

Craig Dumart

From: Elanor Waslander
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 1:45 PM
To: Craig Dumart
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Re: 134-152 Shanley Street Site Walk/Development Discussion

Thanks Craig! This response is very helpful and appreciated.
Elanor

On Mon, Aug 16, 2021 at 1:37 PM Craig Dumart <Craig.Dumart@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Elanor,

Comments are reviewed and considered by staff when making their recommendation. Common themes are identified and discussed with the applicant. Your concerns were among common themes identified and discussed at Neighbourhood Meeting. Public comments will form part of the public record as an attachment to the staff report. Tomorrow will be a great opportunity to discuss your comments more in depth with the developer and staff.

We look forward to meeting with you then.

Have a great afternoon.

Craig Dumart, BES, MCIP, RPP

Senior Planner | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
(519) 741-2200 ext 7073 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | craig.dumart@kitchener.ca



To: Craig Dumart <Craig.Dumart@kitchener.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 134-152 Shanley Street Site Walk/Development Discussion

Hi Craig,

Thank you kindly for your email and invitation to join the site walk. I look forward to discussing the development with you tomorrow.

I was wondering what happened to the comments we submitted in the previous consultation. Do these comments have an impact on the development? I attended the town hall as well and was quite disappointed with the format of the proceedings as I was not able to discuss my concerns and also felt like my previously emailed comments fell on deaf ears. Could you confirm receipt of my comments (signed by 4 residents in our neighbourhood)?

I am happy to continue to engage in this process as I'd like to see some changes made to the development, but also recognize that if there is no real opportunity to change the development at this stage that I'd like to be aware of that.

My main concerns are:

- the height of the building - 27m is far taller than any surrounding buildings and more than 2x as tall as the previous building
- the number of units that are not for families (1-2 bedroom rather than 2-3 bedroom)
- that units are not being bought/sold; rental community is more transient than current surrounding neighbourhood
- traffic volume concerns and unsafe intersections with inconsistent traffic rules in comparison with other 4 way stops in the area

Thanks for considering my requests above and reviewing my concerns, I look forward to your reply.

Much appreciated,

Elanor

Letter in support of re-zoning request for 134-152 Shanley Street

Public Meeting, February 7th at 7 pm

Councillor Chapman, fellow Councillors

I reside within 120 metres of this proposed development.

This brownfield site once contained a derelict, vandalized factory building vacant for over 25 years which was ordered demolished by the City. The developer has spent considerable time and money demolishing the building and offered a commitment to clean up the contamination and build a much-needed rental property on the site.

Prior to the sale of the building/the site, the City held a number of public meetings including a neighbourhood “charette” which resulted in a “visioning statement” where potential re-uses were explored. At the time of the charette, attended by 60 plus residents, the “vision” outlined a build similar to that proposed by the developer.

Over the past number of years, the developer has revised and adapted the original proposal based on significant feedback from residents. The re-zoning of the single-family home (134 Shanley) and the factory site (152 Shanley) is required in order to allow this build to proceed. I believe it will be a welcome addition to the neighbourhood once completed and will provide much needed “mid rise” rentals

The design of the street level apartments will give the renter access to street level green space and should be attractive to renters with children. This street level access with private green space will also do much to help integrate the new renters into the neighbourhood. The developer has been thoughtful in the design and committed to re-using some of the heritage aspects of the old factory – re-using reclaimed brick, factory beams in the new build. The stepped-back design of the upper floors will mitigate shadow impacts to neighbouring homes. The placement of the building on the site and its orientation has also been designed to minimize impact to the neighbouring properties. The proposed landscaping plans at ground level and the public amenity spaces on upper floors are in keeping with the City’s desire to increase tree canopy. It is unusual, particularly in core neighbourhoods, to see an infill build with this amount of greenspace.

Personally, I am looking forward to having the completed building in the neighbourhood rather than living adjacent to a derelict, contaminated building. In fact, my perception is this new build will actually increase the value of existing homes surrounding the site.

I urge Councillors to approve this re-zoning request.

Sincerely

Catherine Owens

Craig Dumart

From: Catherine Owens
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 3:10 PM
To: Julianne vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley Street - Comments on the Proposed Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Attention: Planning Staff, PSIC Committee, The Mayor and Council

Kudos to Shannondale Developments for taking on the challenge of re-developing this contaminated brownfield site which has been a plight on our midtown neighbourhood for decades. I am pleased to see that this developer has created a very viable building design similar to, if not an improvement on, the design originally envisioned by the City and created after significant neighbourhood consultation prior to the building having to be demolished (known as "The Vision Statement"). I believe the build will actually add value to the immediate surrounding homes rather than detracting value being adjacent to a contaminated site.

The Vision statement originally proposed a two storey addition on what was then a four storey industrial building with higher than normal floor height. The proposed build is not only in keeping with the Vision Statement (approximately 3 metres higher) but is in fact an improved design in that the stepping of the lower floors diminishes the shadow impact on the existing single family residences surrounding the building. The eight storey building is, in my view, a viable compromise.

The build envisions 172 units (probably rental), many of which will be "family units" or at least will be larger than many of the units currently being built in central Kitchener. The site sits in the middle of a residential neighbourhood and the fact that the developer is planning street access to the main floor units will be a welcome addition to the neighbourhood and offer "more eyes on the street" and better integration of the residents into the neighbourhood. I live within 120 metres of the site and feel that the height/design will in fact add to the neighbourhood vibrancy.

I am fully supportive of the re-zoning and build and have no issues with

1. The height – only slightly higher than The Vision Statement
2. Reduced parking and higher density– its within 800 metres of a MTSA
3. Shadow – no significant shadow impact
4. Traffic – minimal traffic impact
5. Re-zoning/demolition of 134 Shanley – this home is not heritage designated and the homeowner opted to sell

Shannondale, to date, has been a very good neighbour – they surrounded the site with a high quality construction fence and ultimately sponsored a neighbourhood art project. We are assuming that the willingness of Shannondale to be a good neighbourhood is a testament to the way they will treat the site during the clean up and construction phases. They have also made a concerted effort to engage with the Ward Councillor and some of the immediate neighbours in order to ensure that they have a neighbourhood compatible design.

Looking forward to see this long abandoned site utilized for additional housing.

Sincerely

Craig Dumart

From: Juliane vonWesterholt
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2021 5:26 PM
To: Craig Dumart
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Feedback for Application OPA21/002/S/JVW / 152 Shanley St Property / Feedback

Here is an email for you Craig for Shanley.

From: Tanya Wright <
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 8:16 AM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca>; Sarah Marsh <Sarah.Marsh@kitchener.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Feedback for Application OPA21/002/S/JVW / 152 Shanley St Property / Feedback

RE: We want your input: a private property owner is requesting permissions to develop an 8-storey building with a total of 172 residential dwelling units.
Applications involved: Official Plan Amendment Application OPA21/002/S/JVW
Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZBA21/004/S/JVW
Address: 134-152 Shanley Street
Owner: 2701098 Ontario Inc. (Shannondale Developments)

Hello,

I recently attended the Public meeting on Thursday June 17th to discuss the above noted property. I am providing my feedback in writing about the proposal. an adjacent property to the proposed building.

Design

I want to acknowledge that a considerable amount of thought went into the proposed design. I was impressed by that effort by both Superkul and Shannondale. It's a thoughtful design.

Height of building

I do not want an 8 storey (27M) building behind me. I have an issue with both the height and the number of units that are being proposed in what is largely a neighbourhood of single family homes and some low rise rental units. The Planning and Urban Design Report prepared by the IBI Group does reference the proposed design coming out of the Charette from a few years ago. I did attend the session but did not approve of the design that came out of the afternoon. I would only have approved of a 6 modern storey building. I also did not agree with unduly burdening a developer with having to save the old 4 storey building as the expense would have been considerable.

Loss of Privacy to my backyard

The higher the building, means there will be more units and the loss of morning sun into my house and in my yard. My biggest concern is the loss of privacy to my backyard.

I spend a considerable amount of time in my backyard from May to October. I have extensive gardens and take on new projects each year. A large part of the value comes from the privacy I have.

The proposed design by Shannondale will have **53 units (2nd floor through to 8th floor) that will have access to view my backyard once the existing trees are removed.** Even if/when new trees are planted **I lose my privacy for the next 10 to 15 years** and possibly never depending on the height of the building and where trees are planted. The loss of privacy will be a considerable loss to the value of my backyard. I'm not willing to agree to lose that value.

