



CITY OF STRATFORD PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

A public meeting was held on Thursday, June 27, 2024, at 7:10 p.m., in the Council Chamber, at Stratford City Hall, 1 Wellington Street. The purpose of the public meeting was to give Council an opportunity to hear and consider comments from the public regarding the to Zone Change Application, Z01-24. The application affects the properties with the municipal address of 93 Trinity Street and 266 King Street, Stratford.

COUNCIL PRESENT: Mayor Martin Ritsma – Chair presiding, Councillor Brad Beatty, Councillor Bonnie Henderson, Councillor Larry McCabe, Councillor Harjinder Nijjar, Councillor Cody Sebben and Councillor Geza Wordofa

REGRETS: Councillor Leslie Biehn, Councillor Taylor Briscoe, Councillor Jo-Dee Burbach, and Councillor Mark Hunter

STAFF PRESENT: Joan Thomson – Chief Administrative Officer, Adam Betteridge – Director of Building and Planning Services, Neil Anderson – Director of Emergency Services/Fire Chief, Taylor Crinklaw - Director of Infrastructure Services, Tim Wolfe – Director of Community Services, Kim McElroy – Director of Social Services, Dave Bush – Director of Human Resources, Karmen Krueger – Director of Corporate Services, Tatiana Dafoe – City Clerk, Audrey Pascual – Deputy Clerk, Alex Burnett – Planner, Danielle Clayton – Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Members of the public and media

Mayor Ritsma called the meeting to order and stated the purpose of the meeting was to give Council an opportunity to hear and consider comments from the public regarding Zone Change Application, Z01-24. The application affects the properties with the municipal address of 93 Trinity Street and 266 King Street, Stratford.

The Mayor explained the order of procedure for the public meeting.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Alex Burnett, Planner, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, advised that the purpose of the public meeting was to discuss Zone Change Application Z01-24 for 93 Trinity Street and 266 King Street.

The application, submitted by Baker Planning Group on behalf of Juliana Development Inc. proposes a rezoning of the subject lands from Factory District – I4 zone to a Site Specific Residential Fifth Density (R5(3)-___) zone. This proposed change aims to permit Cluster Townhouse Dwellings and other R5 uses, and requests site-specific provisions including:

- reduced parking rates;
- a maximum height of 36 meters which would equate to approximately 10 stories; and
- reduced setbacks for the existing and proposed buildings.

Studies and reports submitted that were included as part of the zone change application include:

- A Planning Justification Report;
- Traffic Impact and Parking Study;
- Land Use Compatibility Assessment;
- Heritage Impact Brief and Urban Design Report;
- Functional Servicing Report;
- Geotechnical Report; and
- Letters supporting the application.

The Planner advised that the site at 93 Trinity Street is predominantly vacant, having been previously used as an industrial factory. The property at 266 King Street is currently a single detached dwelling and owned under separate ownership.

The combined area of these properties is approximately 2.85 hectares or 7 acres. The proposal includes developing the land into a residential neighborhood with eleven buildings and 382 dwelling units.

The land is designated as Industrial and Factory District in the City's Official Plan, which supports the transition from industrial to residential use, provided that the existing buildings are no longer required or in demand for industrial or related purposes and provided that such alternative uses do not conflict or lead to conflicts with the remaining industrial uses in the area. The Planner noted that this point holds significance in that the policies currently in place seek to see this area transition from underutilized industrial land uses towards new residential opportunities. The Planner advised that this demonstrates how important Official Plans are in shaping the future of our cities and towns.

Referring to the map in the PowerPoint presentation, the Planner noted that the site is currently zoned as Factory District (I4), which permits various industrial uses. The current permitted maximum height in the I4 zone is 30 metres.

City Planning Staff received comments from multiple agencies as outlined and detailed in the Management Report COU24-068. The City's Infrastructure Services Department has no objections, provided the development can be serviced per the Functional Servicing Report. CN Rail, who's rail line and shunting yard is located to the south of the site and south of Regent Street, highlighted the need for a Needs and Alternatives Test and appropriate mitigation measures for noise, vibration, and air quality.

