

Planning Advisory Committee

Monday, May 15, 2017

A meeting of the St. Marys Planning Advisory Committee was held on Monday, May 15, 2017, in the 2/3 Hall, Pyramid Recreation Centre, 317 James Street South, St. Marys, Ontario at 6:00 pm to discuss the following.

1.0 Call to order

2.0 Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

3.0 Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting of March 6, 2017

Motion:

Second:

4.0 Applications OP01-2016 and Z06-2016 to Amend the Town of St. Marys Official Plan and the Town of St. Marys Zoning By-law Z1-1997, as amended

Lots 14-17, inclusive w/s Wellington Street and Lots 13-17, inclusive e/s Water Street, Registered Plan No. 225 and Part of Lot 16, Concession 17, formerly in the Township of Blanshard, now in the Town of St. Marys, 151 Water Street North, St. Marys.

Applicant: 1934733 Ontario Inc.

5.0 Next Meeting

6.0 Adjournment

Present:

- Chairman Councillor Don Van Galen
- Councillor Jim Craigmile
- Member W. J. (Bill) Galloway
- Member Steve Cousins
- Member Marti Lindsay
- Mark Stone, Planner
- Susan Luckhardt, Secretary-Treasurer PAC
- Grant Brouwer, Director of Building and Development
- Jed Kelly, Director of Public Works
- Brent Kittmer, CAO-Clerk

Regrets:

- Member Dr. J. H. (Jim) Loucks

1.0 Call to Order

Chairman Don Van Galen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2.0 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest:

None.

3.0 Approval of Minutes dated March 6, 2017

Motion by Councillor Jim Craigmile, seconded by Member Steve Cousins that the Minutes dated March 6, 2017 be approved as circulated.

Carried.

4.0 Applications OP01-2016 and Z06-2016 to Amend the Town of St. Marys Official Plan and the Town of St. Marys Zoning By-law Z1-1997, as amended

Chairman Don Van Galen introduced the applications and outlined the procedure for the evening to include presentations from the Town Planner; the proponent, and members of the public with new information.

Chairman Don Van Galen invited Mark Stone, Town Planner, to provide overview comments regarding the applications.

Mark Stone provided an overview of the applications. The property is approximately 1.3 hectares in size and is a through lot with frontage onto Water Street North and Wellington Street North. The property is bounded by the Grand Trunk Trail to the north and single detached lots to the south. Residential uses also exist to the west and the east southeast.

The applicant is seeking to develop the subject property as an age-in-place residential development in the form of multi-storey apartment type buildings, constructed in two phases. At full build-out, the development will consist of 126 assisted living units and 76 senior's apartments with shared access to a dining hall and other ancillary uses such as a hair salon; games room and theatre room. Outdoor amenities include a patio to the north, resident gardens and a barbecue area. On-site parking for residents, visitors and staff will be provided via covered parking and surface parking areas.

Following the November 7, 2016 PAC review meeting for the applications, the applicant has submitted revised plans; a revised planning justification report and a shadow study.

Chairman Don Van Galen invited the proponent to present their information regarding the applications.

Jennifer Gaudet, Planner with Sierra Construction, and Cliff Zaluski of Sierra Construction were present for the meeting and provided a PowerPoint overview of the proposal for 151 Water Street North.

Jennifer Gaudet identified the orientation of the site as shown on an aerial view. The proponents are proposing to develop an age in place senior's residence to be constructed in two phases. This is not proposed to be a nursing home. Jennifer Gaudet outlined the project vision as an age in place development to allow couples to remain together as long as possible. The development will include indoor and outdoor amenities. Dwelling units will