How do we balance Shannondale's right to profit with my privacy?

I appreciate Shannondale's right to make a profit on the development but that should not come at the permanent loss of my privacy or the loss of privacy to my neighbour's yards.

Parking

I have some secondary concerns about parking. I am worried that so few visitor parking spaces will create an issue of many cars using Stahl Ave to park. It's a little dead end street that is very narrow. This becomes a huge issue in the winter. If someone parks to the North east side of my driveway I cannot get out of my driveway because snow along the side of the road narrows the street so only a single car can get through. I would like the City to consider making Stahl Ave a No Parking street through the winter months.

Thanks,
Tanya Wright
~

Craig Dumart

From: Juliane vonWesterholt
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2021 9:45 AM
To: 'Craig Dumart';
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposed development of 152 Shanley

Good morning Mr. Richbell,

I can confirm that the city has received your email with your comments and concerns. Thank you.
Sincerely,

Juliane vonWesterholt
Senior Planner
City of Kitchener

From: Nick Richbell
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2021 9:24 AM
To: Sarah Marsh <Sarah.Marsh@kitchener.ca>; Craig Dumart <Craig.Dumart@kitchener.ca>; Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposed development of 152 Shanley

Good morning,

Please can you acknowledge receipt of this email.

Thank you.

On Mon., Jun. 21, 2021, 7:37 a.m. Nick Richbell <nickrichbell@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Good morning,

I write with regards to the proposed development of 152 Shanley Street, Kitchener. I am a resident on Stah Avenue.

Firstly, I note that it was very disappointing that the developer was allowed to run over their allotted presentation time on June 17th. It was even more disappointing when the Q&A section that was being recorded, was cut short to move to the "open dialogue" section that was not recorded.

We oppose this proposed development as it was presented.

Why are there no business spaces on the first floor? We were told that residential units could not be placed there owing to the nature of the contaminated ground.

The proposed building does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. Your senior planner noted that "character does not mean the same as". That's correct, however, this modern building is going to be an eyesore and zero historical research has been made by the developer.

What year was the traffic study conducted that was mentioned by your staff member? I can tell you that if you stand on Duke, Shanley, Louisa, or Wilhelm, you will see people speed along the streets like on a race track. I won't even start about the dangerous crossing at Shanley/Waterloo.

When asked about amenities the developer mentioned they may put in a ping pong table. Was he joking?

Why is a building of 100% rental being considered?

Have your team members stood in my front yard and reviewed the issue of less to zero sunlight coming on my property?

Once again, the City of Kitchener let a building get to the point where the only option was to demolish it.

This development is going to destroy our neighborhood, plain and simple.

Sincerely,

Nicholas (Nick) Richbell

Craig Dumart

From: meredith
Sent: Sunday, June 06, 2021 6:05 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley Street Plan and Zoning Application

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Juliane -

My name is Meredith Pope and I reside property will back onto the proposed residential building at the address above (on its west side).

I support a residential building at the site in question, under a R8 re-zoning for the 152 Shanley property only. I understand the challenges in place with the remediation of the site.

I have several concerns regarding the 2 applications (OPA21/002/S/JVW and ZBA21/004/S/JVW), for simplicity I have listed them below:

1. Re-zoning of the 134 Shanley residential property will eliminate a well-maintained long standing single family century home, to create a paved driveway. This is not consistent with the goals of our community.

2. Parking ratio, and density/massing of units -- the modification of the proposed R8 plan is excessive

- the FSR increase to 3 and the DRASTICALLY poor parking ratio of 0.74 parking spaces / unit is unacceptable
- parking as per the R8 zoning is 220 spaces vs the 128 proposed. Although I am optimistic regarding the transit hub and use of cycling/walking etc -- almost 100 fewer spots than mandated by current zoning woefully provides for the proposed tenants -- I would expect this will lead to marked street parking on our neighbourhood roads which will impact our own use of these street spots and also increase vehicular traffic in our area (ie down our dead end street)
- adding > 172 new residents to our low density residential community will have a vast impact on our community with minimal additional value (no retail on floor 1, removal of trees, no public spaces we can access and the impact of > 172 new residents on our small local parks and trails).
- majority single bedroom rental units: I expect this will lead to a high proportion of short term rentals/airbnbs and possibly high turn-over of tenants who may not value or contribute to our community to the same degree as families/longer term owners. I am concerned about the "upkeep" of the terraces/patios etc

3. Height of building

- both a modification to the zoning (to R8) AND an additional allowance to 27m seems excessive in the heart of a residential community. Although the step backs are visually appealing, adding private terraces simply change the means by which renters will now look into our backyards, and these terraces increase the risk of tenant noise and eye-sore issues (laundry/bikes/storage). Can you provide examples of other residential areas where this zoning exception has been provided? I feel the height of the building, even in its "L shape" is excessive and an undue impact on the privacy of our backyards and impact on shadows of our yards.
- as the community had previously expressed, a building height of 6 standard stories in an L shape with the bulk towards the Shanley/Duke intersection would be an acceptable balance of the developers challenges/financial goals and impact on our properties

4. Traffic Study and Safety of Duke/Shanley intersection

- the traffic study was completed during the provincial "Emergency Lockdown" measures due to the ongoing COVID pandemic. At this time there were also multiple signs in the area (ie: on Waterloo St, Duke St, Wilhelm) indicating the roads were closed to local traffic only. I do not expect these factors have resulted in a reliable traffic study, and the conclusions drawn from this study would not be reliable in their interpretation. I am significantly concerned with the true impact of this development on our traffic volumes post-pandemic.
- given the unusual nature of the Duke/Shanley intersection (limited visibility for traffic travelling on Duke towards Wilhem, stop for traffic only on Shanley, unfortunately the speed at which vehicles travel on Duke) I would be concerned for pedestrian safety at this intersection with increased traffic. Is there consideration being given to modify this intersection (ie 3 way stop)?

5. Transformer location

- as per plans a large "transformer" will be located immediately adjacent to the back of our lot. What information can you provide regarding the noise this will cause, and the height of this structure and any possible odour/gas production? The provided noise assessment references only a belt drive exhaust fan, a cooler and a generator.

6. Tree removal

- the removal of the significant canopy at the rear aspect of the lot will serve to further impact the privacy of our backyards. I appreciate the effort made to avoid damage to trees and also compensate for tree loss for properties affected, however these measures cannot ameliorate the impact a 27m height building would have on our privacy.

Questions

- What is the proposed timeline of site construction?
- The proposal package makes reference to both a Shanley and Duke street vehicle access. It is unclear how removal of the Duke street access (as per drawings) will impact the conclusions drawn in the traffic study/wind study etc.
- Will there be a plan for parking for the numerous construction vehicles and personal vehicles of workers on site?

I will attend the June 17th "Neighbourhood meeting" but would also like to be added to your contact list for any updates regarding this property moving forward.

Thank you for your consideration -

Meredith Pope

Craig Dumart

From: Nick Richbell
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 2:08 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley Street West

Dear Juliane,

I write in response to your letter dated May 10, 2021 with respect to the requested permission to develop an 8-storey building with a total of 172 residential dwelling units.

We do not agree with this project.

This will destroy our neighborhood.

Traffic is already a serious concern. There is no parking. The local park is neglected. We do NOT need 172 new condos in this area. This will not bring anything good to the neighborhood.

How many new condo buildings does this city need? What kickbacks will the city be taking to approve this project? It's about time the City put its foot down and did what's right for its citizens!!

Nicholas Richbell

Craig Dumart

From: victoria maxwell <vmaxwell@cityofvancouver.ca>
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 12:43 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello:

this will not be a supportive email to your proposal.

The proposed site would normally be occupied by 10 houses? Those 10 houses may have as many as 2 cars each (20). What you are proposing is an increase of 172 and possibly 344 cars. Where would those cars be exiting and entering the underground parking lot? The streets are very narrow in our neighbourhood and we are already trying to reduce traffic and speeds. Is this not counterproductive?

One hundred and seventy-two units in an area that would normally house 10 family homes would mean 22 apartments on each floor. Is that correct? We have rental units in the neighbourhood on that block that already cause extraordinary noise in the summer evenings. Were family apartments considered with two and three bedrooms? A rooftop garden is a lovely concept providing parties are not allowed.

