

From: [Julia Elliot](#)
To: [Alexander Burnett](#)
Subject: Development application for Trinity and King
Date: May 1, 2024 7:08:43 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Burnett,

Thank you for the information you have provided to local residents regarding the proposed development for 93 Trinity St., and 266 King St. I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions.

First, may I say, I am glad to see a development proposal that uses land and repurposes old buildings within the city and does not take up valuable farmland. It is encouraging to see a proposal for much needed housing in our community.

My questions/concerns are as follows;

1. I am concerned about, and object to, the request for reduced parking spots. A development of 382 units certainly requires adequate parking for those units. We are not a city with a robust public transit system and people generally rely on having a car to get around the city.
2. What is the plan for the increased traffic in our neighbourhood? I envision that it will be difficult to turn onto Duoro from Trinity and King with an additional 382 units sharing those intersections. Will there be four-way stops or lights to assist with traffic flow?
3. In general, the 3 and 4 story buildings seem reasonable for the area. However, I have grave concerns about the 10-story building. It will tower over the neighbourhood. A 10-story building is not in keeping with the character of this neighbourhood, nor the city in general. Is this change to existing height requirements something that will be implemented throughout the city?
4. Is there a plan to designate a percentage of the new units as affordable or geared-to-income? It seems that a new development such as this would be a golden opportunity to bring more badly needed affordable housing to Stratford.
5. What is the expected price point for the units? Are they to be luxury units (as was proposed by another, now cancelled, project by BMI Group)? Or will they be mixed housing.
6. Is there a plan to ensure these units do not become a large enclave of Air B&B units, which would be very disruptive for this area. Also, as mentioned above, we badly need actual affordable housing in Stratford, not more short-term rentals.
7. What is the projected timeline to project completion? Will it be done in stages? I don't live directly across from the development, but this would be important information for residents close to the construction zone.

I certainly hope to continue to receive updates on this project, including any decisions on zoning amendments.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Julia Elliot
46 College St., Stratford N5A 4R4

From: [Larry/Marylou Drown](#)
To: [Alexander Burnett](#)
Subject: Opinion of zone change letter
Date: May 3, 2024 3:16:10 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

I received your letter re zone change for 93 Trinity and 266 King Street. I live on Queen Street. I am thrilled that the company wants to repurpose the old factory. I saw the plans at their meeting. They were very impressive. I think the zoning should be changed. I hope there will be affordable housing in the complex as that seems to be a real need now in the city. Let's hope it does not take decades to get the redevelopment done.

Yours truly,

Mary-Lou Drown

Home owner,

253 Queen Street,

Stratford Ontario.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)


From: [Lynda Hopkins](#)
To: [Alexander Burnett](#)
Subject: The old Krug factory
Date: May 6, 2024 12:21:02 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

The BMI group is pressuring people to sell their homes to develop the old factory lot. They want to rezone land on property that they do not own. They have also set up a sign where it tells you that you can submit comments for them to discuss at their next meeting. People have barely had a week to submit them as the sign has only been up for about a week. Something about that feels off. It feels like they do not want people to say what they think about this project; a project that will affect their neighbourhood.

To add onto this, the previous mayor, Dan Mathieson is involved. He is the same person who tried to approve a glass plant on the outer edge of Stratford and was a key reason why he would not have won a re-election campaign. It makes you wonder how long has this been planned for?



On the factory's property, there is also a petroleum well. It does not seem to be in use but above it is a planned ten story apartment building; one of the tallest buildings we would have in Stratford. Most other apartment buildings here do not go above four and others not above five. I live in the community and having a ten story apartment building would block the sun and I would live in constant shade. To add onto a point mentioned earlier in this paragraph, a petroleum well does not sound like the most stable foundation.

