

COMMUNITY MEETING

Concerns about
114 Richmond Rd
Zoning Application

This is **YOUR** meeting. 😊

- ⦿ Thanks to everyone who showed up and signed up to speak Tuesday.
- ⦿ This meeting is to exchange ideas, FACTs and organize for Tuesday's meeting
- ⦿ While I would love to sit and complain about Ashcroft and politics, I would like to focus the meeting on the issues and preparing for Tuesday's meeting

Where are we at?

- Ashcroft Homes showed their initial plans in Mar/2010
- Heritage was sought in Mar and approved by PEC and Council in Apr/2010
- Ashcroft cut off talks with the community in March
- Ashcroft filed a zoning application in April/2010 seeking the site be zoned mixed use and upto 12 storeys
- Heritage designation and Zoning are completely different issues. The Heritage doesn't mean that our rights or community are protected
- Ashcroft is appealing the Heritage Designation
- A revised plan was filed(?) lowering the buildings on Richmond to 9 storey but also increasing buildings in the back to 9 storey
- Somehow the City Planners have seen it fit that this plan is justified. A report was released last week with their recommendations
- Zoning application will be heard on Tuesday Sep 26th.

What can we do?

- ⦿ Focus on the PEC Committee meeting and get as many people out to speak on Tuesday
- ⦿ If you don't speak on Tuesday, you cant speak at any other appeal
- ⦿ Get involved and educate your neighbour. It is surprising at how many people don't know what is happening and the future impact to Westboro/Wellington West and beyond
- ⦿ Support your Councillor Christine Leadman. She cant do it all by herself
- ⦿ Even if you don't know what to say, you can donate your 5 minutes to someone else!

What are the key issues?

- Density (over 600 units planned)
- Building heights (up to 9 storeys on both Richmond and Byron side)
- Traffic (over 900 cars between the 3 sites) + commercial traffic
- Impact to Byron Tramway (this is public park space)
- Respecting the Community Design Plan

DENSITY

- ⦿ This issue probably drives most of the other issues.
- ⦿ We support intensification but this is OVER-intensification
- ⦿ If we allowed 360 units, it would be a 10X or 15X increase over similar areas which have single family homes. Isn't that enough?

How Big is the Convent Property?



Could fit ~36 homes from
Leighton and Island Park

Could fit ~24 homes from
Island Park and Piccadilly

TRAFFIC

- ⦿ Island Park and Richmond Rd are broken. (Scott and Holland are not far behind)
- ⦿ Cut-through traffic down side streets and speeding (Road rage). Elementary schools. No sidewalks on street.
- ⦿ Side-streets are narrow in Winter
- ⦿ Over-intensification might lead to widening roads. (surrounding road ARE to have sufficient capacity...don't have it now)
- ⦿ Higher risk to commuter and recreational cyclists. (Accidents)
- ⦿ Putting cars ahead of bikes.
- ⦿ Question about bus support on Byron. No option for increased bus. **We are NOT close to transitway**
- ⦿ Access to Byron will add more traffic down side streets
- ⦿ We have no control over Quebec traffic. The bridge is getting busier
- ⦿ The problem is no longer just a “rush-hour” issue
- ⦿ The traffic study has flaws
- ⦿ They are using a BIG assumption of modal split. We do not have 40% of households on public transit
- ⦿ Ashcroft claims that they will offer bus passes! But for how long?

BUILDING HEIGHTS

- ⦿ CDP calls for 6 storey on Richmond
- ⦿ CDP calls for 4 storey on Byron (nothing higher than 3 today)
- ⦿ They have 5 and 9 storeys on Byron with no setback
- ⦿ This scale of height is not compatible with adjacent homes
- ⦿ Trying to justify their plans by pointing to their own Ashcroft buildings across the street
- ⦿ Trying to call this the “Eastern Gateway” to Westboro. Using it to justify higher building heights
- ⦿ No setbacks on 9 storey buildings on back half

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

- Why is the CDP being manipulated to fit this project?
- Attack the exceptions clause in the report (Community Use and Gateway concept). There is no commitment to community use of the Convent. This is not a Gateway...in the middle of a block
- We have a regulatory framework:
 - Official Plan – approved May 2003
 - Secondary Plan – approved July 2007
 - Convent Planning Guideline – issued Aug 2009
 - Zoning By-Law – approved June 2008
- We along with planners, architects, city staff are authors of the CDP.
- Making exceptions impacts every CDP in the City.
- Rod Lahey, Ted Fobert were part of this process
- No objection on this property
- Architects, Developers
- **Everyone needs to re-inforce the support for the CDP**

BYRON LINEAR PARK

- ⦿ Used by thousands of walkers, runners and cyclists every week
- ⦿ This is a PRIVATE driveway that they want
- ⦿ Not only are they giving up cash-in-lieu of public space, they are taking over public space
- ⦿ Limited parking is not the answer. If they only want 60 spots, put it on the other entrance
- ⦿ What about Service and Delivery vehicles. They aren't allowed on Byron or will that change?
- ⦿ A path to nowhere?
- ⦿ Safe path for kids
- ⦿ Should be supporting cycling and public transport. This is supporting the car.
- ⦿ Snow banks add problems for traffic (close to intersection)
- ⦿ Byron is already 300% over-capacity
- ⦿ Short sightlines from garage to street
- ⦿ No cut-through since 1925. Some have been closed.
- ⦿ We are aware there is a motion supported by Parks and Rec staff. We support it.