Where is the waste from 172 units going to be stored and removed? I can't imagine the shocking experience of an across-the-road neighbour having as many as 8 times 8 balconies (64) all letting out onto your front veranda. Yes, I have grave concerns that the residents would blend in with the quiet dog walking neighbourhood. So, that makes me think. Would there be 172 dogs and goodness knows how many cats occupying this tiny property?

The concept sketch is highly deceiving. Wide boulevards and open vistas do not capture the actual physical situation. This is an ill conceived project for this site. Townhouses would be a much more reasonable blend into the neighbourhood.

Victoria Maxwell

Craig Dumart

From: Caleb Neumeister
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 7:23 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 152 Shanley comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Juliane,

I live at [redacted] is site and I often sit on my front porch and wonder how things will change with this new build. I've lived here for 5 years now and I was so happy to see the old electrohome building come down! Anything will be a welcome change from that decrepit eyesore.

I have read all the studies and information posted about Shannondales build on the city of Kitchener's website and I like what I see. The building won't cast a shadow on my house, traffic will not increase exponentially and the building itself won't add any noise to the neighborhood. I am mildly concerned about how adding that many people and density to my corner will affect the peaceful feel of the area. It seems like a lot of units to add to a small peice of land, but I guess that's what living in a city means.

Also, from what I was hearing before was that the ground was contaminated and residential units couldn't be on the main floor. Has this information changed?

I would love to be kept in the loop of future meetings and progress reports of this process and I appreciate the chance to voice my opinion.

Thanks,
Caleb

Craig Dumart

From:
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 2:15 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Cc: Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 152 Shanley St. - Our comments to Proposed Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Juliane,

We apologize for the late e-mail, we thought today was the last day for comments.

My husband Richard FitzGerald and I, Claudia FitzGerald, live at [REDACTED] We have lived in our beautiful Century Home (1886 or earlier) for 27 years. We love our neighbourhood and feel proud to leave here, great community, friendly and respectful neighbours.

We are very concerned about the proposed 8 storeys building, we were told in a meeting with Shannondale at City Hall that the building wouldn't be much taller than previous building, possibly 5-6 storeys. This would overcome our neighbourhood, and a huge increase in people leaving in a small area, we already deal with so much traffic on our street, we have called numerous times the City of Kitchener Transportation Dept., about cars driving so fast, that people in wheel chairs, scooters, and ourselves leaving or coming into our driveway have been almost hit by speeding cars.

Another concern we have is the proposed setback, it's too close to the sidewalk and it should be the same as the houses in neighborhood. Almost all of our homes have front porch, where we sit and socialized with passing neighbours.

We are also concerned about the water drain, we don't want our homes to be flooded constantly by so much water coming from there.

Please help us to preserve our beautiful neighborhood!

Sincerely,

Rich & Claudia FitzGerald

Craig Dumart

From: Katherine Spring >
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 1:18 AM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Cc: Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 152 Shanley St.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

I apologize for the tardy submission of my comments regarding the proposal for development at 152 Shanley St. I hope that my submission can still be accounted for.

As a Kitchener resident who lives 3.5 blocks away from the development site at 152 Shanley St., I write to express my strongest opposition to the proposal for the construction of an 8-storey building on the lot.

The high-density capacity of the proposed building -- 172 residential units -- will increase automobile traffic to dangerous levels. The site is located at the intersection of two relatively quiet residential streets that are used heavily by pedestrians and cyclists, including young children like mine who walk to/from school during rush hours. The increased traffic around that corner of Duke St. and Shanley St. will put the safety of our community members at serious risk.

In addition, the proposed height of 8 storeys represents a 33% increase to the 6-storey building envisioned by the neighbourhood in 2018. This scale will further violate the aesthetic integrity and architectural consistency of one of Kitchener's most treasured neighbourhoods, which consists primarily of single-family homes and 2- or 2.5-storey residences.

Lastly, it's worth noting that the proposal does not reflect the neighbourhood vision statement in other ways, e.g., it lacks amenity space, it fails to dedicate space to community or retail use, and it lacks elements that reflect the heritage value of the site and the neighbourhood.

While I recognize and appreciate the urgent need for more housing in KW, a disruption to our community through the construction of an 8-storey building, which will tower over residential homes and increase traffic to dangerous levels, is not a viable solution.

I oppose the proposal in the strongest possible terms and urge the members of City Council to do the same. At that corner, 6 storeys is more than enough!

Thank you for your time.

Best wishes,

Katherine Spring

Craig Dumart

From: Catherine Owens < >
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 9:59 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt; Craig Dumart
Cc: Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 152 Shanley Street - Traffic issues

Glad to see a number of the traffic planning staff on the call/public meeting tonight re the Shannondale build.

Just to keep you in the loop

Three members of the Mt. Hope Breithaupt Park Development Committee have a meeting with Barry Cronkite next week to discuss all these traffic issues in Midtown. Our focus is on the portion of Ward 10 bounded by Victoria/King/Weber/Union so our discussions with Barry will cover the 152 Shanley Site. We have asked for a larger, more comprehensive traffic review due to Station Park, Google, Spur Line (Moore Ave in Waterloo), the Transit Hub (closure of Duke – and previously Waterloo St.), the proposed new highway 7 impacting Wellington

I know that ultimately you will be addressing these traffic concerns specific to the build but I just wanted to let you know that we have a bit of a “grass roots” investigation already occurring with the City.

Craig Dumart

From: Kathy Mortimer
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:34 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Cc: Tara Zhang; Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 152 Shanley Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Juliane,

I am sending you my comments, in your role as lead planner for the development at 152 Shanley Street in Kitchener. I've copied Tara to indicate I'd like to register for the presentation on the site June 17. Sarah, I've included you as I heard you would like to know what comments are being submitted by residents.

In my lifetime, Canada and the US have lost 1 in 3 birds. My concern for the development at 152 Shanley is the extent to which it will be "Bird Safe". As you may know, a growing number of Canadian cities (Ottawa, Markham, Toronto, Calgary) have guidelines or requirements for bird safe buildings, based on the [CSA Bird-Friendly Building Design Standard](#). Bird collisions are the second largest cause of bird mortality in Canada, after predation by household and feral cats. Canadian research estimates that **25 million birds** are killed **each year** as a result of collisions with windows and other structures.

Glass, whether reflective or clear, is effectively invisible to birds. If windows reflect sky or vegetation, birds perceive only the reflected image, not the window itself. Any human-built structure that incorporates glass or reflective building material into the design can cause bird collisions during the day. Artificial light also acts as a threat to birds. Many birds migrate at night, relying on natural cues for guidance on direction including stars and moonlight. Artificial light can obscure those natural signals and cause birds to become disoriented or panic, often leading to a collision. Many of the new developments going up in Waterloo Region will pose a serious risk to our bird population, and the City can and should take steps to ensure these buildings are made to be bird safe.

Both Shannondale, the developer, and Superkul, the architect have written to me that they are aware of the requirements to make buildings bird safe, but know Kitchener has no requirements or guidelines in place. Were this building going up in a city with requirements, it would be designed to not kill birds.

I did a week of "bird patrol" in May, near the end of spring migration, and in 7 days, found 10 birds that struck a building. 6 of these were migratory birds, and one was a species listed as threatened in the Federal Species At Risk legislation. Kitchener needs to take steps to protect the remaining bird population. I encourage you to recommend bird-safe design or mitigation measures for the building. There are many resources online to learn more, I recommend birdsafeca.ca as a starting point.

Warm regards
Kathy Mortimer

Craig Dumart

From: Tricia Dumais
Sent: Monday, June 07, 2021 12:08 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 152 Shanley Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you for the invitation for neighbours to address the Neighbourhood Vision Statement items not reflected in the proposed development. I support development and density and look forward to additional housing. The drawings do not appear to reflect the actual street size but I do appreciate getting a sense of what this building will look like.

I understand from speaking with neighbours that 8 floors rather than 6 floors may not impact the height of the building as the ceilings will be lower. More floors will likely mean more residents. I was therefore disappointed to note that there is no ground floor retail, service or community use and no outdoor amenity space for the neighbourhood. Additional people will mean that there is a need for some of these things.