As for their parking spaces, legally there seems to be enough. However, it may not function very well as some people will have more than one car. Each single bedroom unit is given .75 of a parking space. Where will any extra cars park? Continuing on, a small cafe is planned to be constructed on the property. If it is open to the general public, not just those living in the new are, where will they park? If there is barely enough spaces for those living there, where will visitors park? Stratford is not a very walkable city. We do not have a great bus system and I doubt the many people who would be interested in these units will want to take the bus every time they need something from the store. The BMI group builds higher end units, not something everyone can easily afford. If you can afford to live there, you likely own a car. The same car that will likely not fit in the parking lot with everyone else's cars.

The BMI group has also claimed that they mailed out notices to the people living in the neighbourhood. I checked both the mailbox attached to my house and the Canada Post box. There was nothing there. It is almost like they do not want the people already living in the community to know what will really be going on across from them.

Something is not right with all of this. People are not being told what is actually happening to their neighbourhood. The people who actively search have to sometimes spend hours trying to

find the full plan. We want to know what is happening when it will directly affect us.

Thank you,

Comments On The Juliana Development Zone Change Application

Attn: Alex Burnett

I am writing to express a number of concerns I have regarding the Zone Change Application File #Z01-24 for the Juliana Development.

A change from the current zoning of I4 to R5(3) is a very large difference in an area that is surrounded by mostly R2(2) zoning. Additional requests for reduced parking rates, a maximum height of 36 metres, and reduced setbacks are also problematic for the surrounding neighbourhood.

In reading through the City of Stratford Official Plan, where new development is proposed, it is stated that these new developments should reflect and respect the neighbourhood. This plan does not.

The biggest concern is the proposed Building F, at 35.4 metres. The current profile of the existing factory building, which is the image depicted on the notice board for the public meeting, is four stories, or 16 metres. The current maximum height permitted in an R5(3) Zone is listed in the current City of Stratford Zoning By-law as 22 metres, and in the current Official Plan as six storeys. The requested zone change would allow a 36 metre, 10 storey building. This is not compatible with the surrounding predominantly R2(2) neighbourhoods, and would be taller than any other apartment buildings in the whole of Stratford. Under Section 4.6.1 “Goals and Objectives for High Density Residential Areas” is the statement “ii) To provide for the creation of new high density residential areas in locations which generally respect adjacent development.” This proposal does not do that.

Another concern is the density of the planned development. The density of the proposal is listed at 134 Units/Hectare, while the Zoning By-law states the maximum density for R5(3) is 100 units. Putting this level of population density into a low density neighbourhood will change the area significantly.

Parking is another issue. The development is requesting a reduced parking rate where the number of units (382) would be very similar to the number of parking spaces available (393). This seems likely to lead to parking issues, as is the small number of visitor spaces (12) provided for the entire complex. This situation could lead to parking shortages on the site, with the question being, where will the excess cars park? Both Trinity and King Street are small, quiet residential streets and do not have the capacity to absorb large amounts of on-street parking without causing traffic issues. Is there a plan in place to deal with snow removal or will this further reduce available parking spaces during the winter months?

Traffic is another significant concern. Adding almost 400 residential units will lead to a large increase in the amount of traffic in the area. There appear to be four exits from the development site, two on Trinity St., one on King St., and one on Douro St. While Douro is a busy street, Trinity and King are not at this time, but very likely would become so with the increase in traffic. Can these three streets handle the increase in traffic volume without negative impacts?

Infrastructure is a concern as well. Can the water, natural gas, and hydro lines handle the increased volume? Can the sewer systems handle the increased volume caused by so many new residents? If not, and upgrades are required, will the developer pay, or will taxes increase? Is the current fire fighting equipment suited to handle potential emergencies in a ten storey building? What is the plan for storm water management in this development? The current parking lot already has significant runoff during

large rain events, and that is with a gravel parking lot, and a large grassed area. What will it be like once the area is largely covered with paving?

