



STRATFORD CITY COUNCIL ADDENDUM

Adoption of Addendum to the Regular Council Agenda:

Motion by

THAT the Addendum to the Regular Agenda of Council dated November 8, 2021, be added to the agenda as printed to include the following:

6.0 Hearings of Deputations and Presentations:

6.2 Official Plan Amendment Application OPA01-20 and Zone Change Application Z06-20, 370-396 Ontario Street

Following publishing of the agenda, the following persons requested to address Council:

- Jane Marie Mitchell
- Emily Elliott, agent for the applicant
- Patrick O'Rourke

Motion by

THAT Jane Marie Mitchell, Emily Elliot and Patrick O'Rourke be added to the list of delegates regarding Official Plan Amendment Application OPA01-20 and Zone Change Amendment Z06-20.

Following the deadline for inclusion with the agenda, correspondence from the following persons was received and is included with this addendum for the consideration of Council.

Attachment –

- Email from Julia Schneider dated November 5, 2021
- Email from Cynthia Venables dated November 5, 2021
- Email from Michelle McDonough dated November 5, 2021
- Email from Mary Beaty dated November 5, 2021
- Email from Richard Kapp dated November 5, 2021
- Email from Michael Welsh dated November 6, 2021
- Email from Elin Becker dated November 6, 2021
- Letter from Joan Bidell dated November 6, 2021

- Letter from Sara Topham dated November 5, 2021

Motion by

THAT the correspondence from the following persons regarding Official Plan Amendment Application OPA01-20 and Zone Change Amendment Z06-20 be received for information:

- **Julia Schneider**
- **Cynthia Venables**
- **Michelle McDonough**
- **Mary Beaty**
- **Richard Kapp**
- **Michael Welsh**
- **Elin Becker**
- **Joan Bidell**
- **Sara Topham**

From: Julia Schneider <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 12:14 AM
To: Tatiana Dafoe [REDACTED]
Subject: Letter to Councillors in favour of the Chancery development project sent Nov. 4, 2021

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

Dear Ms. Dafoe,

I have the following letter to Couns. Henderson, Beatty, Bunting, Burbach, Ingram, Vassilakos, and Mayor Henderson today. Please note this for the official record.

Thank you.

Sincerely
Julia Schneider,

To City Councillors in favour of step backward
Re: Hayden Bulbrook's article about the three houses on Ontario Street and the Chancery proposed development (September issue of The Stratford Times) and Chris Montanini's story in the Beacon-Herald October 27
I don't want it!

It could be that the six City Councillors who recently voted in favour of the proposed Trow-Ontario-Queen development three blocks from the Festival Theatre had good intentions. It is, of course, good to promote in-fill and higher density housing rather than suburban sprawl. Those in favour may also truly believe that the reason an official plan and City zoning are general so they can be changed when a development is proposed that suits the City -- but does the Chancery project do so?

Coun. Danielle Ingram, one councillor in favour of the development, made the case that the amendment to high density housing in the official plan and zoning were not that big a deal because the broad and general nature of the plan "couldn't possibly considerevery potential development to come through."

Further to this, Coun. Ingram also gave as a reason for her support that "adding more types of housing ... particularly options for young families priced out of the traditional single family market" was desirable.

Though these general points are certainly commendable, they could just as well be seen as reasons NOT to support the proposed development. As residents of the area surrounding it have made clear, they are very opposed to an intensification of housing in what is to them a "tiny, vital area" very visible to City visitors, in a strategic area close to both the Festival Theatre and road into the City. The fact that the current official plan allows for amendments should not mean that amendments need to be made.

Coun. Ingram's argument in favour of housing for families is similarly open to question and out-of-place when it involves the development of the street for families with children. Does she envision lots more kids playing on Ontario Street, with loads more traffic added to the already heavy flow between Queen and Front Streets? As far as affordability is concerned, nowhere do I find any any mention of low-income housing in the Chancery proposal. To satisfy Coun. Ingram's desires, it would seem easier and preferable to turn to the Robert Ritz proposal that does not require an amendment and would allow for more housing diversit.

One likes to think that the concerns of residents will be taken into account in considering any new development, especially one whose urgency relates to such a vital and visible part of the City. Is it not the

residents and the City, after all, that Councillors are supposed to be serving? In this case, in favouring the development, they seem to be working for the developers; everyone I have spoken to sees the proposed development as an unsightly blight they would like to stop.

There is a final vote to come before the proposed wall of housing goes ahead on Ontario Street and thereby renders the area's designation as a Heritage Area a joke while posing avoidable safety and visual concerns. How will the councillors who continue to vote for this project be remembered? They will certainly be remembered on election night if they continue their unreasonable support -- through an absence of checks beside their names.

Those who voted for it were councillors Bonnie Henderson, Kathy Vassilakos, Jo-Dee Burbach, Brad Beatty, Graham Bunting, the aforementioned Danielle Ingram, and Mayor Dan Mathieson. Let them know you don't want it!

