dwellings, limiting the maximum building height to 22.5 m, changing the density measure from units/net residential hectare to Floor Space Index (FSI) consistent with the proposed Official Plan Amendment, reducing the minimum front yard setback from 4.5 m to 3.0 m, interior (east) side yard setback from 7.5 m to 3.5 m, and rear yard setback from 7.5 m to 6.0 m, removing the 45-

degree angular plane requirement for the rear yard setback and interior (east) side yard setback; and reducing the minimum parking requirement from 1.75 to a consolidated minimum of 1.34 spaces per unit.

The submission materials were circulated to internal departments and external agencies for review and comment. No objections were raised; however, some issues have been identified which include the following:

Planning

- To determine conformity with the Town's Official Plan regarding the rental housing vacancy rate, Planning staff requires confirmation from the Applicant of the intended tenure of the proposed apartment units (whether they will be all rental or a mix of rental and condominium units).
- Further information is also requested by Planning and Halton Region staff in the next submission regarding how the existing tenants within the townhouse and triplex buildings will be relocated once the buildings are demolished, and whether it is intended that they will be accommodated in the new building once it has been constructed.
- The submitted Shadow Study needs to be updated to show shadowing for additional hours and the solstices to fully understand impacts.
- In addition, Planning staff advised the Applicant that the submitted Draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment documents need to be revised as they suggest amending certain policies and provisions that do not apply to the proposal, or are inaccurate.
- For example, the minimum required 5 metre setback to the Greenlands designation only applies in the Hamlet of Glen Williams Secondary Plan (not the Georgetown GO Station Area Secondary Plan), loading spaces are not required to be provided for residential buildings (so a proposed reduction from 3 to 1 is not required), the requested site-specific parking ratio would be 1.34 spaces per unit (not 1.32 spaces per unit), and the maximum height permitted within the High Density Residential zone is 25 metres (not 20 metres), so a site-specific exception to this zone is not required to increase the proposed height to 22.5 metres.

Recreation & Parks

- Additional outdoor amenity space may be required through the Site Plan application process, which is to be confirmed by the Applicant.

Transportation

- The stated future development traffic volumes in the Traffic Impact Study appear to be under-projected and need to be updated.

Staff has identified concerns with the parking assessment provided within the Traffic Impact Study and noted that a scope of work for an updated parking assessment is required for review

prior to providing any comment regarding the appropriateness of the proposed parking reduction for the site.

Credit Valley Conservation

- The submitted environmental information does not appear to satisfactorily address Species at Risk that may exist in or adjacent to Silver Creek (Redside Dace and bats) and clearance from the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks from a Species at Risk perspective is requested as part of the second submission.

Halton Region

- Confirmation is required that the 2 levels of underground parking can be accommodated at a depth that remains above the water table. If dewatering is expected to be required, this information needs to be provided to Halton Region for review and to ensure conformity with the policies of the CTC Source (Water) Protection Plan.
- In addition, as part of the second submission the submitted Phase I Environmental Site Assessment needs to be updated to Ontario Regulation 153/04 standards and to address the closed landfill on the adjacent Town property, and the Functional Servicing Report needs to be updated to address watermain/wastewater analysis.

Nine letters of objection have been received from residents in the neighbourhood, including one letter from the Silver Creek Neighbourhood Association. The identified concerns relate to:

- Increased traffic and proposed reduced parking requirements;
- Building height and lot coverage;
- Setting a precedent for future development that does not conform to the policies of the Secondary Plan (e.g. High Density vs. Medium Density) and does not maintain the low density character of the neighbourhood;
- Reduced yard and natural heritage area setbacks;
- Impacts to the Silver Creek subwatershed and its species at risk;
- Source water protection impacts (groundwater recharge);
- Environmental Site Assessment not considering impacts from the closed landfill on the adjacent Town property; and,
- Potential loss of affordable housing.

Following the Public Meeting, Planning staff will await a second submission from the Applicant for review that addresses the comments and issues identified by Town department and external agency staff. Staff will also await and work through comments provided from the public, which is encouraged to visit the project webpage on the Town's website for status updates and to obtain additional background information regarding the proposal, such as submitted drawings, reports and other documentation: <https://www.haltonhills.ca/en/business/16-and-18-mill-street-georgetown-redevelopment-proposal.aspx>

The deadline to provide public comments for staff consideration in the final Recommendation Report is April 23rd, 2021. Lastly, staff will then summarize and address all comments in the final Recommendation Report to Council regarding the disposition of this matter.