Planning Staff advised they are cognizant of the concerns raised by CN. However, it is also recognized that the City's Official Plan supports the transition of this area from industrial to residential use, contingent upon ensuring that this transition does not adversely affect the remaining industrial activities in the vicinity. Planning Staff agree that appropriate measures will need to be implemented to mitigate any nuisance impacts effectively.

The Planner advised that City Staff have received comments from the public, and they were provided on an addendum to the Council agenda for review. Concerns include reduced privacy, site drainage, increased parking and traffic, the development's fit within the neighbourhood, the height of the proposed buildings, potential contamination, lack of greenspace, and infrastructure capacity.

Several letters in support of the proposal have also been received. These letters of support included favor of the proposed infill development rather than developing farmland, the heritage preservation of the existing building, and the inclusion of affordable housing as part of the proposal.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Sebben requested clarification on the process for applying for a multi level storey building that does not currently fit within the Zoning By-law. The Planner advised that the

Planning Act allows developers to apply for a Zoning By-law amendment. The City does go through a formal consultation process where an application is seen prior to a formal Zone Change Application is brought to Council. Once an application is accepted as a complete application by Planning Staff, it is the responsibility of staff to develop a report for Council and a public meeting be scheduled.

Councillor Henderson questioned how an emergency or fire would be handled in a large multi level 10 storey building. The Planner advised that discussions have taken place with the City's Fire Department regarding the proposed development and the impact on the City's firefighting ability. When evaluating development proposals, the City's Fire Department upholds strict criteria based on the Ontario Building and Fire Codes, including sprinkler systems, number of exists, areas of refuge, fire separation ratings, standpipe or fire dept connections, and accessible water supplies and flows. These criteria are evaluated as part of the Site Plan Approval and Building Permit process. The City's aerial truck can project water onto the roof of a 10-storey building. The Planner advised that the criteria for developing a development this size are dealt with at the Site Plan stage which would take place after any zone change.

The Fire Chief advised that their tactical priorities are rescue, fire control, and property conservation. The Fire Chief advised that they look at what type of warning systems there are, are stairwell exits pressurized, and fire connections on each floor. The Fire Chief advised that the department has not received any plans for the building in relation to fire safety systems at this time. The Fire Department is stringent on supporting the Ontario Fire Code and the Ontario Building Code to ensure that the required systems are in place. The Fire Chief confirmed that aerial ladders are mostly used as a tool to assist firefighters.

Taylor Crinklaw, Director of Infrastructure Services, advised that water capacity is looked at an engineering standpoint to ensure that it can service the Fire Department's needs.

Councillor Wordofa questioned if there are any permits for the 10-storey building. The Planner advised that as part of the current zone change, the maximum height of 30m would equate to 10 storeys. At this time, there is no permission from the City to build a 10 storey building.

Councillor Nijjar questioned if a Traffic Study has been completed. The Planner advised that a Traffic Impact and Parking Study was submitted as part of the completed application. It was noted that the conclusions of the studies will be incorporated into Planning's recommendation report.

Adam Betteridge, Director of Building of Planning, advised that the applicant's agent was present and some of these technical questions may be addressed in their presentation.

Councillor Sebben questioned if 30m is for industrial zoning only or if the 30m height limit is also for residential zoning. The Planner advised that the 30m height limit applies only to the I4 zoning which currently permits a variety of industrial uses. The height limit does not currently apply to residential uses.

Councillor Sebben questioned what the height limit is for residential uses. The Planner advised that the current permitted maximum height limit is under the R5(3) zone and has a maximum height limit of 22m.

Councillor Sebben requested clarification on what the 30m height limit in the I4 zoning is for. The Planner advised that the maximum height limit applies to all buildings.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Caroline Baker, agent for the applicant from Baker Planning Group, referring to a PowerPoint presentation provided the following information regarding the application:

- the property owner is Juliana Development;
- the site is 7 acres in size;
- this being a large property for an infill opportunity in the central area of Stratford;
- the property having frontage on three municipal streets;
- surrounding uses being industrial uses to south and residential uses to the north;
- there being five new vehicular entrances to the property; and
- there being a number of sidewalks and pedestrian connections to all municipal roads.