Sincerely,
Julia Schneider
[REDACTED] Ballantyne Ave.
Stratford, Ontario [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Cynthia Venables [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 10:28 AM
To: City Clerks [REDACTED]
Subject: Hoping this can be included with the Agenda for Planning Heritage on Monday Nov. 8

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

To our councillors- a lesson on the environment especially to those who justify the destruction rather than adaptive re-use of Ontario St. buildings as the environmentally proactive approach. These buildings must be re-purposed to house duplex and triplex dwellings NOT replaced by new stacked 3 1/2 storey townhouses. The 3 open lots where the houses have already been destroyed will house 2 storey triplexes. These small lots will already be higher density than most places in Stratford. Adaptive re-use is the environmentally and heritage aware approach Stratford needs."for a brand-new, energy-efficient building, it can take between 10 to 80 years to "pay back" the carbon load resulting from its construction. Yet it's not simply carbon emissions that make new construction problematic. Waste is also an issue. According to a recent U.S. Environmental Protection Agency report, building-related construction and demolition debris account for 26% of all non-industrial waste generated in the United States. Adaptive reuse stands as a method to cut back enormously on both the emissions and the construction and demolition waste — not to mention the associated costs — that come with building something new." The old homes on the Queen Trow block aren't just four buildings, they embody a combined amount of approximately 200 tons of building material that would end up in a landfill if they are demolished. This Is NOT environmentally aware. The new structures proposed by Chancery do NOT have any energy efficient specifics or environmental criteria as part of their proposal so how can we quantify what energy will be saved if they are built. The Chancery buildings are targeted at BnB investment and retired couples or singles. The price point for these condos, with an asphalt parking lot filling the entire back of the land and with a few meters at the front directly on busy Ontario St. makes it ludicrous to suggest young families will be living here. To our Councillors, the destructive nature of this Official Plan Change will be remembered in the same light as knocking down our city hall to put up a Howard Johnson's Hotel in the 1960's and 70's. It is shortsighted and destructive to our environmental and economic future and must be stopped. Cynthia Venables [REDACTED] Front St. Stratford

From: mlm [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 2:16 PM
To: Dan Mathieson <[REDACTED]>; Martin Ritsma <[REDACTED]ca>; Brad Beatty
[REDACTED] Tom Clifford [REDACTED] Graham Bunting
[REDACTED] ; Jo-Dee Burbach [REDACTED] ; Bonnie Henderson
[REDACTED] >; Dave Gaffney [REDACTED] ; Cody Sebben
[REDACTED] ; Danielle Ingram [REDACTED] Kathy Vassilakos
[REDACTED] ; City Clerks [REDACTED]
Cc: Tatiana Dafoe <[REDACTED]>; Alyssa Bridge [REDACTED]
Subject: Re Queen/Trow Ontario St. Development Application (PLA21 - 026)

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

Note to the City Clerk: I am requesting that this letter be included with the agenda for the Council meeting scheduled for November 8, 2021 and that it is included in the public record.

To the Mayor and Council Members

Re: MHBC/Chancery Proposal for 380-396 Ontario St., Stratford

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

Today I am writing to you to request that you deny the Official Plan Amendment application and the Zone Change Amendment application for 380 - 396 Ontario Street. The reason for the denial is that the request is NOT in conformity with the goals, objectives and policies of the Official Plan ("OP") .

For reference, at the end of this letter I am appending a copy of my letter to you dated September 26, 2021. The problematic OP policies identified in it remain relevant despite the amendments to the proposal by the applicant. The proposed development still does not respect the existing lotting pattern. And it still does not respect the height or the built form of the surrounding area. The current proposed maximum height of 14.5 metres is 45% taller than currently permitted on the site or on any of the surrounding blocks. In addition, the proposed density of 91 units per hectare is 40% greater than the allowed maximum in the area and is easily three times the existing density of adjacent properties and the surrounding blocks.

In addition to the policies set out in my previous letter, please also take a look at what has been called the OP "framework" for New High Density Residential Areas. This can be found in section 4.6 High Density Residential Areas ("HDRAs"). I am sharing my analysis below (in blue).

The end result is that in order to pass the framework, a proposal needs to comply with all the applicable policies of the OP as well as achieve all of the criteria set out in section 4.6.4. The Chancery proposal not only does not comply with many of the applicable policies, it also does not achieve all the criteria. Amongst other problems, it fails to have a mix of development forms and densities and it is neither intermixed with medium-density development nor part of a mixed-use development.

I am asking Council members to deny the application for the reason that it does not conform with the goals, objectives and policies of the OP.

respectfully,

Michelle McDonough

Notes and analysis of the OP "framework" for new High Density Residential Areas

I have been advised by Ms. Bridge (back in September) that the Chancery application is the very first application that is requesting to amend the Official Plan ("OP") to have an area designated as High Density Residential Area ("HDRA"). She told me that prior to the 2016 OP being adopted, there was no framework for designating areas as HDRA. So, anything in the City that is already here and high density, was built based on OP policies in place at the relevant time. That is why there are currently no areas on the Land Use map at Schedule A that are the dark brown colour on the legend.

Can a small infill site be a candidate for designation as an HDRA? It would seem that it would need to be large enough to have a mix of development forms and densities, including at least some medium density residential or some mixed use. The Chancery proposal does not.

I think there has been some confusion over what people are saying when they talk about the approval of the application as setting a precedent. I have heard some Councillors say that there are already taller buildings in the City or ones that have higher density, implying that this application would not be precedent setting. Even the Staff Report gives a fairly long list of other buildings from the last ten years and some even older. All of those buildings pre-date the current "framework".