APPLICANT'S OPPORTUNITY

The Chair called upon the applicant Terrance Glover and Jacob Dickie of Urban Mind to provide further information and details on the proposal.

J. Dickie noted that the property is on the north side of Mill Street, abutting the Silver Creek natural heritage lands. The lands are occupied by a 2-storey, 9-unit townhouse building (16 Mill Street), a two-storey triplex (18 Mill Street), and an accessory structure, which are all intended to be demolished for the proposed residential development.

The surrounding area, the property is located within is a comfortable walking distance from the Downtown Area and the Georgetown GO Station. According to the provincial policy framework the property is located in a major transit station area, which is intended to be supported by higher density housing options, to optimize transit users that will support the viability of the regional transit network.

The proposed development is also compatible in scale with other redevelopment projects occurring along the Mill Street corridor, such as an active application for a 14-unit townhouse building and a 116-unit condominium building.

J. Dickie noted that they have received comments from the Town, the Region and the Conservation Authority with respect to the Site Plan that they originally submitted for the property and they are currently working on their submission to address those comments.

The proposed development will have a height of 6 storeys, it will provide for 52 residential apartment units, and the building will be situated on the east side of the property, away from the abutting residential uses. It will feature enhanced landscaping along Mill Street to buffer the surface parking area and will have two levels of underground parking incorporated into the building design.

The proposed developments positive attributes; new rental housing options, high quality architecture, improved streetscape presence, enhanced landscaping along Mill Street, designed with CPTED principles to promote community safety and is a transit oriented development.

Building design meets angular plane provisions to existing residential development and a shadow impact study was conducted that confirms that no shadow is cast on abutting residential properties at any time of the year

J. Dickie provided a brief overview of the applications planning approvals as previously stated by J. McMulkin in his presentation.

T. Glover noted that the development is intended to be fully rental accommodation, with the intention being to provide people living on the site the opportunity to relocate within the new building once it is built.

He noted that the current rental housing vacancy rate in Halton Hills is 1.9% and ideally the vacancy rate should be 3%, which shows that Halton Hills is in dire need of rental housing. This development will provide 52 units with diversified sizing to accommodate both singles and small families.

They are proposing a high-density development with only 6 storeys (as opposed to the 8 storeys maximum permitted for high density) as it is more appropriate for the neighbourhood and consistent with the other development on Mill Street. It makes sense to have density near the GO Station as per the requirements of the Provincial Growth Plan.

Some comments that have been received so far are with respect to traffic and they will be looking at the traffic study again. The reduced parking is due to the nature of the development. As a rental property located in close proximity to the downtown area and GO station, the anticipated renters being potentially seniors, residents will likely only need one car per unit.

He noted that there are no issues with the shadowing but they still have to review their background studies and look at them not in the context of what is currently there but what is proposed.

PUBLIC'S OPPORTUNITY

The Chair asked if there were any persons online that have questions, require further clarification or information or wish to present their views on the proposal to come forward.

The following persons provided comments and asked questions:

Megan Suddergaard, 17 Queen Street

Part of the Silver Creek Neighbourhood Association, a group of concerned citizens in the neighbourhood.

Asked if her letter and drone photos were circulated to staff and Councillors.

J. McMulkin confirmed that they were.

She noted that she felt that the drone photos were important to show how significant an impact that the 22.5 metre height of the proposed development will be on the neighbourhood. The photos show that a huge portion of the low-density neighbourhood's, front yards and back yards are visible.

The current Secondary Plan for the Mill Street area requires that designs minimize height and massing impacts on existing adjacent low-density areas. By doubling the permitted building height this application will have permanent negative impacts to the area in her view.

It appears that there is setback at McNabb and Dayfoot but there is no consideration for the rest of the neighbourhood and the Mill Street frontage goes 7 storeys straight up if the roof top access

were to be included.

How does this application minimize the height and massing impact to the neighbourhood?

T. Glover responded that the development is on the other side of the street from the low density housing in the neighbourhood and on the same side of the street as an existing 6-storey development. Behind the proposed development are other lands that will likely be developed with another 6-storey building. It is in context with what is happening around it. The proposed building will be narrow side towards the low-density residential neighbourhood to the south. They have minimized the types of windows and features that would face that area for privacy, granted there are some balconies. They were asked to bring the building closer to the street for more presence.

T. Glover stated that the residential units to the west may be developed in the future. The plan for the municipality is that the area to the north will be developed in the future for higher density.

M. Suddergaard noted that in the current official plan there are several built forms already permitted such as triplex, street towns, towns and low-rise apartments; why were these forms not considered or why would they not work on this site? Why turn to amendments?

