

Mariah Blake

From: Laura New <laura.new.01@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 2:10 PM
To: Delegation (SM)
Cc: Debbie Chapman; Stephanie Stretch
Subject: Comment re Jan 29th PSIC meeting on Growing Together DSD-2024-005

You don't often get email from laura.new.01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Greetings Councillors,

I appreciate the work and the changes staff have made to the Growing Together proposal of Jan. 19, 2024. However, I remain concerned about three issues I would like to bring to your attention as follows:

1. Priority Streets

I am concerned that adopting the proposals for Priority Streets may generate outcomes in conflict with the following two Official Plan Policies and the City's [Urban Forest Strategy](#):

11.C.1.22. The City will require the provision of shade, either natural or constructed, to provide protection from sun exposure, mitigate the urban heat island, and reduce energy demands

13.C.1.4. The City will design pedestrian-friendly streets by: v) providing shade as an essential component of streetscape design;

The stated goal of Priority Streets in the Glossary is to “contribute to an enhanced streetscape and pedestrian realm”. I fear that the 0m minimum front yard setback provision and the 0% landscaping provision will result in the exact opposite, especially considering that on many of the ‘Priority Streets’ there is no space in the public realm for the addition of shade and street trees.

My Request: Do not permit an exemption for 0% landscaped area and 0 m front yard setbacks along Priority Streets.

2. Loss of the Secondary Plans.

I object to the repeal of secondary plans without due mandate and appropriate consultation. We, neighbourhood residents have spent significant time over the past many years and invested into working with the City through the Secondary Plan process and then as part of the neighbourhood planning review (NPR). The Secondary Plans, both existing and those proposed under NPR, include neighbourhood-specific requirements that will be lost with these changes.

I suggest that the rezoning of these ‘additional’ Secondary Plan lands that fall beyond the boundaries of the Major Transit Station Areas is not necessary to meet the requirements of Bill 23. I suggest that

the recently announced Official Plan review is a more appropriate opportunity to update the Secondary Plans.

My request: Either A) Defer the rezoning of non-PMTSA lands and commit to completion of the Secondary Plan process through a separate exercise or B) Re-zone these non-PMTSA lands as per the final NPR proposal.

3. Transition Provisions for Proposed Developments

The sunset clause (proposed zoning bylaw Section 18.5) lists a time period of 10 years for the expiry of approved developments. I suggest a time period of 3 years as was approved when the new CroZBy zoning bylaw was introduced in 2019. In addition, the list of properties in Section 18.4 should be expanded to include 149-151 Ontario Street N & 21 Weber St W (C of A # A2019-050 / HPA-2023-IV-030) and any other approvals made by Council since Nov. 3, 2023.

My request: Ask staff to revise the Sunset Clause to a 3 year period.

Thank you for your consideration,

Laura New