When I say the application will set a precedent, I don't mean it will be the tallest or the most dense. I mean it will be the start of showing the way. It will be setting the path for others to follow. It is the first under this framework and it is showing what future

applications can expect to be judged by. If it is accepted, we can expect others will be pointing at it and saying they want to be allowed to do the same thing.

Note that at this time, there has now been a second application requesting an OP Amendment to designate an area as an HDRA - 30 Queensland Road. No doubt, those interested in that application will be watching closely to see what happens with the Chancery application. This is just the first of many applications that you are going to see that are going to be requesting an OP amendment to redesignate areas to allow high density. It is important to take the time to be sure you are thoroughly understanding the process and that you are doing the correct thing here.

In reviewing the OP document, it occurs to me that the designation of HDRA was not designed to be used for just one project on one lot.

Let's review what the OP says about HDRAs.

4.6 HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREA

4.6.1 Goals and Objectives for High Density Residential Areas

- i) To recognize established high density residential areas and ensure that new uses generally respect the existing character and density of these areas and ***adjacent*** development; and,
- ii) To provide for the creation of new high density residential areas in locations which generally respect ***adjacent*** development.

So, you will note that there are two goals and objectives of the High Density Residential Areas ("HDRAs"). The first deals with existing areas and the second with creating new areas. As I stated earlier, there are currently no designated HDRAs in Stratford. Thus, the focus is mostly on the objective of creating new areas. However, note that the policy anticipates new uses in HDRAs after they have been designated. This suggests that the HDRA is intended to cover an area or section of the City and not just one specific lot or building site within that area.

Policies for High Density Residential Areas

4.6.2 Permitted Uses

The permitted uses are:

- i) medium density residential including townhouse dwellings, low rise apartments and stacked townhouses, but shall generally not include single detached, semi-detached or duplex dwellings; and,
- ii) high density residential including high rise apartments.

In addition, in areas located arterial roads, development may incorporate commercial, office and institutional components as part of mixed use developments.

The permitted uses are medium and high density residential. And if it's on an arterial road, it can also be mixed use.

4.6.3 Established High Density Residential Areas

Established high density residential areas are those areas where potential new development or **redevelopment** is limited. Applications for new development in such areas shall be evaluated based on their ability to generally maintain the following elements of the structure and character of the surrounding high density residential area:

- i) the scale of development with respect to the height and massing of buildings;
- ii) nature of the streetscape as defined by such elements as landscaped areas, and the relationship between the public street, front yards and primary entrances to buildings;
- iii) relationship between the rear wall of buildings and rear yard open spaces;
- iv) design and siting of buildings in relation to abutting properties, including any abutting lands in the Residential Area designation, to ensure that there will be no significant negative impacts with respect to privacy and shadowing and appropriate buffering can be provided;
- v) retention of the existing street pattern, unless modifications will improve accessibility for active transportation modes; and,
- vi) any proposed **redevelopment** shall take into consideration *adjacent* uses including low density development, as well as **adjacent** development across a street.

A holding zone may be used to ensure that the appropriate review of new development is undertaken in accordance with these criteria.

This whole section deals only with already designated HDRAs. We don't have any of those yet. These rules make sense if an HDRA is a larger area than just one specific lot

or building site. The added or redeveloped parts "shall be evaluated based on their ability to generally maintain the following elements of the structure and character of the surrounding high density residential area..." So, this implies that the area is large enough to surround the new development or redevelopment proposal.

And now, at last, we get to the part of the OP that sets out what has been described as the "framework" for determining if a new area can be designated as an HDRA. **This section is very important.**

4.6.4 New High Density Residential Areas

Applications for new High Density Residential Area designations shall require an Official Plan amendment and shall be evaluated based on their conformity with the applicable policies of this Plan and the following criteria:

- i) a mix of development forms and densities; ✗
- ii) high density residential uses are:
 - a) intermixed with medium density development and/or commercial, office and institutional components as part of mixed use developments; ✗
 - b) primarily street oriented in design; and, ✓
 - c) located with direct access to collector and arterial roads, park and greenland areas, community facilities and/or commercial areas. ✓
- iii) designed to ensure that there are no significant negative impacts with respect to privacy and shadowing, and that appropriate buffering can be provided for any adjacent lands in the Residential Area designation; ✗
- v) size and scale of the development is such that it can be integrated with any adjacent residential areas, in particular conforms with the policies of Section 3.5, Heritage Conservation and preserves designated and listed heritage buildings and structures, and where located **adjacent** to such buildings and structures is designed to be compatible; and, ✗
- vi) municipal services with the capacity to accommodate the proposed development are, or can be made, available. ✓

Note the yellow highlighting that shows the language structure indicating that to pass the framework, *all parts have to be met*. You need to meet i), ii), iii), iv), v) **AND** vi). And to meet ii) you have to meet a), b) **AND** c) sub-sections. And, per the preamble, you also have to conform to all the other applicable parts of the OP.

The very first section, **section i)** says the proposed area has to have "a mix of development forms and densities". It is not possible to meet this criteria with one apartment building or two stacked townhouse buildings. Once again, it appears an HDRA is supposed to cover a much larger area than the Chancery site. It does not appear to be intended for small infill sites.

Note the yellow highlighted part ii). The language shows **a, b AND c**. This implies that all three have to be met. In the Staff Report, they completely ignore **a** and go on about **b** and **c**. This project is neither intermixed with medium density development nor part of a mixed use development, so it cannot meet test **a**.