I am concerned for the people living beside 152 Shanley as the entrance for the parking will mean that they have traffic entering and exiting the parking garage regularly. A second entrance /exit may be beneficial.

Thank you for considering our concerns and advocating on our behalf.

Regards,
Tricia Dumais

Craig Dumart

From: Elanor Waslander n>
Sent: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:05 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for 134-152 Shanley Street Development (official version)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Juliane von Westerholt,

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the development going in at 134-152 Shanley street. I am part of a local community group that has some concerns. The names included on this comment all agree on the requests below and thought sending one email would be more efficient. You may follow up with each individual or as a group.

Height of building: Our primary concern, by far, is the height of the building. We would request that the total height of the building be lowered to 5-6 storeys. This is because all the surrounding homes are maximum 3 storey. An eight storey building would tower above the houses and dramatically change the feel of the neighbourhood. It would also open the door for other taller developments to come into the area. If only one measure in this list is considered, we would strongly make this our top priority.

Improvement of road safety: The intersections at Duke and Louisa and at Shanley and Duke are incredibly unsafe. The surrounding intersections are 4 way stops, but these intersections are 2 way stops which is confusing. This is incredibly dangerous for drivers and pedestrians alike. With the increase in volume anticipated with this new development, these intersections need to be addressed. Children often cross at these intersections to get to Duke street park. A traffic light, 4 way stop, or crosswalk flashing light needs to be added to these two intersections.

Units: We would like to see a portion or all of the units in the building be buy-sell units to encourage long lasting tenants that will contribute to the vibrant Mount Hope neighbourhood. We would also like to see a portion be allocated to affordable housing so that the neighbourhood can remain diverse.

Parking: The request for relief from setbacks should be denied because the development only accounts for 0.72 parking spaces per unit. The overflow parking on Shanley will drastically change the flow of traffic in the area and cause additional issues for road safety. The city will need the extra space to accommodate parking and foot traffic. We request the alternative of wider sidewalks as seen at the on Louisa leading into King where a condo is located.

Community green space: Shannondale Development prides itself on being a community-minded developer, however this plan does not include any new infrastructure for the community. We request that the city and/or developer anticipate the increase in volume of children, families, young adults and dog-owners to the area and add a green space to the current project. In lieu of adding it to the existing design, improved infrastructure to Duke street park (without the removal of established trees) would help provide a healthy green space for the incoming tenants and owners (this could include: additional seating, splash pad, naturescaping the green space with native pollinators, naturalized playground features).

Thank you for considering our comments. Please let us know if we can clarify anything shared above.

Sincerely,

Elanor, Carol, Josh, Tanya and Gary

City of Kitchener
200 King Street West
Kitchener, ON, N2G 4V6

June 10, 2021

Ms. von Westerholt,

First of all, I agree that the development of the subject property at 152 Shanley Street should take place. I'm purposely excluding 134 Shanley Street for the moment and will discuss it below.

As with all the friends and neighbours we know in the area, we are opposed to the proposed building as recently laid out by the developer. The height is unreasonably high for our neighbourhood of low and medium rise dwellings, and the number of units proposed is mind-boggling.

We are not opposed to the development, as it has to occur to accommodate the influx of new residents which will help this city prosper. However, as a city and region, we do need to listen to the constituents of the affected area. I'm sure that none of the city staff nor elected officials would like the proposed building within 100m of their residence. Additionally, I would like to know how the proposed building and 172 units therein will affect the value of my home. I'm fairly certain it will negatively affect any future sale price. Again, how would city staff or our elected officials react to a decrease in property value? They wouldn't be happy. This is not nimbyism; this is about maintaining the integrity of our neighbourhood.

Below are some of my comments referencing specific documents as part of the application to the city. These are by no means in order of priority.

File 619929_152Shanley_ZBA_App

[...]

9. Proposed Zoning By-law Designation Chart

1. The request to allow maximum building height proposed is not acceptable to the neighbourhood. The charrette held in April 28, 2018, of which I was a part, proposed a building of **no greater than 6 stories**. Stahl Ave residents were firmly opposed to even a 6-storey building. An eight-storey building is not suitable for this area, Shanley and Duke. The developer's current proposal is more suited to a green field build, not a build in an existing and established neighbourhood of older homes.

2. Any relief from reducing existing set-backs should **not be granted** by city staff. If anything they should be **increased**. Any set back should be **grass** and not concrete.

3. As to parking, 0.74 spots is not practical and would cause excessive street parking, of which there is very little. The assumption that the residents of this proposed structure would not have a vehicle I

believe is incorrect. The lack of parking spots is more suitable to Toronto when residents have ample access to public transit. Not so for Kitchener. Street parking is already an issue with Shanley Street being narrow to begin with. Parking relief should not be granted. Also, has consideration been given to eliminating parking on Shanley Street between Duke and Waterloo altogether?

10. Site Conditions Application for Zoning By-law Amendment

b) Demolition of a detached dwelling at 134 Shanley. (Part of Lot 446 Registered Plan 376). This dwelling is in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood. It is important to **keep** this structure as it represents a home for a family, not a parking lot. The destruction of this structure would be a disappointment. This house is one of the original dwellings on this part of Shanley Street. If the city is determined to allow the tear-down, this area should be green space. The fact that the sale of this home was private between the owner and Shannondale could be an indication of back-room dealing.

g) The construction of an 8-storey apartment building with 130 single bedroom apartments and the balance two bedrooms would be better suited to the Toronto area. Shoehorning in that many residents would overwhelm the existing neighbourhood. The proposal of an apartment complex at 152 Shanley was not even considered at the charrette. Reducing the number of single bedroom apartments and increasing the number of multi-bedroom apartments would be preferable. Even freehold apartments would be acceptable. Right now, after 2 decades of recovery from crack houses and derelict buildings, this neighbourhood is bringing families into the area. Affordable housing, as indicated in the charrette, is also desirable. Freehold townhouses, like those on Louisa east of Margaret (Victoria Commons) would be another ideal solution.

Referring back to the charrette again, "any new building [sh]ould enhance the public realm along Shanley Street" and Stahl and Duke Streets.

Drawing A020

These renderings are misleading in that the elevations provided give a false impression of a low density neighbourhood, but this is not the case. The omission of the surrounding structures provides a view biased towards the design of the proposed building. Wide and open streets do not exist on Shanley and Duke Streets.

Drawing A 030

Provides a good understanding of how the proposed building will cast shadow through the day and at June and September. I am sure, however, that the residents on Duke Street and Stahl Ave will not be enthused about a permanent shadow across their yards in the evening and afternoon respectively. This was brought up in the charrette. I also see this in a petition to Tina Malone-Wright.

Drawing A050

In reviewing the ground level plans, I see several points of issue.

1. The location of the vehicle entrance to the proposed building. An entrance off Shanley street is absolutely a non-starter. The charrette clearly indicated an entrance off Duke Street. The city, this year and last year, has put "local traffic only" signs on the road for Shanley and Duke. Is this proposed entrance on Shanley not running counter to the "local traffic only" signs? How is this entrance going to reduce traffic on Shanley? It will not!
2. What about the proposed closure of Duke Street at Victoria because of the new transit hub development? Was the resulting change in traffic flow taken into consideration by the city and/or the developer? And the Duke Street dogleg at Shanley with not one but two stop signs? How does a parking entrance off Shanley make any sense?
3. The location of the exhaust air venting is not acceptable. Why would this venting be placed within 15 feet of a residence? I would propose that this venting go in the above ground parking area.

File 619929_Transportation Impact, and Transportation Demand Mana and Parking Justification Study Report 152 Shanley Salvini Consulting March 2021

I will again refer to the "local traffic only" initiative. How is this intent by the city to reduce traffic on Shanley and Duke Streets aligning with the "62 and 76 vehicle trips?" The neighbourhood is not suited to this level of traffic. The authors of this report do not live here and have no feel for suitable levels of traffic.

The statement of a speed limit of 50km/h is correct but in many cases drivers race to get from stop sign to the next.

This increase in vehicular traffic is a fatality waiting to happen.

IBI Group Final Report

Section 2.2 Neighbourhood Context

"The subject lands are located within the midtown area of the City of Kitchener, which is an area comprised mainly of low and medium density residential development."

The proposed building does not fit with this description. The developer's own consultant described this area perfectly.