range from 550 sq ft. to 1200 sq ft. It is proposed to lower and level the site through the use of retaining walls. Hardscaping and softscaping will be used to soften the development. Jennifer Gaudet outlined the concerns raised at the November 7, 2016 PAC meeting including height and shadowing impacts, proposed density, traffic impacts, safety, compatibility with the existing neighbourhood, operation of the facility, and also concern about setting precedent for developments in St. Marys. Jennifer Gaudet stated that the R6 zone, which is requested for the lands, will permit a senior's facility only and therefore the development cannot be converted in future to student housing or other uses without a further zoning by-law amendment. Jennifer Gaudet spoke to the current proposal compared to that presented by her group on November 7, 2016. Underground parking has been eliminated to become surface and covered parking at grade; shadowing has been addressed through decreased heights where required as per the shadow study; emergency access has been added at Wellington Street; the loading area has been removed from Water Street with the exception of waste pickup from a molok garbage system; balconies overlooking existing yards have been eliminated in the new design. Jennifer Gaudet provided elevations for the development which have been created through the use of a drone. The elevations provided include the outline of the former school to illustrate the proposal is in keeping with the height of the former school. Jennifer Gaudet spoke to the 45 degree plane which has been added to the drawings for information. Jennifer Gaudet provided reasons for choosing this site to develop as a senior's age in place facility: the lands are bordered by two streets and a ravine; proximity to downtown; public trails and parks; Wellington Street is identified to be widened in future; the parcel is an appropriate size for the use; the lands are on municipal services; the residential use proposed is most compatible with the existing residential neighbourhood versus a commercial/industrial neighbourhood; the development will bring residents close to the core area of the Town.

Jennifer Gaudet spoke to their market study by CBRE which identified that 65% of residents targeted would be from a 12 km radius from St. Marys; and also spoke to their demand supply ratio analysis which showed there is a need in this area for senior's housing. The proposed development will enable the elderly to remain in their home community.

Cliff Zaluski presented views of comparable projects constructed by Sierra Construction showing exterior elevations including finishes; interior views showing amenity areas; at grade covered parking areas with facades to blend with the rest of the building so as not to have the appearance of a parking garage.

Cliff Zaluski provided examples of low-rise and mid-rise residential developments in St. Marys and other communities to illustrate the mix of low-rise/mid-rise developments adjacent to single detached neighbourhoods.

At the invitation of Chairman Don Van Galen, Mark Stone spoke to his planning report. The proposed development supports the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Town's Official Plan by promoting development and land use patterns that efficiently use land, infrastructure and public service facilities. The proposed development supports the provision of a range and mix of housing types and densities to meet the needs of current and future residents. However there are concerns with height; compatibility; transition between lower density and higher density uses; urban design including consistency of

setbacks; shadowing; privacy impacts; increased traffic; and impacts on servicing and infrastructure including the ability of the Town's sanitary treatment and conveyance system, and water supply and distribution system to accommodate the proposed development.

Mark Stone commented on the Town's Official Plan in that it provides only one general residential designation policy for the entire Town. Some communities offer low density; medium density policies within the residential designation. When there is only one residential designation policy provided by an Official Plan, it is important there be policies to ensure compatibility between residential uses and densities. Mark Stone stated there is a need for some additional analysis to break down some of the Official Plan policies with respect to this proposal that would look at setbacks, massing and building types in the surrounding area of this site. If approved this development will provide the tallest building in the Town with the highest density for a site. Mark Stone cited the requirement for a balance between the need for senior's housing and the impact on the community.

Chairman Don Van Galen asked for comments from PAC members.

Member Councillor Jim Craigmile stated that height and density appear to be the greatest issues for the community and is unsure whether there is any compromise.

Jennifer Gaudet responded, stating that the proponent has significantly lowered the height of the development. The location of the five storey portion of the development has been altered to be along Wellington Street. To address density concerns, Jennifer Gaudet stated that this is a proposed senior's development and since over half of the units are assisted living it is not expected that there would be a lot of drivers and evening activity would also be minimal given the nature of the occupants; therefore, the density of this development would have less impact on the surrounding neighborhood than other development. Cliff Zaluski spoke to the height issue of the proposed five storeys stating that even though the southeast corner of the building is five storeys in height, the grade will allow the building to sit down about a storey, lessening the impact.

Member Councillor Jim Craigmile asked the proponents that if to move forward, are 200 units required within the development. Jennifer Gaudet responded, stating that 200 units are required to support the proposed amenities that make the project work.

Member Steve Cousins stated there is still an existing gap between the proposal and the concerns of the neighbourhood and asked if the new Town planner, Mark Stone, has met with the proponents. Mark Stone confirmed he has met with the proponents. Member Steve Cousins stated he concurs with the planner's opinion that there is still more work to be done to address concerns with the development.