Here is the part of the Staff Report (prepared for the October 25 2021 Planning and Heritage Committee Meeting) that purports to address part i) and part ii):

The subject applications provide a development that widens the range of development forms and densities through two, 3.5 storey stacked townhouse buildings (30 units in total) that is primarily street oriented in design. Access to the proposed development is off Queen Street which has a direct connection to Ontario Street, an arterial road, minimizing traffic impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood. The subject site is located within 400 metres of a number of parks and recreational opportunities and is located in proximity to the Downtown Core and commercial uses along Ontario Street.

re part i): Does the framework say that the application has to *have* a mix of development forms and densities? Or does it say, as the report suggests, that it has to "widen the range" of such forms (presumably in the City as a whole)? It occurs to me that the widening of the range is a pretty easy standard to meet. Indeed, any possible development will differ in some way from already existing forms and densities in the City, so most anything at all would meet that test. It seems unlikely that part i) would have been included in the framework, if it does not actually mean anything. But, if the criterion is that it is supposed to *have* a mix, that would mean that the area being designated as a new High Density Residential Area must be of sufficient size to accommodate more than one type of housing and more than one density.

re part ii): Notice that the above paragraph from the report does not mention anything at all about part ii) a). The development is not intermixed with medium density development nor is it part of a mixed use development. Again, this criterion suggests a larger and more complex development than the one proposed.

There has been considerable comment and discussion regarding the negative impacts on the adjacent lands and the appropriateness of the development when integrating with the adjacent residential area. These criteria are set out in parts iii) and iv) above. I will not address those criteria specifically here except to say that the proposed development fails to satisfy either of them.

As noted above, the applicable policies of the OP have to be conformed with as well. There have been multiple sections of the OP that have been identified as relevant (and

remain relevant in light of the revised stacked townhouse plan) and where it is legitimately questioned whether the application is in conformity. I set out a number of those sections in my correspondence with council members dated September 26, 2021 (copy appended below). They have also been identified by numerous other people, including in the report prepared by LHC.

For completeness, these are the remaining parts of section 4.6 of the OP:

4.6.5 Density

The minimum density for development in the High Density Residential Area designation shall be 65 units per net hectare (26 units per net acre). The maximum density for residential development in the High Density Residential Area designation shall be 100 units per net hectare (40 units per net acre).

4.6.6 Height

The maximum height for development in the High Density Residential Area designation shall be six storeys. The minimum height shall be three storeys, other than a podium which forms part of a building may be two storeys.

These last policies are consistent with the idea that the area is a larger site with "a mix of development forms and densities".

Can a small infill site be a candidate for designation as a HDRA? It would seem that it would need to be large enough to have a mix of development forms and densities, including at least some medium density residential or some mixed use. The Chancery proposal does not.

For reference, below is my letter to you dated September 26, 2021.

To the Mayor and Council Members

Re: MHBC/Chancery Proposal for 370-396 Ontario St., Stratford

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

Last Friday morning, I took a walk around the neighbourhood . I want to tell you about what I saw.

Here's a map that covers the area I was walking in:



See all those green "H's"? Those are houses. Some of them are small, some are larger. The ones with the "*" are under construction.

Almost all of these houses have a heritage charm that comes from having been built many years ago. There are gorgeous old homes with sweeping porches and small balconies, gabled windows and pretty gardens. And there are a few classic Ontario Cottages. Many of the larger homes have been divided into apartments or turned into B&B's or inns. And on Ontario St., a few of them have a business located in them. A few of them have been altered with additions added. And certainly they almost all must have had interior renovations done, most several times over their lives. And yet, to a person like myself, walking through the neighbourhood, they retain the "built form" of houses.

Some are one storey and many are taller. I noticed that none was more than three storeys and those that were 3 storeys had the third floor tucked in under the roof. I saw none that were 3 full storeys with a roof on top of that. The whole area appears to have a bit of an alphabet soup of zoning types. All those zoning types (including the C1 and MUR for 370 to 396 Ontario St.) have something in common. They all have a maximum height of 10.0 metres.

From my walk I observed that the "built form" in the surrounding area to 370-396 Ontario St. is *all* houses. There were just 3 exceptions that I noted:

- 2 former gas stations that have been repurposed - one as the UPS Store and one as Domino's, and
- 1 church at the corner of Parkview and Ontario.

Below are relevant excerpts from the City of Stratford Official Plan.

2.3 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- vi) **Intensification** – Encourage appropriate **intensification** and infill, including mixed use development, which reflects the existing context of the City with respect to factors such as height and design.
- vii) **Heritage Conservation** - Protect areas, landmarks and features which provide a physical link to the early development of Stratford and which contribute to its distinct character and sense of place.

3.5 HERITAGE CONSERVATION

3.5.8 Infilling in Heritage Areas

In the 'Heritage Areas' and the 'Heritage Corridors' as shown on Schedule "E", the City will ensure that, where infilling is proposed or municipal services are being installed or upgraded, the inherent heritage qualities of the area or corridor will be retained, restored and ideally enhanced unless overriding conditions of public health and safety warrant otherwise.

