

## Legislation Text

---

File #: 17-G-223, Version: 2

---

**APPLICATION FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT -  
SUBMITTED BY INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS ON BEHALF OF HI-WAY PENTECOSTAL  
CHURCH - 40, 42, 44 AND 50 ANNE STREET AND 124, 128 AND 130 HENRY STREET (FILE: D14-1622)  
(WARD 2)**

Mr. Darren Vella of Innovative Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting was to review an application for an Official Plan amendment and an amendment to the Zoning By-Law on behalf of the Hi-Way Pentecostal Church for the lands municipally known as 40, 42, 44 and 50 Anne Street and 124, 128 and 130 Henry Street.

Mr. Vella discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The context of the subject application including information concerning the site and surrounding land uses;
- The current land use designation for the properties;
- The current zoning for the properties;
- A site plan illustrating the development proposal;
- The proposed amendments to the Zoning By-law, including special provisions being sought; and
- The studies completed in support of the applications.

In closing, Mr. Vella detailed the importance of approving the application in regards to the community.

Ms. Andrea Bourrie, Director of Planning and Building Services provided details related to the application as well as the primary planning and land use items being considered. She discussed the comments and concerns of the members of the public in attendance at the Neighbourhood Meeting held on April 26, 2017 and the anticipated timelines of the staff report regarding the application.

## VERBAL COMMENTS

1. **Ms. Sandra Rucker, 122 Henry Street** advised that she spoke to staff separately as she was not able to attend the Neighbourhood Meeting. She indicated that she had asked about the completion of a marketing study and questioned how the project would impact the value of her home. Ms. Rucker also discussed her concerns associated with the traffic flow from the church parking lot onto Henry Street and the height of proposed office/meeting room building. She commented that when she looked at the site plan that the office/meeting building would be facing the side of her home and that the church would be facing along the rear of her property. Ms. Rucker discussed her concerns associated with the proposed side and rear yard setbacks for the church and the office/meeting room building and the impacts on the trees and the privacy to her property, and noted that she would feel closed in. Ms. Rucker advised of her concerns associated with the increase in the volume of traffic and questioned if any provisions for privacy for the neighbouring properties, including items such as fencing were being considered.
2. **Mr. Mario Titus, 2 Toronto Street** advised that he welcomed a project of this kind.

3. **Mr. Blake Williams, 134 Henry Street** indicated that staff had discussed a number of the issues that were brought forward concerning the proposed development at the Neighbourhood Meeting, and commented that he was glad these issues were under consideration. He discussed his concerns associated with the proposed entrance to the parking lot from Anne Street. Mr. Williams advised that his property backs onto the proposed building and discussed his concerns related to the demolition of the area historical buildings and homes. He noted his concerns associated with whether or not the church would be built on that site. Mr. Williams questioned what would happen to Henry Street as a result of the development. He suggested that parkland be put between the church parking lot and the neighbouring properties and acknowledged that this would result in a few less parking spaces. He commented that he felt he would be looking at the rear of a commercial building from his property. Mr. Williams discussed concerns associated with the influx of cars on Henry Street resulting from the development. He stated there are only 12 residences left on Henry Street, with real people with children. Mr. Williams advised that the church purchased six area properties and that the remaining surrounding properties are commercial.

Members of General Committee asked several questions of the applicant's representative and City staff and received responses

#### **WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no written correspondence received concerning this application.