Jennifer Gaudet spoke to densities and the differences between senior's housing versus other developments. Density is calculated based on the number of units per hectare. In the case of senior's housing, one unit typically has only one or two occupants; whereas in other households there may potentially be a family of four living in each unit. The number of people living in a senior's development is therefore much lower than what the density or number of units per hectare reflects.

Chairman Don Van Galen opened the discussion to the public; noting that the Town has received a number of letters and a petition from the public. Chairman Don Van Galen asked for new comments as those already given are on record.

Susan McMaster, 112 Church St N, provided comment as the spokesperson for the neighbourhood group. Susan McMaster stated that the proposed building face is 400 feet long, and at some points to the north along the trail is 6 storeys in height. The development does not show compatibility with the low density neighbourhood. The shadow study does not reflect the contours of the site or the massing of the buildings. The market study has been done by a real estate company to find out what will sell; not what is needed in St. Marys. The fire services of the local fire department cannot deal with a building of this height and a fire would threaten the neighbor's houses and lives. The connecting roadways and pedestrian ways are unclear. The residents living in the senior's development won't be able to walk downtown due to topography and would probably be bused out of town for shopping – not to our own core area. Susan McMaster questioned snow clearing with the proposed retaining walls and the site configuration. Susan McMaster stated that a traffic study should be provided, including emergency and delivery vehicles as well as private traffic movements.

Chairman Don Van Galen invited the proponents to respond. With regard to fire concerns, Jennifer Gaudet stated they have met with the Town Fire Chief and there were no concerns with fighting a fire in the proposed development. The building will be fully sprinklered. Regarding snow concerns, Cliff stated that it is proposed for snow to be stored on site and trucked off throughout the winter. With regard to shadowing; Jennifer Gaudet stated that the shadow study was done by their architect in conjunction with a topographical survey and 3-D modelling to provide an accurate study. Cliff Zaluski stated the current design presents no shadowing impacts on existing houses. Jennifer Gaudet stated that a connecting link to the trail will be created in conjunction with the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority. With regard to the marketing study, Cliff Zaluski stated that a marketing study is a needs study; CBRE, who completed their marketing study, is not connected to the real estate group and they have used this company before.

Chairman Don Van Galen asked Mark Stone to comment on the need for a traffic study and consultations with emergency services. Mark Stone commented on the 400 foot long wall on Wellington Street and pedestrian connections; covered parking and the loss of connections i.e. eyes on the street. If there is an urban design review – these items would be part of those discussions. With regard to a traffic study, Town staff has provided advice that a traffic study is not required at this time; however, a traffic study may be requested at the site plan stage. With regard to compatibility, Mark Stone stated this is something that needs to be looked at in more detail.

Henry Monteith, 111 Widder St E, provided comment regarding heritage preservation. Henry Monteith addressed the relevant paragraphs of Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) stating as follows “2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.”; and “2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be

conserved.” Henry Monteith stated his opinion that these two paragraphs have not been respected in any way by the current proposal at hand. Henry Monteith referenced the elevations drawing provided by the proponents and cited the dwelling at 131 Water Street North which is a heritage property adjacent to the site.

Henry Monteith referenced the Heritage Conservation Section of the St. Marys Official Plan as follows: “Council recognizes that many of the buildings and streetscapes in the Town of St. Marys are of special architectural and historic significance. As such they are considered to be worthy of conservation in order to maintain the attractive aesthetic and heritage character of the Town.” and “The objectives and policies that follow have been developed for the purpose of preserving and enhancing the Town’s cultural heritage resources for future generations while moving forward with initiatives to foster their long term economic well-being in a planned and managed manner.” With reference to the neighbourhood of the proposed development, Henry Monteith identified 25 properties being of architectural historical significance that appear on Schedule D of the Town Official Plan identifying heritage conservation sites. He stated the neighbourhood is of heritage status and is a cultural and heritage resource for the Town.

Henry Monteith provided a quote from the RFP for redevelopment of 121 Ontario Street, stating “It is expected that the proposed development of the site will be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood in its proposed style and density. The character of the neighbourhood is defined and influenced by its heritage homes and structures. As such, the proposed redevelopment of the site should fit with the heritage character of the existing neighbourhood.” Henry Monteith stated that he believes this paragraph is just as relevant for the North Ward neighbourhood surrounding the proposed development at 151 Water Street North.