4.5 RESIDENTIAL AREAS

4.5.1 Goals and Objectives for Residential Areas

- ii) To ensure that where **intensification** of development is proposed in residential areas, it is compatible in terms of scale, density and design with neighbouring development and adheres to sound planning principles related to servicing, traffic, site design and amenities, provided there is sufficient capacity in the City's municipal services to accommodate that development.

4.5.2 Permitted Uses

Areas designated "Residential Area" on Schedule "A" shall permit low and medium density residential uses in accordance with the policies of this section including the height and density requirements of Sections 4.5.3.3 and 4.5.3.4. The permitted uses, buildings and structures are low density residential including single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings. In addition, medium density residential including small lot single detached, semi-detached, duplex, and triplex dwellings, townhouse dwellings, low rise apartments, back-to-back and stacked townhouses may be permitted subject to the policies of Section 4.5.3. Specific areas may be designated 'Medium Density Residential' on Schedule "A" in a Secondary Plan Area, or where the City determines that a specific site should be designated for such development, generally however, the location of medium density development shall be controlled through the zoning by-law.

4.5.3.1 Stable Residential Areas

Stable residential areas are residential areas where potential new development or **redevelopment** is limited. Any **intensification** will be modest and incremental occurring through changes such as development of vacant lots, accessory apartments, or other forms of residential housing that meet the criteria below. Applications for new development in such areas shall be evaluated based on their ability to generally maintain the following elements of the structure and character of the immediate surrounding residential area:

- i) scale of development respects the height, massing and density of **adjacent** buildings and is appropriate for the site;
- vii) respects the residential lotting pattern in the immediate surrounding area;

For the purposes of this policy, the immediate surrounding residential area shall be defined by:

- i) the existing road pattern, and particularly boundaries created by arterial or collector roads;
- ii) the existing lotting pattern;
- iii) boundaries created by physical features such as streams;
- iv) the prevailing building type including any special built form features; and,
- v) any special landscape or other features.

4.5.3.4 Height

The maximum height for residential development shall be three storeys in Stable Residential Areas and four storeys in New Residential Areas.

I read the Staff Report from the Planning Department and I am at a loss to explain its conclusion:

Staff are of the opinion that the subject applications conform with the City of Stratford Official Plan.

I note that the proposal for 370-396 Ontario would be very different from the surrounding built form. The concept plan is 16.9 m high and the proposed zoning would permit up to 17.5 m. **This would be 69-75% taller than any of the buildings in the surrounding area.** In addition, as an apartment building approximately 77 m long by 18 m wide, it would be the largest building in the area by a considerable margin.

When I look at the map, I see a kind of friendly yacht club, boats of different sizes moored in berths of slightly different sizes. And then I see a full size replica of the Queen Mary jammed into a berth created from 5 or 6 existing berths and towering over everyone else. It does not respect the existing lotting pattern. It does not respect the height or the built form of the surrounding area.

The City of Stratford has done a pretty good job over the years to protect this beautiful City. Previous Councils have recognized that the authentic historic charm of the place is an asset that provides a distinct competitive advantage compared to other places. We have been a thriving tourist destination and a beautiful place to live. When I read through the Official Plan I can see the effort of those Council members of the past who saw the importance of this and sought to ensure we were protected.

As the current stewards of our beautiful City, I ask you to re-read the excerpts from the Official Plan above and determine that it is not possible to agree with the conclusion in the Staff Report.

The MHBC/Chancery proposal does NOT conform with the City of Stratford Official Plan.

respectfully,

Michelle McDonough

From: Mary Beaty <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 1:38 PM
To: City Clerks <[REDACTED]>; Dave Gaffney <[REDACTED]@ca>; Graham Bunting
[REDACTED]; Alyssa Bridge <[REDACTED]>; Dan Mathieson
[REDACTED]; Jo-Dee Burbach <[REDACTED]>; Kathy Vassilakos
[REDACTED]; Bonnie Henderson <[REDACTED]>; Brad Beatty
[REDACTED]; Cody Sebben <[REDACTED]@ca>; Tom Clifford <[REDACTED]>
Danielle Ingram <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Zone change application, Z06-20

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

To the Clerk: Please list and record this comment for consideration and for inclusion in the upcoming meeting/s on this topic

Dear Councillor:

Please READ this letter.

Like so many others, I am, again, asking for your reconsideration of this Application for a ('special') Zone change to permit a non-local developer to institute a luxury 'mini-condo' development on a site which could be re-developed for community housing suiting local Stratford residents.

It is apparent that many people have proposed creative alternative development for this site, including mixed housing, family housing, and higher density - but which would not be designed solely for (questionable) investment purposes.

As we know, and as the real-estate and condo development industry know, high density mini-condos are not designed for families, they are designed for AirB&B, flipping, money-laundering, and outside investors. Changing the zoning to permit this type of speculation means that ANY AREA of Stratford can be repurposed in this way. Including my neighbourhood.

<https://betterdwelling.com/canadas-largest-source-of-money-laundered-funds-for-real-estate-is-canadians/>

<https://precondo.ca/toronto-real-estate-money-laundering/>

I am VERY afraid that this 'special' exemption will open Stratford to Toronto (and Vancouver) - type Condo investment schemes, destroying local housing, and providing NOTHING for those seeking housing in Stratford.