T. Glover responded that they did look at these however they are a waste of land and may be an underdeveloped use of the lands. In their discussions with the Town and the Region the lack of rental units in Halton Hills was brought to their attention. Given the proximity of the site to the GO station, not optimizing the use of lands would be a wasted opportunity.

M. Suddergaard asked why a four-storey building wouldn't work on this property.

T. Glover responded that a four-storey building is an as-of-right permission and there is a 6-storey building being built just down the road. It seems it would be an underutilization of the property and does not give justice to the GO Station proximity, as well as the fact that there is better opportunity to provide rental units at 6 storeys as opposed to 4 storeys. The Provincial Growth Plan says that we have to maximize the greatest benefit from the property.

M. Suddergaard noted that as the lands are already designated medium density that the development should be assessed with that in mind.

M. Suddergaard stated that in terms of precedent that she and her family are concerned about setting the right tone for future redevelopment; they support redevelopment and recognize that they are in an area of growth. She stated that the heights and forms currently permitted in the official plan and secondary plan protect the existing stable low-rise development in the neighbourhood. They are worried about developers taking advantage of the neighbourhood if the official plan cannot protect us.

Is it possible for staff and council to take similar measures as they did with the interim control by-law that was passed to protect against monster homes, for the people of this neighbourhood to save our neighbourhood and protect against overbuilding on these sites?

J. McMulkin responded that each application is evaluated individually on its own merits based on the appropriateness of its own site and the surrounding context. With respect to setting a

precedent, each application is unique and evaluated individually on its own merits.

The application is evaluated based on the policy framework that is in place when the application is filed. An interim control by-law can be passed by Council to prevent development at any point, however, that would be up to Council to initiate.

J. Markowiak, Director of Development Review responded that the interim control by-law that was adopted for the mature neighbourhood area applied to lands in this area. For interim control by-laws that have been adopted for a specific geographic area, you cannot adopt another one for another three year period of time. Staff would have to see when that interim control by-law expired to determine when another interim control by-law can be used for this area; he did not believe that this mechanism is available in the immediate time frame. As this is an active application filed before an interim by-law has been passed, it would not prevent staff from evaluating this proposal.

He also noted that towards the end of this year the Town has identified in its Capital Budget to undertake an update to the GO Station Secondary Plan. This will give residents the opportunity to provide further feedback in terms of the direction for the planning of this community.

M. Suddergaard stated that they know that there is a proposed TSA transit plan for this area and it appears that these requests to move from medium to high density are a part of that. She noted that this regional transit plan needs to be considered differently in Georgetown and Acton as these transit hubs exist in low density residential stable mature neighbourhoods, as opposed to in Milton, Oakville and Burlington where it is commercial or employment lands. We need to consider that when we are considering the TSA.

She noted that this is an opportunity to intensify appropriately keeping with the nature of the neighbourhood and in keeping with the official and secondary plans. She urged Town staff and Town Council to reject the development application and reject the official plan amendments and that the developer resubmit an application that fits within the official and secondary plans by providing a built form consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Susan Robertson, 17 McNabb Street

S. Robertson asked of J. McMulkin why there is a 5 metre increase to the width of Mill Street being provided.

J. McMulkin responded that Mill Street is identified as a local road in the Official Plan which requires a 20 metre wide road allowance. Currently the road allowance width along Mill Street is 10 metres; it is based on an old subdivision from the 1800s and they did not have cars back then. To get the 20 metre full width in accordance with the Town's Official Plan we request as part of any development application that they dedicate 5 metres to the Town and hope that eventually there will be some development on the south side so that we can get the other 5 metres on the south side to eventually get to the full 20 metre road allowance.

S. Robertson provided a context comparison to 42 Mill Street, the Amico development as there seems to be a justification based on adjacency to this development. This is not a good planning

justification. 42 Mill Street is adjacent to a Regional Road and at a major intersection, so it is inappropriate to compare the two developments in that 16 and 18 Mill Street are further into the low-density residential interior. The site is a lot more constrained, is located further into the neighbourhood and is incompatible with the Silver Creek Valley.

She is concerned about losing 14 feet of the greenspace buffer as well as the hedgerow. She stated that her concerns are with respect to the Silver Creek Subwatershed, which is already probably the most constrained portion of the Silver Creek. She noted there already exists issues for the flora and fauna and species at risk in this area and that this development will further impact this area. S. Robertson explained the potential environmental impacts providing examples from her professional experience. S. Robertson stated that it is contextually inappropriate and overmassing for the site.