HERITAGE

- ⦿ Where are the Heritage Reports?
- ⦿ Why is this process being rushed?
- ⦿ Is this vote even legal?
- ⦿ How could all those Councillors vote for Heritage designation and then allow this abomination?

MY OTHER CONCERNS

- Alain Miguelez was the author of the original buyer's guideline (which was clear about building heights, etc)
- Not all staff seem to support the recommendations....where are their comments and why are we getting them last minute
- The Design Expert Panel seems to be carrying some weight but it is taken out of context (doesn't address density or height). Ashcroft is saying they are following recommendations but actually left in a building that was recommended to be removed
- All the issues mentioned are impacted by 101 and 111 Richmond Rd too. They should be considered in the total impact.

MY OTHER CONCERNS

- In an election year, I assume that some of the Councillors on the Committee have take money from Ashcroft, FoTenn, Lahey, their lawyers and lobbyists. Is this not a conflict of interest? What about Ethics?
- What level of political interference has taken place on this project. It certainly doesn't seem to stand on its own. Larry is coming down from the throne and dispensing favours

MY OTHER CONCERNS

- Ashcroft makes the claim that they had 5 community meetings.
- When in fact they walked away from the table in March when there was opposition to their plan
- *“We would have come to the community with the revised proposal, but we saw no point after we saw what was happening with the councillor (Christine Leadman)”*
 - *Rod Lahey - April 1*
- They have not met with the Public about their developments or any revisions since mid-March

MY OTHER CONCERNS

- They have not said what the “community use” is of the Convent building but they are getting consideration of it. They also threw a resident under the bus claiming she/community supports it
- Ashcroft has manipulated the media to make it seem that the community supports their plans?...how do they know when they don't ask us?
- What is happening with the “Hotel”? How is this appropriate intensification if they are addressing a transient population

PEC Committee

- ⦿ Councillor Peter Hume - Chair (Pro-Developer)
- ⦿ Councillor Peggy Feltmate (might vote NO)
- ⦿ Councillor Michel Bellemare (? On the fence)
- ⦿ Councillor Clive Doucet (will vote NO)
- ⦿ Councillor Diane Holmes (might vote NO)
- ⦿ Councillor Gord Hunter (Pro-Developer)
- ⦿ Councillor Bob Monette (? May follow mayor)
- ⦿ Councillor Shad Qadri (Pro-Developer)
- ⦿ Mayor Larry O'Brien (Very Pro-Developer)

Meeting Tuesday Sep 28

- ⦿ City Hall (110 Laurier Ave W) – Champlain Room
- ⦿ Meeting starts at 9:30. It is first on the agenda. Other business may be dispensed quickly but it will likely start by 9:45am
- ⦿ Will start with staff reports, comments of Councillors then public is allowed to speak
- ⦿ You can sign up the morning of the meeting! Bring people out
- ⦿ Caitlin will handle the order of speakers (usually determined by order you sign up). If you need this changed, please do so.
- ⦿ You have 5 minutes to speak and then there might be Q&A. This doesn't cut into your 5 minutes
- ⦿ Support each other. If you are nervous, write out your notes ahead of time

What shall I say?

- ⦿ Whatever you want! You have 5 minutes
- ⦿ Try to stick to the facts. While your opinion counts, facts are better
- ⦿ Feel free to hit on all the points but if you have a theme or topic, just go with it.
- ⦿ Use the notes in this group presentation to craft your own speech in your own words.
- ⦿ Take as much time as you can.

What are our chances of swaying votes?

- It is hard to say....some Councillors are pro-developer and will vote anything in that doesn't affect their Ward
- Some are worried about the upcoming election and may be taking developer money
- Some like Mr. Doucet are making this a platform issue
- What is guaranteed is that if we don't speak out Ashcroft will use that as justification that the community supports their plans
- Keep in mind that Lansdowne was a split vote (4-4) and the Mayor decided that he would swing the vote
- Councillor Leadman has fought very hard for the community's concerns but she is only one voice.

What happens after this meeting?

- It goes to City Council for a vote (in Oct?)
- If it is voted through, the community has the option of appeal to OMB
- If it is voted down, Ashcroft will appeal to OMB (in fact it is already filed)

How do I get involved

- Talk to your neighbours
 - Share information and ideas
 - Organize events to discuss this
 - Support your community association
-
- If you need more info or want to be on a mailing list for Convent issues, email:
carrasco@magma.ca