JUST IN MY AREA, 3 local rental houses have been flipped to single owners, and the WORKING PEOPLE IN THOSE APARTMENTS, including 2 families, are unable to find housing. Luxury mini-condos are not the answer. Community housing which is either NEW or which REDEVELOPS EXISTING LARGE HOMES for families is the creative and responsible approach.

It makes good economic sense, community sense, and is an investment for the future.

Thank-you, and please vote wisely.

Mary Beaty

Stratford

From: RICHARD KAPP [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:07 PM
To: Tatiana Dafoe <[REDACTED]@[REDACTED].ca>; Cynthia Venables
[REDACTED]@[REDACTED].com>; J. BLACKBURN [REDACTED]; Vincent Hill
Subject: Ontario Street condos

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

Hello,

Please be informed that I oppose the plan to demolish the old homes facing Ontario Street in order to build new units that will be unaffordable for folks of modest means. I was trained as a European historian, and in the Old World governments bend over backwards to save any trace of the past. These old houses are a part of Stratford's unique heritage, and at least their basic facades and structures should be preserved as the interiors are renovated. Why do so many people come here? Not just for our traditional theatre, but for our wonderful Victorian heritage. Even though renovation, as opposed to demolition and new building, might be expensive in the short run, the longterm advantages of retaining the city's original character are priceless. We owe it to future generations to preserve as much of Canada's and Stratford's past as we can.

Let us give the city and the developers more time to reconsider the options. In Europe, and probably Quebec and the Maritimes, this would be a no brainer.

Please inform the councillors and the mayor of my views.

I am a former Coburg Street B&B owner, whose guests from all over the planet marvelled at our heritage.

Thank you,

Richard W. Kapp

From: Michael C Welsh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, November 6, 2021 12:07 PM
To: City Clerks [REDACTED]; Alyssa Bridge <[REDACTED]>; Bonnie Henderson <[REDACTED]>; Brad Beatty <[REDACTED]>; Cody Sebben <[REDACTED]>; Danielle Ingram <[REDACTED]>; Dave Gaffney <[REDACTED]>; Graham Bunting <[REDACTED]>; Jo-Dee Burbach <[REDACTED]>; Kathy Vassilakos <[REDACTED]>; Martin Ritsma <[REDACTED]>; Tom Clifford <[REDACTED]>; Dan Mathieson <[REDACTED]>
Cc: June Welsh <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Zone Change Application Z06-20 and Official Plan Amendment Application OPA01-20

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

Attention City Clerk: I would appreciate it if you would incorporate the following letter in the record of documents and submissions relating to the City Council meeting on the topic noted in the subject line above. Thank you.

Dear Councillor:

I write to register my views for your consideration concerning the development proposals for the properties on the north side of Ontario Street between Queen Street and Trow Avenue. For brevity's sake I offer the following points:

1. I support redevelopment of this site. The former restaurant at Queen and Ontario has been abandoned for years and is an eyesore, all the more so in that it sits as an informal and embarrassing signpost for visitors to find their way to the world-famous Stratford Festival. The fact that the city has sat idly by waiting for something, anything to happen there stands as a blemish on the city's land management policies and practices. The vacant sites further west toward town also have lain fallow for far too long.
2. I support the concept of intensification, including within older city neighbourhoods. Intensification offers welcome renewal and revival in long settled streets. How it is to be done is the question, not whether.
3. I endorse the principles in the current Official City Plan in this respect, including the pursuit of "modest and incremental" development with regard to height, massing and density of adjacent buildings; while imposing no significant negative effects on privacy and shadowing or traffic management in the neighbourhood.
4. I think that the proposed development by the Chancery group pays virtually no heed to the spirit or letter of the Official Plan. The proposal seeks to shoehorn an industrial scale housing development onto land with nothing but token gestures toward the Heritage character of the neighbourhood. If it is allowed to proceed it will forever change the streetscape and invite more conversions to high-rise multi unit dwellings

unlike anything there now. It will signal that the City Official Plan holds little more than soft and beguiling suggestions, easily dismissed or fudged to meet the financial objectives of developers. It beggars belief that city planners see this proposal as anywhere near what the Official Plan sets out for this community. Why have a plan if everything in it is 'negotiable'?

5. If I were the new owners of the two new houses on Cobourg Street immediately behind the proposed development, I would be livid that the City is prepared to allow construction that shows so little respect for the principles and objectives of the Official Plan; is so far beyond the reasonable expectation anyone could have in purchasing a new property on Cobourg; and imposes such a direct negative impact on my investment.

6. I am incredulous that city officials have concluded that there will be no negative impacts on traffic flows from the proposed development. Traffic along Queen, Parkside, Water and Cobourg after a show is a long-standing problem, especially since there are essentially no dedicated traffic controls at any of the closest and most direct exits from the theatre back to Ontario Street. Several hundred people in scores of cars (and buses) try to get out of the theatre district all at the same time. One has to know the circuitous routes via Christopher Plummer, Front Street, and William/Delamere to avoid waiting on out-of-towners wishing to turn left across traffic onto Stratford's busiest thoroughfare. Moreover I cannot believe that in appraising the Chancery proposal city staff could realistically calculate traffic flows in the Queen, Trow, Water and Cobourg Street areas when for the past two years the Theatre has essentially been shut down or functioning on skeleton-scale. The Chancery proposal is a traffic nightmare ahead pure and simple when, god-willing, we get back to normal times.

