

Centrepointe Community Association Questions

For Planning Staff

The new Official Plan has not been presented to Planning Committee, nor to City Council. Explain why these material ad hoc changes to the zoning regulations should not be perceived as a lack of respect to the established democratic process.

On October 2, about five weeks before this video session, Richcraft submitted a revised application that had material changes to the application they filed in April. The two most notable revisions were:

- reducing the three towers of 22, 24 and 26 storeys to two towers of 24 storeys each, while retaining the same density; and
- reducing the minimum parking requirements from 552 spaces for residents to 420 spaces.

Why were these changes not considered to be material to the overall project? If they were considered to be material, would it have resulted in a different set of deadlines for staff to respond?

Did planning staff take into consideration the evidence provided by the Centrepointe Community Association in April 2016 regarding off-site parking problems in Centrepointe? This evidence was used by Councillor Chiarelli to support a carve out for Centrepointe from the minimum parking requirements for new developments near LRT stations. If staff did take this into account, what new information did they consider that they thought overrode the aforementioned carve out provisions that were approved by our elected officials?

Has the Planning Department confirmed the following capacity related issues with its counterparts within city hall:

Water Supply/Sanitary and Storm Sewer Capacity

- Is there sufficient capacity to supply water to a building with 600 units with about 1,000 residents at peak usage hours with no noticeable difference in pressure to the nearby buildings?
- Do the existing sanitary sewers have the capacity to receive the peak hour effluent from the 600 units with about 1,000 residents?
- Does the storm sewer system have the capacity to accept the increased run off that will result from covering a significant amount of open land?
- If the answer to any of the above was that the capacity is insufficient to handle the increased load, when will the city take tangible steps to address the problems?

Traffic Management

- Has the city's traffic management group commented on the impact of the expected increase in traffic volumes for Centrepointe Drive, between Baseline Road and south of Hemmingwood Way, and in particular:
 - pedestrian and cyclist safety at the Hemmingwood/Centrepointe intersection?
 - congestion at the Centrepointe/Gemini intersection due to an increase in the number of vehicles entering/exiting Gemini?
- Has the city's traffic management group commented on the impact on traffic flow if there is an increase in the parking on the nearby streets?

- Has either of the city's traffic management or traffic engineering groups commented on the incremental load that will be added to what the Traffic Impact Assessment report acknowledges, then ignores, as the over capacity intersection at Baseline and Woodroffe?
- Has the city's traffic management group commented on the reasonableness of the key assumptions in the Traffic Impact Assessment report?

Waste/Recycling/Composting Facilities

Did staff consult with their counterparts on whether these buildings should have facilities that offer greater opportunities for its residents to:

- minimize their household waste that goes to landfill;
- maximize their household waste that can be directed to recycling facilities; and
- maximize the collection of compostable material (noting the well publicized lament from the city that the residents are not directing enough material to the composting facilities).

On-site Parking

During the community consultation in April 2016 regarding the proposed minimum parking regulations, it was acknowledged by planning staff that:

- about 3,000 people report to work at city facilities in Centrepointe;
- there are about 1,200 parking spaces available for city employees (~40% of # of employees)
- there is a well documented off site parking problem during the hours that city facilities in Centrepointe are open

Has the city asked its Centrepointe based employees:

- how many of them regularly use OC Transpo to get to/from work?
- for those who do not rely on OC Transpo to get to/from work, why, when Baseline Station is less than 400 metres away?

If so, what were the findings? If not, why has the city not polled its employees on not just a Centrepointe issue, but an issue that is fundamental to the assumptions about mass transit usage? These are not academic questions. They tie into the fundamental assumption that relatively few people who live near LRT stations will own vehicles. The city knows that its own employees choose, for their own good and valid reasons, not to rely on OC Transpo to get to/from work. In short:

- what evidence does planning staff have that the behaviour of its employees will change once the LRT reaches Baseline Station?
- what evidence does planning staff have that the behaviour exhibited by the city's employees to not use mass transit will not be mimicked by the residents of 19 Centrepointe?

Did the planning department perform any analysis of the actual demand for residential parking spaces in recent higher rise properties that are proximate to the LRT (e.g. in Mechanicsville, Hintonburg, Westboro)? If so, what were the findings? If not, why?

Can approval of the variances be made conditional on Richcraft performing specific actions? For example:

- Richcraft must build the properties in a fashion consistent with those presented as part of the revised application within five years;
- the proposed usage (rental vs condominium) must be honoured;

- Richcraft must commit to specified number of units being directed at the affordably housing market, with the details of what constitutes “affordable”;
- the building must include features that facilitate the collection of recycling and compostable material.

There are a number of challenges known to the city that are faced by the community on a daily basis, notably the off site parking problems and the hazards to pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle drivers on the section of Centrepointe Drive between Baseline Road and south of Hemmingwood Way. What obligations does the city have to address these problems before it approves a plan that will add to the problem?

Can the city be obligated as part of approving this revised application to:

- remove the median on Constellation and Gemini, to allow left turns from Gemini onto Constellation, and then out to Baseline Road?
- open the existing part of Navaho Drive that connects Constellation to Woodroffe to public use?

If Richcraft determines that the demand for on-site parking exceeds the 0.7 spaces per residential unit, do they need to go through another application, or would it be addressed as part of the site plan approval process?

For Richcraft

In November 2019, you advised us that the plan was for two of the three proposed towers to be rentals, at a rental rate that would not be attractive to Algonquin students, with the third being a condominium. The plan at that time was to build the two rental towers first, with the condominium tower coming later. You advised us that the expected construction period would be about five years.

What are the plans now, vis a vis rental versus condominium?

Do you plan on building the entire project in a single phase?

What is the expected timeline for construction:

- start date;
- months to full completion?

If there are rental units, what is the target demographic/rental rate?

Will Richcraft commit to providing, in advance of the granting of the revised application being approved, a specified number of affordable housing units, and define the metrics of what constitutes “affordable”?

If, during the pre-sale/pre-lease stage demand for parking spaces exceeds the requested 0.7 factors, will you adjust your plans?