Reduced setbacks for buildings raise concerns as well. The houses on the Douro Street end of King Street will be facing a five storey building that is very close to the edge of the development property, and directly across the street. This will block afternoon sun for these homes. Houses on Trinity near Regent Street will likely have morning sun blocked by three storey stacked townhouses directly across the street from them. Some existing houses on the development block will find themselves extremely close to the new townhouses. All of the proposed development units are taller than the existing houses and can be expected to lead to a feeling of less privacy for current residents.

How will a ten storey building affect sun and shadow patterns in this neighbourhood? Will some houses have much of their sunlight blocked by this building?

There are also concerns over potential contamination of the site. As it has operated as a factory for decades, what contaminants have entered the soil? What is the purpose of the vent pipe that protrudes from the small hill in the parking lot?

According to the Official Plan, there is a petroleum well located on the property. What are the potential hazards or contamination resulting from this? Are there risks to current or future residents if development occurs on or around it?

Other concerns and questions I have are in regards to the seeming rush and secrecy surrounding this project. The Notice of Public Meeting sign was installed Wednesday, May 1st, and the deadline for submitting comments to be summarized for the public meeting is May 6th, only five days. This seems to be a very short time frame. There has also been no notification of anything to do with this development from the city to the surrounding neighbours. The public notice board seems very small and easily missed, particularly considering the extent of the changes proposed. The illustration of the development is also misleading as it shows only the current factory profile with the word “elevation”, with no indication of the other proposed buildings, most of which will have a higher elevation than the one pictured. There have been reports of property owners on the block being pressured to sell. Does BMI even own all the land it needs to make this project a reality?

While I am in favour of the factory building being restored and converted to apartments, and look forward to its restoration, the rest of the proposal generates mainly questions and concerns. While we absolutely need housing, is cramming a very high density residential area into a much lower density neighbourhood the best way to achieve this? This proposed development, particularly the ten storey apartment building, looks nothing like its surroundings, and would fundamentally alter the character of this quiet neighbourhood.

I look forward to finding answers to my questions and concerns,

Marnie Lockyer

From: [DZ Carpentry Inc.](#)
To: [Alexander Burnett](#)
Subject: Zone change application # Z01-24 93 Trinity and 266 King st
Date: May 6, 2024 11:46:54 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing regarding the application for zone change for file# Z01-24 Juliana Development Inc. 93 Trinity st and 266 King st

We are residents in the area as well as Business owners for many years. We do have questions and concerns:

- 1) We are very concerned about the height of the proposed buildings. There is an existing 5-6 story building there now and to add a 10 story building in this area is going to seriously affect the sunlight and atmosphere of many residents and future ones to come. Where do all these residents and visitors park?
- 2) The parking request seriously concerns us as there will end up being numerous vehicles parked on side streets and create huge challenges, potential accidents and health concerns for the entire area. Owning property on a corner and business this will seriously impact our safety and daily operations. The proximity of what I believe are the access roads are directly going to impact. From what I believe the subdivision accesses the street on King st in the same area hence will this become a stop sign for your parking lot access and will the access to the new subdivision located on the opposite side of King st have a similar stop sign? In my opinion It will not be a matter if this will create accidents and possible serious health concerns but **merely when will this happen.** The volume of traffic alone is going to have a major impact especially on Douro and Fredrick streets. This will turn what is a clean safe neighborhood into huge volumes of people and traffic. Have you the City thought of the impact on your job for snow removal and the challenges this will bring with more vehicles on the streets. This is only the start of the problems that happen.
- 3) infrastructure concerns. How will this impact the City services? Sewer, water, maintenance. watershed, environmental. The impact of this amount of people and vehicles is massive!

I have many more concerns. I feel this is a good idea for development but the overall volume of units creates numbers and many concerns, problems to follow. How can you squeeze this amount of units and people into such a small area. Building higher does not suit our City as from what I understand never has so why now especially in an established and very mature area. Build this style of housing in a new part of the city when it doesn't impact so many existing residents who have been in this area for so long. A new area makes so much more sense so you can address infrastructure concerns and prepare for this and build to suit.