The agent advised that the exiting L-shaped building is proposed to have minor breaks in the building to break up the frontage along the streetscapes which will allow light to penetrate through the site. There are a number of newly proposed buildings that range from 3-5 storeys, stacked townhouses and a proposed 10 storey building. There are 393 new proposed dwellings which equates to 134 units per hectare. These units will be a mix of 1 and 2 bedrooms with some 3 bedrooms and studio units.

The agent advised of the following proposed outdoor amenities and landscaping to the property:

- private amenity areas and terraces within each building;
- parkette oriented to Trinity Street;
- outdoor common area internal to the site;
- walking paths throughout the site and to the community; and
- landscaping will differentiate site areas such as parking, courtyards, gardens, and sidewalks to give each component of the site a distinct, clearly defined character.

The agent advised that a new centralized private road connecting Trinity Street to King Street, known as a Woonerf, will prioritize pedestrian and cyclist areas while accommodating vehicular access. The Woonerf will be privately maintained and will be irregular in shape with traffic calming measures such as patterned and textured street paving, planting, bollards and street furniture.

The applicant is proposing 101 surface parking spaces, 159 structure parking spaces and 133 underground parking spaces. The parking areas will be located within the site's interior area. This will minimize their visual impact with planting strips, landscaped traffic islands and/or paving articulations.

The agent provided the following information regarding the requested Zoning By-law amendment to rezone to a site-specific R5(3) Zone with provisions for:

- define the:
 - front and exterior lot lines - what is considered the front and exterior lot lines.
 - location and size of porches and balconies;
- off-street parking requirements which are supported by the Parking Study:
 - Studio/1 Bedroom Dwelling Units: 0.75 parking space/unit
 - 2 and 3-Bedroom Dwelling Units: 1 parking space/unit
 - Cluster Townhouse Dwelling: 1.5 parking spaces/unit
- one loading space per 100 dwelling units being required;
- maximum density being 1.5 floor space ratio;

- maximum lot coverage being 45%;
- maximum height being 36m;
- the increase to the maximum height of 36m not being a blanket permission across the entire site;
- minimum front yard setback being 0m (existing buildings) and 4.5m (new buildings);
- minimum exterior side yard setback being 0m (existing buildings) and 1.5m (new buildings);
- the minimum setback to a property line for any building or structure greater than 22 metres in height being 18 metres; and
- the minimum rear yard being 4m (Cluster Townhouse) and 7.5m (Apartment Building).

The agent reviewed how the floor space ratio was determined and noted that this provides clearer guidance when building dwelling units.

The agent provided the following information regarding public consultation that took place prior to the Public Meeting and comments that were provided by residents:

- two door-to-door campaigns, stakeholder interviews and a public Open House having been held;
- five letters of support from area residents, the Stratford/Perth County Branch of Architectural Conservancy Ontario, and the Stratford and District Historical Society being received;
- there being strong support for preserving the buildings for residential uses;
- some residents raising concerns about increased noise and traffic in the neighbourhood;
- the introduction of the one 10-storey building raising questions about privacy, however given its setback away from the street and to the centre of the site, no opposition being raised; and
- residents appreciating that the site would be cleaned up.

The agent noted that the proposed development will be serviced by existing municipal sanitary sewers, storm sewers and watermains. There will be stormwater management quantity controls incorporated and a quality control through a combination of LID facilities and oil grit separators. It was noted that the overall site grading will generally match existing roads and boundary grades with appropriate slopes. Prior to Juliana Developments owning the property, a Record of Site Conditions was issued by the Ministry of Environment to demonstrate that the site is free of contaminants for residential use.

The agent reviewed the Traffic Impact and Parking Study that was conducted and highlighted the following:

- the study showing the following new auto trips being generated:
 - Weekday AM peak hour = 170 trips (39 In / 131 Out)
 - Weekday PM peak hour = 173 trips (106 In / 67 Out)
- site trips being distributed along five site accesses;
- all movements at study intersections being expected to operate with acceptable levels of service;
- the study recommending the traffic signal cycle length be increased from 74 seconds to 80 seconds at the Romeo Street at Douro Street intersection;
- parking utilization surveys for two existing residential developments in the City showed the highest parking utilization recorded at 59 Campbell Court and 337 Home Street were 57% and 76%, respectively;
- applying the highest utilization rates to the proposed number of dwelling units on the site would require 283 and 377 parking spaces;
- the proposed development including 393 parking spaces, which exceeds the highest utilization rate surveyed; and
- the owner also proposing transportation demand management (TDM) measures.