At the request of Chairman Don Van Galen, Mark Stone responded, stating that in circumstances of heritage, it is usually with respect to heritage designated properties and heritage conservation districts that there is consideration given. He will meet with Town staff to discuss this matter in more detail.

Councillor Jim Craigmile asked Jennifer Gaudet to explain further about health and safety with respect to emergency services. Jennifer Gaudet stated that it is her understanding that an increased height aerial ladder is anticipated for the future; as is the purchase of firefighting equipment. Chairman Don Van Galen noted that there is a letter on file from the Fire Chief commenting on the ability to fight a fire in a development of this form.

Reg Quinton, 326 Widder St E, commented on density for the development and the connection to amenities provided.

Cliff Zaluski stated that rents for units in the proposed development would start around \$2,300 a month; and for the care component would price up to \$3,400-\$3,500 a month. The senior’s apartments would be modelled more toward local rental rates.

Nicole Taylor, 149 Wellington St N, commented on other developments by the proponents of this project, stating that the building in Brampton was constructed as affordable housing built with grant money; the Orangeville complex – the amenities areas were turned over to apartments to make more money.

Cliff Zaluski responded stating that the Brampton project was non-profit; he disagreed with her statement about the Orangeville project. The Orangeville project is exactly as it was built with full amenities.

Arlene Callendar asked the proponents to summarize the levels of proposed amenities.

Cliff spoke to the amenities including cards; shuffleboard; putting green; bowling alley; shuttle service; residents can schedule their time to use the shuttle. The proponents try to provide as many amenities as they can. They have activity directors on staff; shuttle bus outings throughout the area.

Teresa Wunder, 196 Widder Street, stated concern regarding the impact of the proposed building on sightlines and on the area in general.

Alexander Best, 92 Wellington St N, asked if this is the only scale of development that is economically feasible.

Cliff Zaluski responded stating that to make the plan work with the proposed amenities, the number of units in the development is critical.

Alexander Best asked how the density requirement has any connection to the height of the proposal. Jennifer Gaudet provided a response to his question.

Alexander Best asked PAC members if the need for senior's housing has been determined by a needs study; and if there has not been a needs study, why has Council not commissioned such a study. Chairman Don Van Galen confirmed that such a study has not been commissioned by Council.

In response to a question from Alexander Best, Mark Stone stated that he does have comments from emergency services in the report but there are a number of items to be cleared up, including meeting with the Fire Chief.

Alexander Best complimented the planning report.

Herman Veenandal, 146 Ontario St S, provided comment supporting a single storey development for senior's housing.

Julie Docker-Johnson, 226 Widder St E, spoke to the carnage of trees in the north end of Town and asked if trees would be removed by the proponents of this development to gain access to the trail.

Jennifer Gaudet stated that the access to the trail system would be along the street and there would not be a tunnel or bridge constructed that would require potential tree removal.

Alan Grogan, 189 Elizabeth St, asked if the plan is contingent upon the improvement of Wellington Street.

Jed Kelly, Director of Public Works, stated that Wellington Street is identified by the Town for full reconstruction in the next five years.

This concluded comments from the public.

MOTION:

Applications OP01-2016 and Z06-2016 to Amend the Town of St. Marys Official Plan and the Town of St. Marys Zoning By-law Z1-1997, as amended:

Motion by Member Steve Cousins

Seconded by Member Bill Galloway

That the Planning Advisory Committee for the Separated Town of St. Marys defer a recommendation on Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications OP01-2016 and Z06-2016 for 151 Water Street North, St. Marys to permit the applicant the opportunity to address remaining issues, compatibility and scale of development, and direct Staff to prepare a final recommendation Report to PAC based on the review of revisions to the Applications.

Carried.

Chairman Don Van Galen asked staff how soon PAC would have a response back regarding the applications. Mark Stone stated that he will be consulting with staff and the applicant to provide a response to PAC.

5.0 Next Meeting:

June 5, 2017 at 6:00 pm

6.0 Adjournment:

Motion by Member W. J. (Bill) Galloway, seconded by Member Steve Cousins that the meeting adjourn at 6:50 pm.

Councillor Don Van Galen
Chairman

Susan Luckhardt
Secretary-Treasurer

Copies to:

- PAC Members
- CAO-Clerk
- Council