

PRESENTATION - re PARKS

MY NAME IS CHARLES CAMPBELL. I AM THE LAWYER FOR ACTIVE 18, THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION THAT HAS BEEN PARTICIPATING IN ALL THE LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO DATE.

I HAVE DISTRIBUTED A SIX PAGE MEMO WHICH COVERS A NUMBER OF ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ON ANY OF THEM BUT GIVEN TIME CONSTRAINTS I PROPOSE TO SPEAK ABOUT ONLY ONE - PARKS.

FOR THE MOST PART ACTIVE 18 HAS BEEN SUPPORTING THE CITY IN THIS CASE. TODAY YOU ARE HEARING ABOUT ISSUES WHERE WE DISAGREE.

I WOULD LIKE TO START BY THANKING COUNCIL FOR ITS COURAGE - AND THE DEDICATION OF RESOURCES - TO THE DIFFICULT APPEALS UNDERWAY - AND COMPLIMENTING THE PLANNING AND LEGAL STAFF WHO HAVE DONE THE HEAVY LIFTING THROUGH THESE LONG AND DIFFICULT PROCEEDINGS. OF ALL OUR PROBLEMS, THE AMOUNT OF EFFORT FROM STAFF IN THE LAST YEAR IS NOT ONE

**THE PROBLEM - IN A NUTSHELL - IS THAT A SMALL AREA SW OF QUEEN AND DOVERCOURT - THAT IS RIPE FOR REASONABLE DEVELOPMENT - IS HEADING FOR DEVELOPMENT AT DENSITY GREATER THAN ST JAMESTOWN AND, IF ADOPTED AS PROPOSED, THIS SECONDARY PLAN WILL LEAVE OUR AREA - ALREADY PARK DEFICIENT - IN A WORSE POSITION AT THE END OF THE DAY THAN WE ARE NOW.**

LET ME REVIEW THE HISTORY.

CITY COUNCIL AT THE JULY 25 2006 MEETING AFFIRMED THE DIRECTIONS OF THE ADMIN COMMITTEE JULY 4 TO PREPARE THE NECESSARY REVIEW OF ACQUISITION COST AND GET MOVING TO ACQUIRE THE NECESSARY PARKLAND. THE NECESSARY FUNDS WERE TO BE IN 2007 CAPITAL BUDGET. WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT HAPPENED?

THE FACT IS, NO PARKLAND HAS BEEN ACQUIRED IN THE PAST YEAR, BY PURCHASE OR EXPROPRIATION. AND NOW ONE OF THE DEVELOPERS HAS OPTIONED THE LAND THE CITY IDENTIFIED FOR A PARK. THE CITY NOW HAS TO ACQUIRE LAND FROM THAT DEVELOPER AT PRICES REFLECTING THE MASSIVE UP-ZONING UNDERWAY.

OUR IMMEDIATE CONCERN IS THAT MONEY FOR PARKS, WHICH ARE CLEARLY REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE NEW DEVELOPMENT, WILL NOW TO BE DIRECTED TO PAY NEEDLESSLY HIGH AMOUNTS GIVEN THAT PRICES

IN THE TRIANGLE HAVE SKYROCKETED AS A RESULT OF THE OMB DECISION.

I HAVE ASKED CITY STAFF REPEATEDLY TO BE FRANK ABOUT THE CITY'S LIMITED FINANCES ON THIS ISSUE. IF, AS IT APPEARS, THE CITY CANNOT AFFORD TO ACQUIRE AND BUILD THE PARKS. THAT FACT IS A KEY BIT OF EVIDENCE UPON WHICH WE SHOULD RETURN TO THE HEARING OFFICER. WE WILL REQUEST, EVEN IF THE CITY WON'T, THAT THE FIRST THREE PROPOSALS BE SCALED BACK, OR REJECTED OUTRIGHT, IF THE CITY SIMPLY CAN'T AFFORD TO SUPPLY THE PARKS REQUIRED.

AT THE OMB HEARING LAST FALL CITY WITNESSES ASSURED THE BOARD THAT ACQUISITION WAS 'IN PROCESS'. THE BOARD, RELYING ON THIS, APPROVED THE THREE PROPOSALS ALMOST ON THE SCALE PROPOSED AND SAID IF PARKLAND WAS NOT IN PLACE BY SEPTEMBER 1, "IT COULD BE SPOKEN TO". THIS FUNNY CONCLUSION WAS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE 'HOLD' REQUESTED BY THE CITY.

WE REQUEST YOU TO DIRECT THE STAFF TO MAKE THESE DISCLOSURES – EVEN IF IT IS EMBARRASSING TO THE CITY. THE CONSEQUENCE OF NOT BEING FORTHRIGHT MAY WELL BE A DEVELOPMENT DENSER THAN ST JAMESTOWN – WITHOUT PARKS.