The agent advised that the property owner is working with CN Rail and are responding to CN Rail's comments.

The agent reviewed the Heritage Impact Assessment Study and noted that this study is not required to be submitted by the City. The following information was provided regarding the study and property:

- the site not being designated/listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, but identified as "Heritage Area" in the Official Plan (entire central area of Stratford);
- the new development retaining, restoring and enhancing the inherent heritage qualities of the area or corridor;
- the new use being appropriate for conserving the factory, capitalizing on the building's embodied energy and contributing to the City's sustainable development objectives;
- proposed alterations being favorable, increasing natural light, improving site permeability, and reducing the canyon effect caused by the factory's long continuous mass; and
- the impact on surrounding area being moderate, but appropriately mitigated through the existing factory's conservation as well as design, thoughtful transitional measures, enhancements, and repairs to the site's broken frontages, well-designed landscaping, and pedestrian safety measures.

The agent outlined the following sustainability impact that the proposed development would provide:

- builder's block, in its compact, intensified form, providing an ideal urban development typology for a broad range of sustainability goals;
- energy consumption of existing buildings being carefully considered when retrofitting to improve efficiency;
- green infrastructure and passive energy design being considered in several locations;
- there being support for local transit and supply of bicycle parking; and
- considering opportunities for district energy, car share opportunities and bike share.

The agent advised that there will be barrier-free parking spaces that are distributed throughout the development. As well, there will be barrier-free dwelling units, access to dwelling units with at-grade entrances and a selection of sidewalk materials for easy movement.

The agent provided the following information regarding housing affordability:

- this form of development contributing to a greater range of housing types in the community;
- the owner working with housing specialists to obtain CMHC funding for affordable housing units within the development;
- aiming for a minimum of 10% of the units to be affordable; and
- it being intended that the development will include a mix of ownership and rental units.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Henderson questioned if the affordable and accessible housing units would be in the same building or spread throughout the development. The agent advised that both would be spread throughout the development.

Councillor Henderson questioned if there would be any condominiums. The agent stated that there will be condominiums that will be available for lease and purchase.

Councillor Henderson noted that a 10-storey apartment building in Stratford is unusual. It was questioned if the design and colour of the building would be different from surrounding buildings. The agent advised that there will be a variety of materials and colours used on all buildings and that there will be projections such as porches and balconies. The apartment building would not be a typical square building.

Councillor Henderson questioned how many units would be in a 10-storey building and if the underground parking would be located under the 10 storey building. The agent advised that the underground parking will be located under the 5-storey building on the northeast corner of the site. Parking for the proposed 10 storey building will have structured parking and approximately 80 units in the building.

Councillor Sebben requested clarification on how the number of types of units were determined. The agent advised that it was based on market research and the interest from the community for various sizes and forms of units.

Councillor Sebben requested clarification on the maximum density of units per hectare. The agent advised that it would be 134.

Councillor Sebben questioned how the comparison site for parking and their density compare to this proposal. The agent advised that the two comparison sites are apartment buildings that range from 3-4 storeys. The density is lower on the comparator sites as the current cap is 100 units per hectare. The parking demand is based on the unit size, site location, and the availability of transit.

Councillor Wordofa questioned what the price would be for the affordable housing units. The agent advised that based on the provincial definition it would be 30% of market value. The rentals would be around \$1,000 a month while the purchase price would be based on construction costs would be between \$400,000-\$700,000.

Councillor Wordofa questioned if the developers would be working with the City to determine pricing. The agent advised that the developers would work with the province in terms of the application for affordable housing and determining affordable rent.