We do request to be informed on all zone changes and updated on decisions etc. I also request to be notified that this message has been accepted

Thanks,

Dave Zorgdrager

Owner, President

DZ Carpentry Inc.

[279 King St.](#)

[Stratford, ON](#)

[N5A 4S3](#)

[REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Adam McMichael](#)
To: [Alexander Burnett](#)
Subject: Application for zone change for 93 Trinity and 266 King st
Date: May 6, 2024 9:38:31 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Adam McMichael and myself and my wife and 1 year old son live at 274 King st which backs on to the former Krug site.

I have alot to say about this development, but I need to open by saying that I'm glad to see it developed, I'm not opposed to that, but I am very opposed to the proposal that has been submitted by BMI.

First off why is the city even entertaining a proposal when BMI doesn't own 266 king st? While there have been talks about buying this property, currently the answer is no. How can we as residents of this area say anything about a theoretical development? Should we not first see what it would look like with what they currently own? How can the owners of 266 king decide if they want to sell or stay, if they only see a proposal with their home gone? It blows my mind that BMI can propose this, and it even be considered when they don't own 266 king.

That being said, I think if anyone lived in a quiet neighborhood and you got a proposal in your mailbox showing a 10 story building very close to your back fence, and 3 story town houses on the other side of their house, it would be shocking to say the least. I will have gone from a quiet house with privacy, to having countless homes and people now looking down into my backyard.

Now if there was some communication with BMI perhaps I would feel better, but I have asked several times for BMI to provide me with some drawings or sketches because I was too sick to go to the open house, I emailed them at least 3 times asking for even a sketch and they said each time that they didn't have anything to give me. Add to that that I currently have demolition machinery taking down buildings and working withing under 50-70ft of my land, and I received no notice from anyone that that would be happening. Add to that, BMI had workers breaking off the asbestos siding and building materials off those buildings on windy days while me my wife and baby played in the back yard of our home not far away. We only found out later through word of mouth that that was asbestos. The only interaction with BMI is when someone from their company knocked on my door and invited us to the open house and bragged about the former mayor and several other former city hall staff were now a part of BMI (which felt to me like you can't stop us) I did find some humor in the fact that the former mayor of stratford who is a part of BMI fought the former owner of the Cooper site for 10+ years, one of the problems of that development that the city had issue with, were the 2 proposed towers that exceeded the city's highth restrictions, now that former mayor and his fellow developers are asking the same thing a much shorter distance away from residential buildings, somewhat ironic.

The proposal does not fit this historic section of town. BMI is asking for more then the allowed tolerances in an attempt to leverage the tallest and most profitable development. If

this were on the edge of town, in a new section, go for it! But rather than seeing the Krug site turned into something beautiful, we are looking at BMI throwing as much pavement and buildings as possible in one spot, with no regard to the people who live there. Not to mention the green space is absurd, where will their snow piles go in the winter? Is stratford not trying to be a green community? Or is that just when there isn't big money involved? In fact, they are requesting the set back to be less than required, which when we are looking at tall buildings in a 2 story neighborhood is absurd.

I have much more to say, but I highly doubt that one guy, who's house backs onto this will have any effect on the matter regardless of how this development will effect him, and his family and neighborhood.

Thank you for listening

- 1/ Snow removal (Flooding in spring)
melt.
- 2/ Flooding in South East parking lot
a Where are the storm drains?
b Are the grades to change to fix this problem?
- 3 Sewers on trinity street
a Fix after construction?
b Fix before high density construction.
c Trinity wide enough to handle traffic load?
- 4 10 storey building with a code of 6 storey restriction by law?
- 5 How close to (boulevard) boundary lines are to be allowed?

Lorne Johnston

136 - Trinity St

May 6 2024

Phone [REDACTED]