I would respectfully request that the city make every possible effort to reject the zoning by-law amendments and have the developer go back to the drawing board, using the charrette

recommendations as a guide. I also request that the city take note of how it treats its rate payers. An out-of-city developer has no stake in this city other than monetary, while we as residents have a long-term interest.

With regards,

David Johnston

Cheryl Massey

cc: Sarah Marsh

Craig Dumart

From: Matthew Buckley n>
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 2:27 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt; Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Development on 152 Shanley

Hi Juliane and Sarah,

I am reaching out to provide some feedback on the Shanley development that is proposed in the neighbourhood right now. I will be attending the meeting and look forward to hearing how the development plans to intertwine with the existing community stakeholders.

Development is a priority

- I believe that developing this property is in the best interests of the community, that being said I will get into some details that I am less enthused about with regard to the current proposal.

1. Amendments to the zoning regulations as set out by the city

- FSR - Maximum suggested is 2.0 and on application this is 3.0
- Height - 24m recommended by the city, proposed at 27.7m
- Parking - 128 spots for 172 units...183 is recommended by the city

*Other units in the area have found the current regulations profitable enough to develop and even retrofit. Could you provide me with an example of a building similar to the one that is being proposed in this area?

2. Housing For All

"Housing has become a key driver of growing socioeconomic inequality, increasing wealth for those who own housing and driving those who do not into greater debt and poverty."

- 172 Rental Units suggested while neighbourhood consultation suggested 143 Units - 130 are 1 bedroom units (75.6%) and 42 (24.4%) are two bedroom units
- What are the rental unit prices? If in line with the city's plan, these should be at \$1300/month or less

Confusion

Parking seems all wrong - The new Zoning By-law (2019-051) requirement would be 1.0 spaces per unit for residents and 0.10 spaces per unit for visitors for a total of 1.2 spaces per unit or 189 spaces. PARTS Policy doc is 0.9.

--> *The proposal includes 128 parking spaces or 0.74 spaces per unit including visitor parking --> 0.64 spaces per unit for residents.*

Bicycles - The document makes it seem as though they are generous by providing 96 bike spots when the current zoning requests 50% of the 183 required parking spaces according to the Architectural Plan Table.

Overall...

This feels like a great opportunity for the developer if the amendments go through as the profitability of the property would be maximized. Increase the height, decrease the parking, add more rental units. On the citizen side, this feels like a gross overreach to ask for amendments to the city developed regulations for a building that is on no major roads and has other neighborhood condo developments that are profitable within the set regulations.

My guiding questions are WHY do these regulations need to be changed and WHO does it help by changing them? Neither answer involves the improvement of the community.

Looking forward to the meeting,

Craig Dumart

From: Leila S
Sent: Sunday, June 06, 2021 9:15 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Input on 134-152 Shanley Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the city planner's,

We the owners o concerns with the development proposal by Shannondale. When we purchased our property we had a 4 story unused building with our neighbors at a buffer. We would most likely have not bought our property had there been a building with a parking lot next to it. The old structure was 4 stories tall and built away from our property. Building a structure twice as tall and closer to our property will severely impact our privacy while using our backyard. We purchased our property in a relatively quiet neighborhood, we do not like the idea of having potentially dozens of people able to watch us from above while we are trying to enjoy our backyard. We enjoy a street with quiet calm traffic and adding 172 units would drastically change that. For 2 years the City of Kitchener has been trying to calm traffic in our area with slow street signs and closed street signs. How would the addition of this many units affect that program? We appose allowing relief for parking spots, as it will likely just cause the surrounding streets to end up filled with parked cars.

We have concerns about the noise, dust, and vibration from this development and how it will affect the structural stability of our 100 plus year old house being built so close to our existing structure. The proposal shows underground parking vents near the front corner of our house, will this release exhaust fumes near the front windows of our residence? Also how much noise will these vents produce? Reading through the transportation impact we are quite upset by the idea of 60-70 cars coming and going at peak morning and evening hour, that is a huge increase in traffic for our street.

We would like to see no more than 4 stories built to the standard setbacks and density requirements. We would also require a very tall solid fence for privacy regardless of the size of the new structure from the front of the property to the rear. We also find that the attached concept images appear stretched and compressed to make the new development appear lower than a 8 story structure would actually be in our neighbourhood. The view angle of the attached concept image appears as if it is being viewed from a distance away, not as if someone were to view it from the actual street corner or sidewalk. The images of the cars on the street show a much wider street than it actually is. This proposed concept image would be a tower over all the houses in the area. As owners of the now adjoining property we would like to be able to engage more in discussions with the developer. At this time we have had no direct contact with them. This development now directly affects our day to day life and we are requesting compensation and understanding of how this will affect our future life living a

Leila Szasz & Wayne Kropf

Craig Dumart

From: Ted Parkinson
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 9:13 AM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt; Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] My comments on 152 Shanley application

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Juliane: I have been writing about this property for over 10 years on our mhbpna.org website. It has been a long and winding road that brings us here. There were many times that neighbours wondered what disruptive concept the owner would introduce (like unlicensed businesses), if people were sleeping in the building, or if it was falling apart. It was strange and exciting to see it finally torn down and to have an experienced developer produce long term plans for removing the contamination and developing something that looks nice for that location.

I attended the charrette the City of Kitchener organized and was pretty happy with how well it was done. The city presented a very realistic concept of how large a building would be (based on the Midtown Lofts footprint). And this building's design looks far nicer than that square grey structure. But I know many people did not consider what the footprint would really be for a building to make money on the investment of removing contamination and building units.

The current size is not surprising for anyone who attended the charrette or reads the city's Vision Statement. And the design is quite good for reducing shade in the surrounding area. It seems like an excellent design for that spot and minimizes its impact on the surrounding area.

Shannondale Development has been very responsive to neighbours and held a meeting at city hall and has been good at engagement. They have also built a very nice fence and supported the mural project which was very positive. I am also pleasantly surprised they claim the units will be apartments. There is a real lack of apartment space in Kitchener, and in our neighbourhood.

So in a general sense, this seems like the best outcome we could have imagined: a responsible developer is engaged in the community and is pushing through the timeline to finally build something positive on that land. I know some people living close to the structure are upset about how tall it will be, but I think we knew more or less, what size it would be for years. The city made that clear in the Vision Statement and you can only look around at every other condo development. The streetscape will change and that is all part of growth and increasing density in the core areas of the city.

Many of us were surprised that the house (134 Shanley) was sold and will be torn down. It is always unfortunate that a century old house gets razed for the sake of 'progress'. One part of Shannondale's Planning Justification and Urban Design Report rings a little false. The Vision Statement says "The Site's Heritage value will be respected". And their response is to say that the building had to be torn down and they will reuse some bricks. That may be true, but it completely ignores the fact they are tearing down a historic house. There are also people in the neighbourhood who know the history of that house and I would hope the developer might create a plaque to acknowledge that history and to mark the loss of the house.

My main objection is not to this development in particular, but to the way the city implements traffic studies. I read the traffic study for this development and everything was fine and, yes, the traffic would be 'within the limits' of our kind of neighbourhood. But with everything in isolation, ALL these studies say "yep, our development is just fine and fits right in." The City of Kitchener **consistently ignores the other developments around an area** and what traffic they might cause in *combination* with the current proposal. You may have heard about this "Station Park" place going up with thousands of people scheduled to live there? Wellington will be a major access to it (and to 152 Shanley). I'm sure

people will exit at Wilhelm and drive along Shanley as Wellington gets more chocked with traffic. You have already closed Waterloo, and soon Duke will be closed as well, so there will be fewer entry points. I expect to see traffic increase on Duke from the Waterloo side. And eventually the Transit Hub will start building condos as well. **Our neighbourhood should be a PERMANENT "slow streets" area with a posted (and enforced) 30K speed limit.** And the city needs to change their traffic studies and analysis to include ALL developments in different areas, otherwise you are just hiding your heads in the sand and hoping problems go away.

Also, I hope Shannondale will consider having one or two spots for 'care share' type of vehicles and also external electric charging stations.

So, overall I am positive about this development down the street from our house and hope the city can be actively engaged in minimizing the traffic in our area so we remain a friendly and relatively quiet neighbourhood.