REGARDING THE AMOUNT OF PARKLAND A FIGURE OF .4 HECTARES WAS IDENTIFIED AS THE AMOUNT OF PARKLAND LAND NECESSARY TO SERVICE THE NEW RESIDENTS OF THE FIRST THREE PROJECTS AND KEEP THE PER CAPITA PARK SERVICES IS ITS CURRENT LEVEL – WHICH WAS ADMITTED TO BE DEFICIENT BY CITY WIDE STANDARDS. .4 HECTARE IS AMOUNT THE CITY SPECIFIED "TO LIFT THE HOLD".

NOW YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO PUT .4 HECTARES IN THE SECONDARY PLAN AS THE AMOUNT OF PARKLAND NOT JUST FOR THE FIRST THREE PROJECTS IN THE TRIANGLE BUT ALSO FOR ALL THE REST OF THE TRIANGLE. THE DEVELOPMENT ALLOWED IN THE PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN FOR THE REST OF THE TRIANGLE WILL, I ESTIMATE, SEE THE DOUBLING AGAIN OF NEW POPULATION. THERE IS NO PLANNING RATIONAL THAT CAN JUSTIFY A SECONDARY PLAN THAT MAKES OUR PARKS SITUATION WORSE. AND THAT IS WHAT YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU. AND I NOTE, NO PROPOSAL OF THIS NATURE HAS BEEN PUT TO THE PUBLIC AS WOULD BE REQUIRED BY THE PLANNING ACT.

WE RECOMMEND THAT A MINIMUM OF .8 HECTARES OF NEW PARKLAND BE REQUIRED FOR THE FULL BUILD OUT OF THE TRIANGLE. I STRESS THAT WITH THIS FIGURE, WE'RE STILL NOT OUT OF THE PARKS DEFICIENT CATEGORY.

THIS IS NOT THE END OF THE PARKS PROBLEM. THE PROBLEM IS WORSE STILL. THE DEVELOPER WHICH NOW OWNS THE PARK LAND, ALSO HAS FOUR OTHER PROPERTIES IN THE LARGER TRIANGLE AREA AND BY VIRTUE OF THAT IT HAS A MAJOR INVESTMENT IN CONTINUING THE EXCESSIVE DENSITY IN THE AREA. AND THAT IS WHAT YOU SEE IN THE PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN - NO LIMITS ON OVERALL GROSS DENSITY.

WHAT CONCERNS US GREATLY IS THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THAT DEVELOPER AND THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT ON ALL THIS HAVE BEEN PROCEEDING. WE HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED.

THIS IS WRONG. YOU LADIES AND GENTLEMEN ARE RESPONSIBLE. WE REQUEST YOU TO STOP THE SLIDE OF THE WEST QUEEN WEST TRIANGLE INTO A SLUM.

I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS.

NOTE – THIS NEEDS TO BE CHECKED AGAINST MAPS WHICH I HADN'T SEEN WHEN I WROTE THIS

MY NAME IS XXXXX

I AM THE XXXX OF ACTIVE 18

I WANT TO ADDRESS TO PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN AND THE QUESTION OF THE SCALE OF QUEEN ST.

BAYWOOD, THE OWNER OF THE BOHEMIAN EMBASSY, HAS PERMISSION FOR A BUILDING AT 1171 QUEEN THAT DWARFS THE STREET. HOPEFULLY THAT DECISION WILL BE OVERTURNED. WE'RE ALL WAITING.

THIS IS NOT JUST A QUESTION HEIGHT BUT ALSO SIZE. THIS MONSTER  $\frac{3}{4}$  OF A BLOCK LONG AS WELL AS BEING AS HIGH AS THE TOP OF THE GLADSTONE TOWER FOR THAT ENTIRE LENGTH.

IT WAS A BIG DISAPPOINTMENT TO US THAT THE CITY SUPPORTED THIS. GOING AGAINST US ON THE HEIGHT WAS BAD. SUPPORTING THEM REST OF THE SCALE WAS AWFUL. WE ARE FACING A WALL A GLASS.

WE ARE NOT FOOLED BY THE DOUBLE TALK ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO THE FULL EXTENT OF THIS IF YOU LOOK AT IT FROM DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET. THAT'S NOT THE ONLY PLACE WE STAND. WE WALK UP AND DOWN THE STREET. WE EVEN CAN CHEW GUM AS WE WALK. WE LOOK UP!

THE COMMUNITY MADE VERY CLEAR IN THE OPEN SESSIONS AND AGAIN IN THE CHARRETTE THAT WE WANTED TO MAINTAIN SOME HUMAN SCALE ON QUEEN STREET. WE FELT BETRAYED.

THERE IS VIRTUALLY NO ARTICULATION ON THE FACE OF THIS BUILDING.

AT STREET LEVEL THERE IS LITTLE TO MARK OFF SEPARATE STORES.

NOW BAYWOOD HAS BOUGHT THE PROPERTIES TO WEST AND THE EAST. WE'RE FACING A MONSTER TWICE THE SIZE – A BLOCK AND HALF LONG.

WHAT DOES THIS PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN DO TO STOP THIS?