7. I support the alternative development scheme proposed by SOS Stratford. It respects the goal of intensification, meshes well with the Heritage character of this neighbourhood, and does a much better job at offering housing options across the income spectrum.

8. The current debate and distress in the community over this proposal should lead Council to do a better job of anticipating development which riles up the public. The case at hand might not have exploded onto the scene had Council put in place a means of tracking the status of vacant or derelict properties, encouraging upkeep and submission of timely development plans; and imposing penalties otherwise. Tracking and reporting on the intentions of owners of properties with obvious major development potential should be the responsibility of the Planning Department so that city councillors don't face the fury of the public when "King Kong" development ideas emerge after property owners sit on assets waiting for a big pay day, whatever their neighbours and the city at large think is appropriate.

9. Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Welsh
[REDACTED] Norman Street
Stratford, ON
[REDACTED]

From: Elin Becker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, November 6, 2021 4:57 PM
To: City Clerks [REDACTED]; Alyssa Bridge [REDACTED]; Bonnie Henderson [REDACTED]; Brad Beatty [REDACTED]; Cody Sebben [REDACTED]; Danielle Ingram [REDACTED]; Dave Gaffney [REDACTED]; Graham Bunting [REDACTED]; Jo-Dee Burbach [REDACTED]; Kathy Vassilakos [REDACTED]; Martin Ritsma [REDACTED]; Tom Clifford [REDACTED]; Dan Mathieson [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Chancery Development on Ontario Street

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

Attention City Clerk and Ms. Brydges: I would appreciate it if you would incorporate the following letter in the record of documents and submissions relating to the City Council meeting on Zone Change Application Z06-20 and Official Plan Amendment Application OPA01-20. Thank you

Dear Councillor:

I am writing to urge you to vote NO on the proposed Chancery development plan on Ontario Street between Queen and Trow Streets. Stratford has an Official Plan. It should not be waived on the financial whim of a developer. It needs to be enforced. I am concerned that raising the allowable height limit for buildings would severely impact houses on Cobourg Street behind the proposed building.

If Ontario is widened, the setback of the proposed development would be very close to a busy street. The sidewalk is already very close to the roadway. I personally walk on the south side of Ontario when I can to avoid walking so close to traffic. Should a vehicle jump the curb, it could be disastrous for pedestrians. I see nothing in the proposed plans to ameliorate this, even though, with increased population density, there would presumably be more pedestrian traffic.

When the Festival Theatre lets out at about 5:00 PM, traffic is backed up on Queen Street north of Ontario Street. Access to the proposed development is through a driveway on Queen Street. This will create an untenable situation for anyone trying to get in or out of the development at the time.

When the developers purchased the land, they knew what the Official Plan said, yet they assumed they could circumvent it. If Chancery is able to run roughshod on the Official Plan, other developers will try to do the same and they will cite the precedent set by Zone Change Application Z06-20 and Official Plan Amendment Application OPA01-20.

Please vote NO on the zone change application and the plan amendment application. A three-storey building that fits the existing Official Plan should be sufficient. There is an alternative development scheme from SOS. Please study it carefully. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elin Becker
[REDACTED] Cobourg Street
Stratford, ON [REDACTED]



November 6, 2021

Mayor Mathieson and Members of Council

Dear Mayor Mathieson,

Re: Application OPA01-20 and Z06-20, 380-396 Ontario Street

As a resident of Stratford, I am writing to express my concerns with respect to the above-noted development application ahead of the Council meeting on Monday, November 8, 2021. The applicant, Chancery Development Ltd., seeks to redesignate the subject properties in the City's Official Plan from the current "Residential Area" to "High Density Residential Area". The proposed designation would permit up to 100 units/hectare and a building maximum of 6 storeys.

The City's Planning and Heritage Committee (PHC) has held several electronic meetings on the proposed development and each time, the Committee heard thoughtful and coherent presentations from community members and the Festival Area Residents Association (FARA) opposed to the developer's recently revised plan. In addition, the PHC received detailed analysis from architectural, heritage and legal professionals on behalf of local residents.

Despite the high level of engagement from the community, the Report from the Manager of Planning does not give credence to the complexity of information and opinions expressed. Moreover, there appears to be little information from either the applicant or the City as to possible impacts of the proposed development on traffic circulation in such close proximity to the Festival Theatre, i.e., peak period traffic studies or to changes in the Ontario St. streetscape from reduced setbacks after the widening of Ontario Street.

With respect to the cultural heritage of the subject properties, has the City incorporated archaeological conservation objectives into its development approval process? See Section 2.6, *Cultural Heritage and Archaeology*, Provincial Policy Statement, 2020.

In its *Strategic Priorities 2018-2022*, the City's Values consist of "Respect - To recognize and consider *all* perspectives and recognize the value of *all* input" (emphasis added). Moreover, the City Values include "Collaboration - To seek community partnership and work together toward a common goal". These core values appear to be absent in the planning process followed for the subject application.

I do not wish to repeat what has been clearly expressed on numerous occasions by those opposed to the development application, suffice to say that the applicant's proposed Amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law would drastically alter the stable residential neighbourhood that presently exists. Moreover, such a change would create increased pressure for high density development in a designated "Heritage Area" and along a designated "Heritage Corridor", one of a few main gateways to the downtown core. (Schedule E, Stratford Official Plan).