Ted Parkinson

Craig Dumart

From: rick e
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 3:23 PM
To: Julianne vonWesterholt
Cc: Coronado
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Official plan amendment application OPA21/002/S/JVW and zoning bylaw Amendment application ZBA21/004/S/JVW

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Julianne Vonwesterholt ,

As the owner and it also being the home I grew up in and having been in my family for 70 years as well as being one of the most affected property owners to be impacted by these applications. My position is definitely against this application as submitted.

1) this type of proposed density and building height in a single family home area would take away from the cultural and heritage significance and look and feel of the area .

This type of proposed development is more suited to a Weber street , King Street , Victoria Street area , not Shanley, Duke and Wilhelm Streets

2) with 172 units more people would be living on that small site than currently live on twenty plus city blocks around the proposed development , and with the current city of Kitchener crews installing no through traffic and slow down signage yearly in the area, this type of density would make a mockery of what is already known about this area.

3) the area has narrow streets and already has a chronic lack of on street parking, this density increase as proposed would be devastating to the current property owners and their visitors

4) The proposed 8 storey building would eliminate all afternoon and evening sun from my property , casting it in a virtually perpetual shadow. With winter ice staying on the driveway and sidewalk continuously throughout the cold season, the streets are so narrow that at times there is only a single lane open after city road crews plow the streets after a winter snow storm.

5) this type of density and height would also have a significant negative impact on my property value , due to the items noted above.

I agree with development of the site , however because of the shadow , density , narrow infrastructure , lack of current area road parking and the current character of the area ; an 8 storey building is unquestionably out of line , any development should be limited to not more than one storey higher than the existing homes height which would be 3 storeys , providing 64 or 65 units , with this type of development still at 5 or 6 times current density , there would be adequate site parking and while increasing density it would generally keep with the character and historical significance of the blue collar heritage of the single family surrounding homes .

Kind regards
Richard Ejsymont

Sent from my iPad

Craig Dumart

From: Joanne Carey-Neath
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 1:38 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPA 21/002/S/JVW 134-172

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Juliane

Re: OPA 21/002/S/JVW 134-152 Shanley St

Please accept this email as an emphatic **NO** to the request to change the Official Plan and Zoning bylaw for this property on Shanley.

We have lived in this neighbourhood for 40 years and have seen endless changes. Some we embraced and others were eyebrow raisers.

This particular property has been an albatross for our neighbourhood and the City for numerous years with neglect and lack of community pride by its previous owners and the city. The structure was left to deteriorate to the point that destruction was necessary. During those years of neglect it was an eyesore and a safety hazard.

Kitchener is notorious in destroying historical and heritage properties and neighbourhoods.

At one time the plan was to turn the electrohome 4 story building into an apartment unit but this was turned down due to lack of parking and the ability of the infrastructure (roads, water, power) to handle this smaller project.

We are not opposed to gentrification of neighbourhoods as long as it is not solely for gain of the private owner. We would expect that neighbours would gain some benefits.

In this case adding 172 units 8 stories high appears to be a win (for owners) - lose (residents) situation.

This building will totally rob the surrounding households of the character, richness and old neighbourhood charm presently offered to its residents. It will add so much more congestion, traffic and pressures to the infrastructure.

At 8 stories high it will dwarf the surrounding houses blocking sun, night skies, bird paths and will significantly affect the privacy, landscape and aesthetics of the surrounding properties.

Mount Hope Breithaupt neighbourhood has accepted its fair share of infill and it's time to put on the brakes and stop catering to profit seeking developers.

I vote for this plan to be denied.

Joanne Neath
Patrick Koch

Craig Dumart

From: Denis Pellerin
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 2:03 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposal for 134-152 Shanley

Hi Juliane. To rehabilitate the old Electrohome property is a great opportunity for our neighbourhood. We live at
I personally know the property well and my wife Chris is familiar with it too.
We are in favour of this development.

Denis Pellerin
Chris Balcerczyk

Craig Dumart

From: GERALDINE PAQUETTE
Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021 6:34 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] re:134-152 Shanley Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sorry that it has taken me so long to respond. I hope I am not to late. I have no interest in seeing a building of that size going up in our neighborhood. We are a very quiet area with small streets and not much traffic. We raise our kids and walk our dogs without fear. A building of that size would overwhelm our small streets bringing way to much traffic and congestion. There are no buildings of that size in this area. We all live in private homes. Many of us including myself are older and want to be able to enjoy our retirement without loud noise and traffic.

Geraldine Paquette

Craig Dumart

From: meredith
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 2021 4:58 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 134-152 Shanley Street Plan and Zoning Application

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Juliane -

Just wanted to ensure you've received this correspondence -

Sorry to bother,

Meredith

On Sun, Jun 6, 2021 at 6:04 PM meredith
Hi Juliane -

wrote:

My name is Meredith Pope and I reside (owner) at
the proposed residential building at the address above (on its west side).

My property will back onto

I support a residential building at the site in question, under a R8 re-zoning for the 152 Shanley property only. I understand the challenges in place with the remediation of the site.

I have several concerns regarding the 2 applications (OPA21/002/S/JVW and ZBA21/004/S/JVW), for simplicity I have listed them below:

1. Re-zoning of the 134 Shanley residential property will eliminate a well-maintained long standing single family century home, to create a paved driveway. This is not consistent with the goals of our community.

2. Parking ratio, and density/massing of units -- the modification of the proposed R8 plan is excessive

- the FSR increase to 3 and the DRASTICALLY poor parking ratio of 0.74 parking spaces / unit is unacceptable
- parking as per the R8 zoning is 220 spaces vs the 128 proposed. Although I am optimistic regarding the transit hub and use of cycling/walking etc -- almost 100 fewer spots than mandated by current zoning woefully provides for the proposed tenants -- I would expect this will lead to marked street parking on our neighbourhood roads which will impact our own use of these street spots and also increase vehicular traffic in our area (ie down our dead end street)
- adding > 172 new residents to our low density residential community will have a vast impact on our community with minimal additional value (no retail on floor 1, removal of trees, no public spaces we can access and the impact of > 172 new residents on our small local parks and trails).
- majority single bedroom rental units: I expect this will lead to a high proportion of short term rentals/airbnbs and possibly high turn-over of tenants who may not value or contribute to our community to the same degree as families/longer term owners. I am concerned about the "upkeep" of the terraces/patios etc

3. Height of building

- both a modification to the zoning (to R8) AND an additional allowance to 27m seems excessive in the heart of a residential community. Although the step backs are visually appealing, adding private terraces simply change the means by which renters will now look into our backyards, and these terraces increase the risk of tenant noise and eye-

sore issues (laundry/bikes/storage). Can you provide examples of other residential areas where this zoning exception has been provided? I feel the height of the building, even in its "L shape" is excessive and an undue impact on the privacy of our backyards and impact on shadows of our yards.

- as the community had previously expressed, a building height of 6 standard stories in an L shape with the bulk towards the Shanley/Duke intersection would be an acceptable balance of the developers challenges/financial goals and impact on our properties

4. Traffic Study and Safety of Duke/Shanley intersection

- the traffic study was completed during the provincial "Emergency Lockdown" measures due to the ongoing COVID pandemic. At this time there were also multiple signs in the area (ie: on Waterloo St, Duke St, Wilhelm) indicating the roads were closed to local traffic only. I do not expect these factors have resulted in a reliable traffic study, and the conclusions drawn from this study would not be reliable in their interpretation. I am significantly concerned with the true impact of this development on our traffic volumes post-pandemic.

- given the unusual nature of the Duke/Shanley intersection (limited visibility for traffic travelling on Duke towards Wilhem, stop for traffic only on Shanley, unfortunately the speed at which vehicles travel on Duke) I would be concerned for pedestrian safety at this intersection with increased traffic. Is there consideration being given to modify this intersection (ie 3 way stop)?

5. Transformer location

- as per plans a large "transformer" will be located immediately adjacent to the back of our lot. What information can you provide regarding the noise this will cause, and the height of this structure and any possible odour/gas production? The provided noise assessment references only a belt drive exhaust fan, a cooler and a generator.

6. Tree removal

- the removal of the significant canopy at the rear aspect of the lot will serve to further impact the privacy of our backyards. I appreciate the effort made to avoid damage to trees and also compensate for tree loss for properties affected, however these measures cannot ameliorate the impact a 27m height building would have on our privacy.