How is this proposal modest in nature? How are you prepared to address impacts to species at risk?

T. Glover responded that in terms of species at risk, habitats and Silver Creek they have met with the Conservation Authority and the Region of Halton and there are no concerns. They are building hard surface on hard surface. In terms of digging down into the landfill they still have to do studies to prove that they can do this; if the studies come back and are not supportive then they obviously have a concern in terms of their development.

In terms of modesty they know that 8 storeys is not appropriate but in terms of what will likely be built behind this development and what is going to happen beside this development and in proximity of this development they feel it is modest for what they are proposing.

S. Robertson stated that she has concerns with respect to all of the cars that this proposed development will bring into the interior of the low density established neighbourhood, as well as it being so close to the fork in the road and within the neighbourhood's very unusual road pattern. How can we be sure that this will be a safe pedestrian-oriented neighbourhood as outlined in the secondary plan policies with the scale and density of the development proposed.

T. Glover responded that they will be revising their traffic study as per the Town's comments and will address that issue.

S. Robertson stated that this proposed development is overmassing of the site and is not contextually appropriate for the Silver Creek or the neighbourhood.

Paul and Teresa Kovacs, 15 Queen Street

P. Kovacs stated that this part of the Silver Creek neighbourhood will transition from low density to medium density as per the Town's official plan and they look forward to proposals from developers to realize this vision while retaining the character of their neighbourhood. This proposal fails to do that. This proposal is 4 times larger than what is permitted in the official plan and it should be rejected. He noted that they feel that if this proposal is approved that both sides of Mill Street will be developed as high density.

P. Kovacs noted that as per J. McMulkin's report there is no direction within the GO Station

Secondary Plan with respect to how to address proposals that request moving from medium density to high density. Town Council's approved policy direction does not contemplate these applications so this proposal at 16 and 18 Mill Street should be rejected.

T. Kovacs asked for clarification with respect to designations and the developers request to be designated High Density/Community Facility rather than High Density Residential.

J. McMulkin responded that the request for that designation was proposed to be consistent with the designation of the Amico development at 42 Mill Street. The Community Facility part of the designation would allow for other uses on the property, such as retirement homes, nursing homes and small-scale commercial uses, however those uses are not being proposed. High Density Residential could also be an appropriate designation for this site as well.

T. Kovacs asked about the impact of transitioning the calculation of density from units per hectare to floor space index?

J. McMulkin responded that the development represents approximately 250 units per hectare.

T. Kovacs requested clarification on FSI.

J. McMulkin responded that Floor Space Index (FSI) represents if you add up all the floor areas (add all of the areas on all of the floors together) and then you do a calculation as to how it represents the actual lot area. For example; an FSI of 2 would be 2 times the lot area.

T. Kovacs asked when an application is considered and the approved FSI is 2.0, having asked for an increase in density that gave an increase to the FSI to go above the 5% threshold, is this an indication of overcrowding and that the site is bearing more than it should?

T. Glover responded that they had originally approached the Town with an 8-storey building and the Town had concerns with that and that it was overbuilding. He stated that Town staff had indicated that they wanted an FSI of 2.1. They designed the building to meet the expectations that were put forward to us. It is a bit over, but it is to the benefit of the municipality in terms of rental units.

J. Markowiak clarified that Town staff had suggested to the applicant that an FSI way of measuring density would be more appropriate than measuring it by the number of units as it measures the massing of the structure rather than how that massing is divided. The statement that staff suggested an FSI of 2.1 is incorrect; staff simply suggested that an FSI measurement was a better way of evaluating what they were proposing to build.

T. Kovacs requested clarification on what index indicates overcrowding.

J. Markowiak responded the FSI index is helpful in assessing the built form impacts of what they are proposing. It is a way of measuring the box on the site, its shadowing impacts and how it would relate to the surrounding character of the existing neighbourhood. However we still have the opportunity to evaluate the density impacts by understanding what the net residential hectare measure would end up being.

T. Kovacs stated that 7-storeys right next to Mill Street is not attractive and that setbacks at Mill Street may frame the streetscape a little bit better. She stated that the proposed development will be looking into the liveable part of her house as evident from the drone pictures that were submitted. Why do you think this is appropriate?

T. Glover responded that the neighbourhood is transitioning, this property is transitioning from an existing medium density to high density and there is a large tree buffer between this site and the backyards of the existing residential properties.

He noted that Official Plans are reviewed every 5 years soon to be every 10 years but they are not static and must be changed as provincial policy changes etc.