Councillor Wordofa questioned if there is a list of individuals who are looking for affordable housing. The Director of Social Services advised that there is not a list kept of individuals who are looking for affordable housing.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Marva Bailey Wisdom questioned if the development has taken children into consideration while designing the site. It was noted that parks and play spaces need to be considered and it was questioned if there are any schools nearby.

On behalf of her mother, Garvia Bailey, Marva Bailey Wisdom provided the following comments:

- affordable housing should be the number one priority;
- not against the development but there are concerns;
- concerned about units becoming investment properties;
- what does the City plan to do to ensure that units do not become short term rentals;
- what would 36m approximately equal in storeys;
- green space and large mature trees act as a natural coolant and provide habitats for various species; and
- concerned with the speed at which the development is progressing.

Henroy Bailey provided the following comments:

- supportive of the proposed zone change;
- would be a positive for the City;
- against the proposed size of the 10 storey building;
- advised that permission has been given by 266 King Street to be included in the initial planning phase;
- wants an opportunity to be able to speak on items such as set backs and other issues that may impact continuing to live at 266 King Street;
- during the construction phase, it is important that Juliana Development be good neighbours;
- how will the noise and dust be mitigated; and
- Krug was a great neighbour.

Caroline Baker, agent for the applicant, advised that there will be park and green space throughout the development with a large common amenity area on site. The agent noted that the applicant has gone above and beyond the statutory requirements that are outlined in the Planning Act with respect to the process. It was noted that the application has been in process for approximately a year prior to the public meeting. There was a pre-consultation last summer with the City, door-to-door conversations with the residents, and a public open house last fall for the community. The agent advised that as a result of Bill 109, the provincial government changed a number of regulations in land development and planning. One change was that a fee refund could happen if a municipality does not process an application within a specific time period. If this is not done by a municipality, the fee must be returned to the applicant. The agent advised that the City has completed a multi-phase consultation.

The agent noted that the Zoning By-law outlines measurements in metres. The 36m height would translate to approximately a 10-storey condominium or apartment building.

Valerie Cotton provided the following comments:

- concerned with the number of variances requested on the proposed site;
- very high-density request for a very small lot in a small community;

- questioned the square footage of the various units;
- concerned with the units being too small;
- concerned with the lack of parking compared to the number of people living at the development; and
- how will the lack of parking be handled when the surrounding streets will have to handle the overflow of parking.

The agent advised that the smaller units will be 500-600sqft and the one to two bedroom units will be 700-900sqft in size. It was noted that the Traffic Study was prepared using data from the peak time of traffic. In regard to parking options, the agent noted that underground parking is always an option to incorporate more parking but it does carry a significant cost compared to grade or structured parking.

Cambria Ravenhill provided the following comments:

- visitor parking is very limited with only 12 spaces;
- concerned with the lack of visitor spaces and how it will affect the surrounding streets;
- questioned how the development will be phased when it comes time for construction;
- how will the construction noise and dust be mitigated; and
- concerned with the height of the proposed apartment building.

The agent advised that on the conceptual site plan there are 12 spaces in addition to the proposed parking rate on site which includes visitor parking. The agent noted that there will be phases to the development with the intent to start on the north side of the site. The applicant is currently having the buildings cleaned up and ensuring that they are structurally sound.

Jason Davis provided the following comments:

- the development is an opportunity to build up and infill housing;
- appreciates that the Official Plan has limitations so that conversations can be had;
- questioned if there will be electric vehicle charging stations;

- disagrees with the number of parking spaces as it does not take into account that many rental places would only allow for one vehicle per household;
- concerned with 10% of units being affordable as it is a very low number;
- would like to see the number of affordable units be increased;
- asked that an official definition of affordability be added to the Official Plan; and
- questioned Bill 109 and the repayment of fees.

The agent advised that the applicant is looking at providing EV Charging stations on site. It was noted that the proposed EV Charging stations would be shown on a site plan application.

Jane Marie Mitchell provided the following comments:

- pleased with the adaptive re-use of the site;
- accessibility and green initiatives need to be considered;
- questioned how many units will be affordable and accessible;
- the proposed density is too high and is not a minor variance;
- concerned with the insufficient amount of parking spaces; and
- questioned whether the strategic priorities and one planet principles be included in the final report to Council.