Questions

- What is the proposed timeline of site construction?
- The proposal package makes reference to both a Shanley and Duke street vehicle access. It is unclear how removal of the Duke street access (as per drawings) will impact the conclusions drawn in the traffic study/wind study etc.
- Will there be a plan for parking for the numerous construction vehicles and personal vehicles of workers on site?

I will attend the June 17th "Neighbourhood meeting" but would also like to be added to your contact list for any updates regarding this property moving forward.

Thank you for your consideration -

Meredith Pope

Craig Dumart

From: Dawn Parker < >
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2021 10:56 AM
To: Julianne vonWesterholt
Cc: Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Some brief official comments on 152/134 Shanley proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Julianne,

Thanks for the information. I'm sure I will have more detailed comments later and will read the full proposal, but in the short run, as the clock is ticking for you, here are a few comments:

- 1) I strongly oppose the re-zoning of 134 to R8, but suggest it be kept as R6 with the special provision related to try-plexes lifted.
- 2). The cultural heritage character of the neighbourhood, per the city's report and stated intention to include the cultural heritage neighbourhood in the secondary plan revision, needs to be acknowledged. 134 Shanley has cultural heritage value in this context. We all know that the neighbourhood is the second oldest in Kitchener and that they Region official plan and the city's previous verbal and written commitments state that stable residential neighbourhoods are not the target for intensification. Approval of the rezoning and subsequent demolition of 134 Shanley would contradict these points.
- 3). The surface parking should not be allowed, or if allowed, should be minimal. The area is now part of a major transit station planning area, where automobile-dependent uses are not appropriate per Provincial guidelines. There will be a large underground lot, and on-street parking (which could be further regulated) is available on neighbourhood streets.

Let us be honest about what is happening. A good condition, large Century home on a parcel that could now house 4 households and has multiple mature trees is being demolished to build a surface parking lot. This not only contradicts Provincial planning guidelines, it contradicts the Region and City's climate change emergency and ambitious greenhouse gas reduction goals. Everyone on council acknowledges these goals, and the need to reduce our 45% of emissions related to transportation is often a point of discussion at Council.
- 4). Naively, I thought the vision creating a quantified design, and that the city would support any design that conformed with the FSR, setbacks, and height of the development. For instance we had back and forth about the setback to 134 Shanley, which was changed to 7.5 meters after my feedback. Although I would continue to oppose the surface parking, I would support a development and appropriate rezoning that allowed the developer to build to right on that rezoning, that conformed to the FSR, setback, and height of the vision drawings on 152 Shanley.
- 5). The current location of the driveway and driveway vent seem designed to maximally impact the remaining neighbour Brenda, at I think 126 Shanley. The driveway location absolutely contradicts the vision. The action is consistent with an intention to degrade her quality of life and encourage her to sell to the developer.
- 6). Your clock to respond to the development re LPAT appeals should be set to start only when signs are posted in front of both 134 and 152 Shanley.

7). While it is outside the current planning mandate, it is very strange that there are no 3 bedroom rentals planned at the site. I have data from the local CMHC economist showing their scarcity and therefore relative profitability in Kitchener centre. Further, 3 beds can mean more people per area and lower overall parking requirements relative to a development of all 1-2 bed units. We all know that Kitchener and WR region as a whole are way ahead of the pack in intensification. But we will only succeed if units are built that can house families with children in the core. **Therefore "intensification targets" should NOT be accepted as an argument in favour of the demolition of 134 Shanley.**

I would like to send comments directly to the developer, to give them enough time to respond, and also to consider an alternative vision for the property that would preserve the house and allow them to build additional units, and also make more money from improved green space premia. Do you have preferred contact at Shannondale for this proposal?

Also, yes, the comparison table to the vision would be overwhelming helpful, not only for me but for other neighbours who have brought up the question. It would need to acknowledge that because the development footprint has expanded, the FSR comparisons would need to be supplemented by some overall volume comparisons.

Thanks,

Dawn Parker

On May 19, 2021, at 12:04 PM, Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hello Dawn,

Here is the plan that is part of the arborist's report. I hope this plan helps.

The sign should have been installed by now and I have reached out to the applicant in this regard.

The existing zoning for 134 Shanley is R5 with Special Use Regulation 129 U which prohibits triplexes. I am not aware of what the sale price was or when it was sold.

I trust this answers your questions.

Sincerely,

Juliane vonWesterholt, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner

-----Original Message-----

From: Dawn Parker

Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2021 6:04 PM

To: Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Please provide comparisons to the city's guidelines for Electrohome

The arborist report also references trees by number but does not seem to include a key. Where is the key found?

Are signs announcing the OPA and secondary plans amendment proposals not also required in front of both 152 Shanley and 134 Shanley?

Finally what is the current zoning for 134 Shanley? And is it possible to access the sold price and date for

that parcel?

Thanks very much,

Dawn Parker

Sent from my iPad

On May 15, 2021, at 8:28 AM, Dawn Parker <dparker@cityofsanjoaquin.ca> wrote:

Hello Juliane,

Could you please send a table with the guidelines put forward by the city in terms of metrics like height, setbacks, floor space ratio, green space, and anything else specified for the proposed Shannondale development, comparing the guidelines put forward by the city to the proposed development?

Since the point of neighbourhood engagement was to set these guidelines before the development occurred we trust that the proposed development is compliant but it would be helpful for neighbourhood discussions to have the comparison on paper.

If you reply to me I will then distribute the information to our two neighbourhood lists.

Thanks,

Dawn Parker

Se

Craig Dumart

From: Juliane vonWesterholt
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 1:34 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley St

From: Kyle Grey
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:44 AM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley St

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the proposed development at 134-152 Shanley St. I live at 406 Duke St West, directly across the street from the building.

First, I would like to say that I am in full support of development on this lot. I wish they had kept the beautiful facade of the electrohome building, but nonetheless I am glad that something is being done.

I would however like to express my strong opposition to the scale of this building. In all directions the surrounding homes are 2 stories tall. This building does not need to be **4 times** that! Not only will my property never see the sun again, it does not fit the neighbourhood. I am not saying that it needs to be 2 stories, but I feel there needs to be more of a consideration for the site and at 8 stories, this is not the case.

Kyle Grey

N

Craig Dumart

From: Juliane vonWesterholt
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 1:35 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley St zoning comments

From: Maggie Modesti <Maggie.Modesti@kitchener.ca>
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 8:38 AM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley St zoning comments

Hello Juliane,

My name is Maggie Modesti and my family and I reside at _____ all address is
_____ is email address _____

Thank you for getting the input from the residing residents.

We could NOT be more opposed to the plans for an 8 story high rise in our quiet community.

First of all, as a mother of little children, I am highly concerned for the safety of my kids and the children in the neighborhood that the huge influx of residents in the area would threaten.

Duke street park which has been valued by the local residents and young family here as one of the safest and cleanest parks in the area, tucked away from lots of traffic and easily accessible to local families, will no doubt be completely saturated with people with the increase in families in the area.

We are concerned that a large high rise will also increase the risk of drug use and drug paraphernalia (used needles for instance) in the park and make park use less safe.

As well, this neighborhood is composed of older residents and very young families who highly value respectful and quiet neighbors. A massive high rise would obviously increase the amount of noise in the area and be detrimental to this community who needs quiet.

In conclusion, we believe a high rise being built here will jeopardize the emotional, social, and physical well-being of our community and we ask that the plans for a high rise be prevented for the good of this community.

Thanks,

Maggie + the Modesti Family

Craig Dumart

From: Juliane vonWesterholt
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 1:36 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley Street West

From: Nick Richbeli
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 2:08 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt <Juliane.vonWesterholt@kitchener.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley Street West

Dear Juliane,

I write in response to your letter dated May 10, 2021 with respect to the requested permission to develop an 8-storey building with a total of 172 residential dwelling units.

We do not agree with this project.

This will destroy our neighborhood.

Traffic is already a serious concern. There is no parking. The local park is neglected. We do NOT need 172 new condos in this area. This will not bring anything good to the neighborhood.

How many new condo buildings does this city need? What kickbacks will the city be taking to approve this project? It's about time the City put its foot down and did what's right for its citizens!!