Until the City completes its upcoming Official Plan Review with an opportunity to consider such issues as urban infill design policies, criteria for urban intensification and other critical issues for future development, the Council is having to make decisions on an individual case basis which is less than desirable. The Daly Ave. subdivision is a case in point.

Clearly, four members of the Planning and Heritage Committee voted against the developer's application in support of maintaining stable residential neighbourhoods, and preserving the important built and cultural heritage of this area. Countless deputations have been made to the PHC, raising genuine concerns not only for the future stability of their residential neighbourhood but also, addressing the fundamental integrity of the City's planning policies.

I would suggest that the redesignation of the subject properties to "High Density Residential Area" is inconsistent with the intent of current policies in the City Official Plan to maintain the low-medium density character of the surrounding residential area and fails to recognize the heritage value of properties along this portion of the Ontario Street streetscape. Therefore, the application as it stands currently, should be denied by this Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan V Bidell, BES (Hon), B Ed., OCT

cc. Ms. Joan Thomson, Chief Administrative Officer

Mr. Taylor Crinklaw, Director of Infrastructure and Development Services

Ms. Alyssa Bridge, Manager of Planning

Ms. Tatiana Dafoe, City Clerk

S A R A T O P H A M

■ Nile Street Stratford ON ■

November 5th, 2021

To the Mayor and Council Members

Re: MHBC/Chancery Proposal for 380-396 Ontario Street, Stratford

Mr. Mayor and Council Members,

My head is so full of all the details of the Official Plan and the changes being requested, and the very clear arguments against approving this application that I almost don't know where to begin. I know you have had many letters articulating the details of people's objections, and the supporting documents that they are basing their arguments on; although I only recently became involved it is, nevertheless, very clear to me that these arguments are sound, and based on concrete problems with this application as it relates to the Official Plan.

I can imagine that it is tempting for you to see these arguments as primarily emotional, and indeed there is a great deal of passion in this group of like-minded citizens who are deeply concerned for their city and their homes. However, there is a clear basis for our concerns and our continuing requests that you deny the Official Plan Amendment application and the Zone Change amendment application for 380-396 Ontario Street: these applications are not in conformity with the goals, objectives and policies of the Official Plan of the City of Stratford.

I am choosing here to highlight the details that I personally have found the most impactful. There are many, many more, of course, but I will leave those to my fellow citizens to advocate for.

The proposed development (even with the recent changes) does not respect the height or the built form of the surrounding area, and the difference of 45% between the current height allowed on the site, or any of the nearby blocks, and the height of 14.5 metres they are seeking approval for is not reasonable. Neither does the proposed development respect the density in existence in that area - cramming many more residences into the space than are currently there.

As you know, the Official Plan, in **Section 4.6 High Density Residential Areas** lays out applicable policies, many of which The Chancery proposal does not comply with. It also lays out the following criteria in section 4.6.1 Goals and Objectives for High Density Residential Areas:

- i) To recognize established high density residential areas and ensure that new uses generally respect the existing character and density of these areas and adjacent development; and,*
- ii) To provide for the creation of new high density residential areas in locations which generally respect adjacent development.*

The Chancery application does not meet these goals; note the use of the phrase 'generally respect' with regards to 'adjacent development' in BOTH sections. Nothing about this proposed development can be said to 'generally respect' either the 'existing character' or 'adjacent development.'

As you will also be aware, in **Section 4.6.4 New High Density Residential Areas** it says that applications for New High Density Residential Areas require an Official Plan amendment and that any approval or denial of said applications “shall be based on their conformity with the applicable policies . . . and the following criteria.” The Chancery application does conform to **SOME** of these criteria, but it is clear from the careful and specific wording in the section that any application must conform to **ALL** of them. The criteria that The Chancery application fails to adhere to are the following:

4.6.4 ii) a) Intermixed with medium density development and/or commercial, office and institutional components as part of mixed use developments

AND:

4.6.4 iii) designed to ensure that there are no significant negative impacts with respect to privacy and shadowing, and that the appropriate buffering can be provided for any adjacent lands in the Residential Area Designation

AND:

4.6.4 v) Size and scale of the development is such that it can be integrated with and adjacent residential areas, in particular conforms with the policies of Section 3.5, Heritage Conservation and preserves designated and listed heritage buildings and structures, and where located adjacent to such buildings and structures is designed to be compatible

There is a clear failure to meet these criteria in The Chancery application, and the wording makes it clear that failure to meet **ANY ONE** of them is grounds for denial. These are just two of the many selections from the Official Plan which make it clear that this application fails to meet the standards for approval. My fellow advocates will have detailed many more, and I urge you to listen to them and consider each detail.

I began by saying that I can imagine the temptation to dismiss the arguments of this group of concerned citizens as being primarily emotional. I would offer that I also understand that having once stated your position on this application it could be very tempting to block the concrete arguments from this group. It can be tempting to refuse to have your mind changed. But if you have previously voted in favour of approving this application, we are asking you to truly take these details on board – and re-examine your position. It is my belief that if you do that, you will see that denial is the only option, based on the carefully thought out and specifically worded guidance in the Official Plan of our fair city.

Thank you for your service. Thank you for your attention to the details of this argument. The details, are after all, where the best course of action can be found,

Yours,

Sara Topham