T. Kovacs stated that the tree buffer is wonderful for 4 storeys but does not accommodate 6 storeys.

The development of Vision Georgetown will have traffic impacts to this area. Were these impacts considered in the traffic impact for this development?

J. McMulkin responded that the traffic impact study submitted needs to address the future development volume on this site as well as the Amico site next door. Traffic volumes are usually based on a 5 or 10 year horizon so it will depend on when those buildings will be built as to whether or not those buildings could be considered as part of this.

J. Jelsma stated that based on his understanding the Vision Georgetown lands are far enough away from this area that they would not be contemplated but he will clarify with traffic staff.

Chris and Cheryl Dickson, 60 King Street

Cheryl Dickson stated that she and her family are deeply concerned with the various developments that are happening in their mature neighbourhood.

Chris Dickson stated that he has concerns that there are several developments in Ward 3 that require site-specific zoning. This appears to be a piece meal approach that undermines the goals of the mature neighbourhood study, one development application at a time.

Chris Dickson noted that as the Town plan has already rezoned large portions of Ward 3 including the north precinct by the GO Station as high density residential, what is the long-term vision and goal for this area?

How does this FSI compare to places such as North York?

T. Glover responded that the provincial view is that we should not go into the agricultural area or the natural heritage area and we need to evaluate and make sure that we are not underutilizing our existing infrastructure. As a result we are seeing across the Greater Toronto Area that development is occurring to maximize density through intensification and redevelopment.

Cheryl Dickson noted that with a condo or residential apartment for families they deserve greenspace and amenities. Are there any plans to provide this within the proposed development?

T. Glover responded that they are proposing to have within the apartment building a common room with a kitchen in it for the residents of the building but no outdoor amenity area is proposed on site given the proximity of the building to Cedarvale Park, Dominion Gardens Park and other greenspace opportunities in the area.

Cheryl Dickson urged the Councillors and staff to have these developers build these buildings with green space and amenity space. To retain the character of the Town but also to be responsible to the residents of these new developments.

Tanya Achilles, 14 Queen Street

T. Achilles referred to the Official Plan and the reference to 'modest changes' beyond 42 Mill Street. She stated that we need to think about how we transition to the existing residential neighbourhood.

T. Achilles noted that there is an opportunity here for pedestrian walkability to the downtown core and that there are currently only two options in the area of Guelph Street or Mill Street for residents of Queen Street to get to the downtown core, by Guelph Street (that is very busy) or by Mill Street (which currently is much nicer). There is an opportunity to develop Mill Street with pedestrian traffic in mind to provide a safe route for the neighbourhood to access the downtown core.

T. Achilles noted concerns with traffic and parking in the area, noting that the proposed development does not appear to have sufficient parking and therefore there may be issues with people parking along Mill Street, thereby creating safety issues and congestion.

T. Glover responded that they are proposing 70 parking spaces. They may refine this at their final submission to address the concerns of staff, based on an updated parking study.

T. Achilles stated that this building is too large and too high for the surrounding neighbourhood.

Morgan Balletto, 16 Mill Street

M. Balletto asked where they plan to relocate the 30 people that live at 16 and 18 Mill Street. If the current residents are relocated when they come back, what kind of rental situation will they be looking at?

T. Glover responded that he did not have the answer, but he would get the owner to contact her directly.

J. McMulkin responded with some information from the Residential Tenancies Act and recommended that the current tenants refer to the Act and find out their rights.

Amil Delic, 9 McNabb Street

A. Delic asked what the cost of the two-bedroom rental units will be.

T. Glover stated that he did not know exactly but that it will likely be market rate at the time of tenancy.

A. Delic stated that there are a lot of questions with respect to execution. He stated that he is opposed to the 6 storeys for the proposed development.

J. McMulkin stated that his understanding based on his conversation with the owner is that current rate for rental units of this nature is \$1800 per month and they expect that the price will be \$1800-\$2000 per month when the apartments are built, however he will have to follow up with the owner to confirm.

FINAL COMMENT FROM STAFF

The Chair asked if there was any further information which Town Staff wished to provide prior to the conclusion of the meeting.

Staff had nothing further to add.

CONCLUSION OF MEETING

The Chair declared the Public Meeting closed. Council will take no action on this proposal tonight. Staff will be reporting at a later date with a recommendation for Council's consideration.

If you wish to receive further information regarding this proposal please contact the Planner, John McMulkin, following the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Rick Bonnette

MAYOR

Valerie Petryniak

TOWN CLERK