

Revised Agenda - Correspondence
Decision Report – 120 Huron Street Official Plan and Zoning By-Law
Amendment– File OZS20-005 – 2021-09

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

My comments regarding 120 Huron Street are as follows:

History:

November 10, 2017, 700 trees were removed with no development application proposed or included, but a promise that when a future application is brought forward, there will be an opportunity for public input.

2018 (January?) original proposal that was brought forward by Momentum Developments included 96 stacked and clustered townhouses and an 87 unit condo in the former Northern Rubber plant. There was concern by residents at this initial meeting about density and the traffic it would bring. A revised plan came back to council and was supported by council that density would be reduced to 59 clustered townhouses and that 87 apartments would be housed in the heritage building known as Northern Rubber. This would become known as the Alice Block.

This revised the total from 183 units to 146 units.

"NOW the current application for 120 Huron Street wants to add a fifth floor and THIRTY more units which adds up to 176 units only 7 shy from what wasn't supported by council back in 2018.

Shortly after Council approved this project, a severance was requested and granted to allow for the splitting of the project, and the development of two separate projects, meaning that plans would and could change after neighborhood input and time.

September 30, 2019 The city provides grants to preserve the heritage aspects of 120 Huron Street, cost \$1.7 million, yet the building has become neglected (broken windows etc.) and gates left open and therefore building not secured. Concerns were raised by the community . Finally, in January 2021, the windows were boarded up and the gate onto the site locked to ensure the protection of a soon to be Heritage Designated Structure.

September 2020, Zoning and O.P. amendments to add a fifth floor for 30 new supportive units in the Ward, at rents no more than \$915 per month.

November 3, 2020, Revised planning application by GSP group with key changes including : A larger 5th storey footprint, larger individual units, modified affordable housing plan, that will no longer be supportive housing units.

Increase in Floor Space index and reduction of required common amenity area.

"It must be remembered that affordable housing can be proposed but cannot be zoned, so there is no guarantee that they will end up being affordable housing"

The whole buy in from residents for supporting the addition of a fifth floor was for the idea of providing supportive housing at the expense of the integrity of the Heritage Building and the impact of increase shadowing and impact on adjacent homes on Alice Street.

Today, I also am very discouraged by the lack of thought that went into Attachment-8: Proposed building elevations as it shows the building in total isolation from how it will interact with the built form around it. This is not a very good way to show if it's impact will compliment or negatively impact the existing neighbourhood and is not very professional.

I find it very frustrating when sites such as 120-122 Huron Street go through a public process, with neighborhood input to allow for Zone Changes, Official Plan changes, brownfield remediation, grants, a site plan gets approved and then the developer sells it off into segments and then new developers come in and try and change the plans.

This is exactly why 120-122 Huron Street should have been approved as a site specific zone, so that neighbours would know what they are getting after all their effort and participation, it starts to get muddy and confusing to residents as to what is really happening. The process becomes a piece meal development with the potential of changing so much from what was promised. Even at tonight's meeting the plan presented since the September 14, 2020 public meeting has changed yet once again. The proposed fifth floor footprint is bigger and now there is no supportive housing (\$915 per month). The whole reason behind the proposal for the fifth floor was for a supportive housing strategy. Now the applicant is passing on that idea, increasing the footage of the fifth floor and proposing "affordable housing" which cannot be guaranteed.

It just seems like the plans keep changing and each time the plan changes, the impact of the site gets greater.

Saying this I think that affordable units on this site is a great idea especially for families when a school is mere a hop, skip and jump away, but the City cannot zone "affordable housing". Affordable housing can only be realized by the City and the County putting more money into affordable housing units. The fifth floor should not be added as there is no guarantee that it will provide affordable housing.

The addition of a fifth storey and now a proposed expanded fifth storey will have negative impacts on adjacent Alice Street residents as well as pedestrians and cyclists. The building is already very close to the road and already creates shadows on Alice Street.

Concerns that arise from the latest increase in density is above all traffic impact and on street parking issues. These concerns were not addressed in the initial development and now the applicant wants to add 30 more units, again only 7 units shy of what wasn't supported by the initial 2018 proposal. The required parking spaces for this would now be 152 spots, but only 114 will be provided.

The Ward has been seeing the highest rate of development in such a small area, these include the Danby site (Neeve and Wellington apartment buildings), York Townies, York and Wyndham Townies, Mill Lofts, Metal Works, Biltmore ,122 and 120 Huron Street, and the now planned development on Duke street and 13 storey Condo on Wyndham St. S. ALL OF THESE developments have incrementally added more traffic and parking issues in our neighborhood and yet nothing is being done to address these issues. Our streets were designed pre car culture and were NEVER designed to deal with these issues.

I don't care what the Traffic "experts" are saying about how this won't have an effect and that roads should be able to handle the extra traffic, it is just not true from a "livable neighbourhood perspective". The St. Patrick's Ward 1 Community Plan Traffic Impact Assessment from Paradigm approved in 2003 stated that "as continued density occurs in St. Patrick's Ward the NEED for traffic mitigation strategies will be needed for the livability of the community." There is a plan to address this increase density, but nothing has been initiated as a long-term solution.

The other issue is parking, the neighborhood already has on street parking issues, so reducing parking requirements will cause more problems for on street parking.

To sum up my rant, I wish to see the removal of the proposed fifth storey and the Heritage building developed as an 87 unit condo/apartment as originally planned and approved.

I also wish to have the incremental increase density in the Ward traffic and parking issues addressed.

I wish to be notified by mail of the decision regarding this application.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Pagnan.

Proud resident of the Ward since 1984.