NOTHING THAT WE CAN SEE. WHY?

YOU CAN REQUIRE DIFFERENT AND VARIED SET BACKS FROM THE STREET FOR THEIR DIFFERENT PROPERTIES. YOU CAN REQUIRE SIDE YARD SET BACKS BETWEEN THE PROPERTIES TO PREVENT ONE MASSIVE BUILDING.

WE KNOW THAT THE CITY NEEDS MORE DESIGN CONTROL TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS LIKE THIS. BUT THE PROVINCE GAVE IT TO YOU AND YOU'RE NOT USING IT.

THE FIASCO OF THE NORTHCOTE EXTENSION – A STREET THAT HAS TURNED INTO A TUNNEL AND A PATH – IS A DISGRACE. NOW THAT BAYWOOD HAS MORE LAND ON QUEEN STREET THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR THIS TUNNEL ENTRANCE. THREE SEPARATE BUILDINGS ALONG QUEEN SHOULD BE REQUIRED. THE ENTRANCE TO THE NORTHCOTE EXTENSION SHOULD BE OPEN TO THE SKY AND RUN BETWEEN TWO OF THOSE BUILDINGS.

WHY IS THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPER WITH THESE AWFUL PLANS?

PRESENTATION - re Streets

MY NAME IS XXXX

THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ARE ABOUT STREETS IN THE WEST QUEEN WEST TRIANGLE.

IT SHOULD BE GIVEN THAT A DEVELOPMENT AREA AS LARGE AS THIS SHOULD HAVE A STREET GRID THAT INTEGRATES IT WITH THE ADJOINING NEIGHBOURHOOD. WE KNOW THAT WITHOUT THIS, WE HAVE THE MAKINGS OF A SLUM. THE LAST TIME THIS CASE WAS BEFORE COUNCIL SEVERAL COUNCILLORS COMMENTED ON THIS PROBLEM.

THE EXTENSION OF NORTHCOTE AVENUE IS THE IMMEDIATE ISSUE.

LOOK AT THE MAP WHICH FORMS THE PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN. NORTHCOTE AVE SHOULD BE CONTINUED SOUTH TO THE EXTENSION OF SUDBURY AS ON THE EXISTING OP MAPS. INCREDIBLY THE CITY NOW PROPOSES TO REMOVE THAT BASIC ASSERTION OF THE NEED FOR PUBLIC SPACE.

WHAT WE ARE GETTING FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT AS AN EXTENSION OF NORTHCOTE IS A PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE PATHWAY. REMEMBER THIS IS TO BE A SUBSTITUTE FOR A PUBLIC STREET.

AND WHAT WILL BE THE ENTRANCE TO THIS SPACE? A TUNNEL UNDER THE CONDO OFF QUEEN ST, INSTEAD OF SOMETHING OPEN TO THE SKY.

SOMEHOW STAFF AGREED TO THIS WITH THE DEVELOPER BEFORE THE MATTER CAME TO THE VARIOUS PUBLIC MEETINGS.

NOW THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT PROPOSES TO ENTRENCH THIS IN THE SECONDARY PLAN. THE WORDING MAKES THIS DISASTROUS GIVE AWAY PERMANENT. THE SECONDARY PLAN AND ZONING SHOULD BE WORDED TO AFFIRM THE OPEN TO THE SKY PRINCIPLE FOR WHAT IS A STREET SUBSTITUTE.

WE LOST THIS ISSUE AT THE OMB. IF THAT DECISION IS OVERTURNED, OR IF THIS PROJECT IS NOT BUILT, WE DON'T WANT TO FACE A SECONDARY PLAN ADOPTED BY COUNCIL WHICH SUPPORTS THIS GIVE AWAY. IF THE OMB DECISION IS APPROVED IT WILL OVER-RULE WHATEVER THE SECONDARY PLAN SAYS. THERE IS NO REASON TO WORD THE SECONDARY PLAN IN THIS FASHION.

THE PROBLEM OF THE NORTHCOTE EXTENSION IS COMPOUNDED BY THE PROPOSED Secondary Plan and zoning. While the Secondary Plan specifies that the

width of the open space will be 11 meters the proposed ZONING.(SECTION 6) says that THE WIDTH OF THE PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE PATH WILL BE 3 METERS! The rest, it would seem, can be closed in for private use.

THIS COSY ARRANGEMENT JUST APPEARED IN THIS DRAFT ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT BEFORE YOU. THIS MAKES A MOCKERY OF THE IDEA THAT THIS SHOULD BE A 'STREET'.

THEN WE HEARD AT THE OMB REVIEW HEARING THAT THE DEVELOPER NOW WANTS TO CLOSE THE NORTHCOTE EXTENSION AT CERTAIN HOURS.

WHAT THIS DEMONSTRATES, ALAS, IS THE STRANGULATION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT SHOULD BE INSTRUCTED GET SOME BACKBONE AND INSIST A STREET WHERE A STREET CLEARLY SHOULD BE..