Nicholas Richbell

Craig Dumart

From: Grant Gingrich
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2021 10:53 AM
To: Craig Dumart
Cc: Sarah Marsh
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Feedback: 134-152 Shanley Proposal

Hello Craig,

I understand you are picking up this file and are accepting submissions from residents as input to any decision by the City. Unfortunate that you were unable to join last night's virtual neighbourhood meeting. The following is a summary of my comments from last night which were not recorded:

Briefly, on the development itself...

- * I think it's a good thing if someone from outside the region wants to perform the needed environmental cleanup and invest in purpose-built rental housing in Kitchener.
- * I think the proposed design elements are pleasing to the eye and will fit well within the neighbourhood. Far more so than the derelict factory that was previously on site, though it is unfortunate that the factory was permitted to get to that state in the first place.
- * I do believe 8 storeys and 172 units is probably too much density to be plunking into the middle of a quiet single family residential neighbourhood and that a greater proportion of 2 and 3 bedroom units are needed - but I'll leave it to others to push for change on those points.

My main concern relates to traffic as follows...

- * In addition to Shanley and Duke, there is a 3rd street that is directly affected by the proposed development. Wilhelm Street abuts the site and yet not once during last night's presentation did anyone mention it.
- * Wilhelm is also a quiet single family residential street crossing Weber where the Spur Line Trail ends, next to George Lippert Park, and having the misfortune of being a straightaway between Duke and Margaret.
- * My neighbours and I see and hear them... morning, noon and night, Northbound cars and trucks blow through Wilhelm above the speed limit, often failing to come to a complete stop at stop signs, in order to get to Margaret, to Wellington and to the expressway; without having to make the left from Weber onto Wellington and deal with congestion on Wellington in that stretch.
- * Coming in the opposite direction, we have the same problem. This is presumably from residents of the new Victoria Common site (as the problem has gotten worse since the completion of that development) trying to get to Weber, Victoria and Downtown.
- * And now Wilhelm could be sandwiched between a second high density development...
- * A number of my neighbours have small children and I worry one day one of those cars travelling above the limit won't be able to stop in time for a child simply being a child. To be clear, Wilhelm is CURRENTLY in need of traffic calming / traffic reducing measures.
- * Now, 134-152 Shanley sits directly at the top of Wilhelm and Wilhelm will be the path of least resistance for that address in and out of the neighbourhood - especially since I think I heard last night that Duke at Victoria will be permanently closed off? Furthermore, Wilhelm between Weber and Margaret will be the path of least resistance for that address to and from the expressway.
- * ANY development, whether it's 8, 6 or 2 storeys is going to exacerbate the existing problems of traffic volume and reckless, high speed driving on Wilhelm; putting pedestrians headed to George Lippert Park, cyclists coming off the Spur Line Trail, and young children in particular, at even greater risk than they are at today.
- * Again, I do not oppose the development, but a COMPLETE plan that addresses current and future volume and safety needs on Wilhelm needs to be in scope.

Counterpoints from the City to my concerns last night would include the following...

- * The development has an application for reduced car and added bicycle parking. There are two flaws with this response: 1) There will still be more cars in the neighbourhood and more cars can only exacerbate the problem, and 2) I suspect the demographic targeted for these one bedroom units will be more frequent users of ride sharing and Skip the

Dishes which does nothing to allay my fears if not make them worse (is use of these types of services even taken into account by the City when reviewing traffic implications of a new development?).

* I can't remember the exact words, but a traffic study was conducted and something was said last night about the 85th percentile and most drivers travelling in the neighbourhood at 47 km/h. I have three issues with this response: 1) Bell curving traffic study results is a flawed approach - you have to look at the extremes and at the consistency and trend of the behaviour, 2) Did the traffic study look at Wilhelm (which is a tempting straightaway) or at Duke / Shanley / Waterloo Streets only?, and 3) If traffic is as safe as the City claims it is, why has the City recently found it necessary to install traffic calming flex signs all up and down Waterloo Street? There are no such measures North of Weber.

Wilhelm is a residential street but increasingly it is being used as an artery. Unless action is taken, the problem will only get worse with this proposal resulting in high density developments at both ends of Wilhelm. I hope the City takes my concerns seriously and implements a complete plan that addresses both current and future volume and safety needs, that maintains the character of Wilhelm as a quiet single family residential neighbourhood, and that an accident or tragedy doesn't have to occur for something to be done.

Thank you,
Grant Gingrich

Craig Dumart

From:
Sent: Saturday, May 22, 2021 5:55 PM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 shanley st

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Juliane,
I am resident of the community. It is a good idea to change the property to all residential units. I am looking forward to seeing the project as soon as possible. thanks
xing

Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Hello Juliane,

My name is Maggie Modesti and my family and I reside at _____ . Our email address is _____
this email address: _____

Thank you for getting the input from the residing residents.

We could NOT be more opposed to the plans for an 8 story high rise in our quiet community.

First of all, as a mother of little children, I am highly concerned for the safety of my kids and the children in the neighborhood that the huge influx of residents in the area would threaten.

Duke street park which has been valued by the local residents and young family here as one of the safest and cleanest parks in the area, tucked away from lots of traffic and easily accessible to local families, will no doubt be completely saturated with people with the increase in families in the area.

We are concerned that a large high rise will also increase the risk of drug use and drug paraphernalia (used needles for instance) in the park and make park use less safe.

As well, this neighborhood is composed of older residents and very young families who highly value respectful and quiet neighbors. A massive high rise would obviously increase the amount of noise in the area and be detrimental to this community who needs quiet.

In conclusion, we believe a high rise being built here will jeopardize the emotional, social, and physical well-being of our community and we ask that the plans for a high rise be prevented for the good of this community.

Thanks,

Maggie + the Modesti Family

Craig Dumart

From: Kyle Grey
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:44 AM
To: Juliane vonWesterholt
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 134-152 Shanley St

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the proposed development at 134-152 Shanley St. I live at the street from the building.

First, I would like to say that I am in full support of development on this lot. I wish they had kept the beautiful facade of the electrohome building, but nonetheless I am glad that something is being done.

I would however like to express my strong opposition to the scale of this building. In all directions the surrounding homes are 2 stories tall. This building does not need to be **4 times** that! Not only will my property never see the sun again, it does not fit the neighbourhood. I am not saying that it needs to be 2 stories, but I feel there needs to be more of a consideration for the site and at 8 stories, this is not the case.

Kyle Grey

Craig Dumart

From: Michael Brisson
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 12:42 PM
To: Craig Dumart
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: 152 Shanley

Hi Craig,

My attached message to SM was a heads up to her that is of equal importance to your department. The negative fallout from the surprise demolition of a fine adjacent home will have lasting impact in the community. Equally, responding to a small coterie of residents such as the resident who mythologized a huge traffic problem on Wilhelm at the last Zoom meeting will lead to an unneeded anti-density reaction from the broader neighborhood when they see the house go down & the proposed vehicle entry in operation.

A scheme which retains the house & adds a new 3 storey volume extending its side walls back to the rear setback with single aspect and entries facing the project's rear open space is an obvious alternative that needs to be weighed carefully in this precarious situation for the city.

If you do have time to discuss further please call.

Thanks

Michael
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From:
Date: June 17, 2021 at 3:37:07 PM EDT
To: Sarah.Marsh@kitchener.ca
Subject: 152 Shanley

Hi Sarah,

I hope this finds you well.

I want to pass on to you what I believe to be very justified concerns expressed to me earlier this week by

The sale & demolition of the house at 152 Shanley & the expansion of the project along Shanley is a big concern to them. It is very much underplayed in the documentation presented & will come as a shock to many members of the neighbourhood. Be that as it may - the decision to have only one entry to the site, contrary to the expressed guidelines for Urban Design set out by the city, and especially the use of one major vehicle entry point further along Shanley rather than on Duke opposite Wilhelm is a major problem.

This building will be very evident above the low homes and very visible from Weber, and traffic to and from it will be coming and going from Weber via Wilhelm. To place the major vehicle entry deep into the quiet surroundings around the tricky corner of Duke and Shanley is both disruptive and dangerous. The

visual effect of the garage entry elevation upon Shanley seen across the front yards and the view into the parking area to the rear is going to be very unattractive.

Anything you can do to correct this situation (I know it is very very difficult to divert these development juggernauts ;)) would result in a much better final result and resident reaction to the final built project.

Cheers - and thanks for all you do in these very difficult planning and urban design situations.

Michael

Sent from my iPad