The Director of Building and Planning advised that as the one planet principles are not built into the City's Official Plan, they are not part of the zoning application or statutory review process.

Tim Forster provided the following comments on behalf of Barb Shaughnessy:

- concerned about short term rentals as these are allowed in the R5 zoning;
- housing is needed for residents;
- concerned that this is a very dense site;
- there is a need for this development and green space;

- concerned with the additional traffic and parking issues;
- suggested that a third party review be done on this application;
- concerned with the height of the proposed apartment building; and
- supports the adaptive reuse of the building.

Lorne Johnston provided the following comments:

- questioned if the storm and sanitary systems had been looked at;
- concerned with the possibility of the surrounding streets continuing to flood when it rains;
- questioned whether the surrounding streets will be torn up during construction on site; and
- questioned whether the developer can change the grade level of the property.

The Director of Building & Planning advised that these questioned would be taken into consideration and would be included in a follow up report.

The agent advised that the current rainwater or rainfall run off cannot exceed the current amount that is currently coming from the site. There has been a Stormwater Management Design prepared and reviewed to ensure that stormwater concerns are addressed. It was noted that there are 140m of storm trunk sewer that will need to be lowered.

The agent advised that if the zoning is approved, a site plan is required to be filed with the City and must outline a grading plan. If approved, a formal legal agreement will be prepared and registered on title.

David Mackey provided the following comments;

- welcomes the reuse of the building and new neighbours;
- questioned if the densification is appropriate to the size of the property and the neighbourhood; and
- encouraged the developers to listen to the neighbours.

Mark Aikman provided the following comments:

- supportive of the repurposing of the building;

- concerns regarding the surrounding land being developed;
- additional buildings on the site creates a density that is too high for the neighbourhood;
- housing is needed in Stratford but concerned about the density on the site;
- concerned about the height of the proposed apartment building;
- concerned about the parking study and lack of parking spaces; and
- encouraged the development to have green space and be reasonable within the existing rules.

Dave Zordrager provided the following comments:

- spoke on behalf of his wife and business;
- concerned with the large amount of residents that could be moving into the area; and
- concerned with the impact that this proposed development will have on traffic and parking.

Sharon Collingwood provided the following comments:

- noted that the rezoning could increase the property value;
- concerned that a crucial precedent could be set;
- questioned who is financing the proposed development; and
- questioned how short-term rentals will be prevented.

On behalf of Mike Sullivan, Sharon Collingwood presented the following comments:

- concerns were raised from a climate perspective and climate targets;
- opportunity to ensure that new developments do not add to emissions;
- concerned with the requested easements, fewer parking spaces and density requests;
- unit sizes are not appropriate for encouraging families to settle in Stratford;

- concerned with the proximity of the development to the rail yard and the noise; and
- encouraged the developer to build a noise wall to mitigate the noise from the rail yard.

Marnie Locklier provided the following comments:

- a housing development should reflect the housing that is currently in the area;
- the proposal does not reflect or respect the surrounding neighbourhood;
- concerned with the setbacks of the proposed townhouses;
- this is a precedent setting development;
- concerned with the parking and traffic that will be on local streets and the capacity of the sewers; and
- concerns regarding the petroleum well and the Ministry of Natural Resources comments.

Caroline Baker, agent for the applicant, acknowledged that they are aware of the comments that were provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources. It was noted that the petroleum wells were incorrectly identified on the schedule and are not located on this property.

Donna Sobura provided the following comments:

- questioned what the development will cost the taxpayers of the City; and
- requested that another meeting be held to bring additional information and everyone up to date.

Caroline Baker, the agent for the applicant, stated that the developer will incur the infrastructure improvement costs.

Joy Pullman provided the following comments:

- requested clarification on when the developer did door-to-door conversations;
- questioned what the community's response to the proposed 10-storey building was;
- questioned whether Regent Street was considered for the updated sewer systems; and

- concerns that residents were not informed regarding the building being torn down with asbestos.

Caroline Baker, the agent for the applicant, advised that the second round of door-to-door conversations with the neighbourhood occurred during September 2023 and that discussions took place with residents regarding the proposed 10-storey building.

The agent advised that the lowering of the storm sewers will improve the flow and reduce the possibility of flooding. It was noted that the comments regarding asbestos will be taken back to the contractors for more information.

Karen Zamaria provided the following comments:

- concerned that this development will set a precedent for Stratford;
- concerned with the proposed density, traffic increase and parking overflowing onto residential street; and
- requested clarification on what time the developers attended the area for a door-to-door conversation.

The agent for the applicant, stated that they will confirm the exact time with the developers and noted that they spoke to approximately 50 residents. It was noted that conversations around the density, proposed 10-storey building, and privacy and height concerns were had with the residents.

Justin Morris provided the following comments:

- acknowledged that the development is important and needed;
- concerned with the proposed density; and
- concerned with the lack of green space and loss of habitats.

Valerie Cotton questioned if all units would have air conditioning. The agent advised that all units would include air conditioning.

Jordan Aikman provided the following comments:

- concerned with the lack of green space in a 7 acre property; and
- concerned with future generations growing up in this area and not having access to enough green space.

The agent advised that 42% of the 7 acres are landscaped spaces, common amenities, walkways, and plants/trees.

Jason Davis provided the following comments:

- encouraged that the developer has taken an interest in developing an old building and providing much needed housing; and
- questioned if this proposal for the land is the best that Stratford can get.

Karen Zamaria provided the following comments:

- requested clarification on the fire that took place on site;
- questioned whether there will be any bike lanes installed; and
- questioned what will happen to the animals that currently live within the building.

The Fire Chief advised that the fire took place when a steel hopper was being removed. It was noted that there were fire extinguishers on site and that the Fire Department attended. The Fire Chief advised that the fire did not spread and there was no damage to the interior of the building.

The agent advised that the Transportation Master Plan identifies cycling routes, and the surrounding streets of this development were not identified. The Director of Infrastructure Services noted that the Transportation Master Plan recommends various cycling routes throughout the City. It was noted that the closest area of recommendation was Albert Street and Brunswick Street, along with sections of Douro Street east of Romeo Street.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Henderson questioned if the City had received complaints of parking concerns in the area of the proposed development. The Director of Building and Planning advised that this will be included in the follow up management report.

Councillor Henderson questioned if there is a definition in the Official Plan for affordable housing and if it can be different than the provincial definition. The Director of Building and Planning advised that Council could implement a definition.

Councillor Henderson raised concerns regarding the flooding street problems that have taken place during heavy rainfall. Councillor Henderson questioned if porous pavement has been considered. The agent advised that a variety of options are being considered.

Councillor Henderson questioned if the reconstruction of Queen Street helped with the street flooding problems. The Director of Infrastructure Services advised that the installation of the Queen Street Trunk Sewer did alleviate the capacity. It was noted that when a site plan application is submitted, engineering staff does a review to ensure that there are no further impediments to the existing system.

Councillor Henderson questioned if it was possible to restrict the development on McCarthy Road until there is a new drainage system in the area that can handle more development. The Director of Infrastructure Services advised that the Quinlan Pumping Station does have the capacity to absorb the McCarthy Road development but is not associated with this proposed development.

Councillor Henderson questioned if there would be elevators. The agent advised that there would be multiple elevators on the site but not located in the stacked townhouses.

Councillor Sebben questioned whether the proposed 36m building height limit would apply to the entire site. The agent advised that the proposed application sought to restrict where a building of that height could be located so that there would not be multiple buildings of that height on the site.

Councillor Sebben questioned how the proposed parking rate compared to what is permitted in that zone. The agent advised that it is the same requirements for all dwelling types and that there would be 1.25 parking spaces per unit and 0.25 for visitor parking.

Councillor Sebben requested clarification if this is what is being proposed for the site. The agent noted that a smaller unit would have less parking than a larger unit.

The Mayor noted that this matter will be considered at a future Regular Council meeting and that a video recording of the meeting would be posted to the City's website.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 10:11 p.m.

The following individuals requested to receive further information from the public meeting on June 27, 2024:

- **Liz Mountain**