

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Laura Tagliafierro <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2024 12:19 PM
To: Alex Singbush
Subject: Notice of application for old St Jo's site

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I would like to express some issue with the proposed development at Paris Street and Boland intersection at the former site of Saint Joseph's Hospital.

Being directly adjacent to the development means:

Decrease scope of view to the lake

Increase in light pollution and ambient light in the night sky (an issue we already deal with due to the new led lighting in the adjacent parking lot which is turned off in winter months.)

increased traffic

Increased cars parked along adjacent streets

increased noise

increased garbage

Increased foot track traffic to an already extremely busy area especially in the summer.

Since the installation of parking at the site for the public and post Covid, we have seen an increase in people camping overnight in the parking lot, significant garbage throughout the summer at the site, as well as an increase in noise, crime and such behaviour in the late night hours 12am to 5am.

We frequently have foot traffic people entering our properties in yards as well as significant noise from Paris Street.

At the intersection, there is significant running of the red light in the north and south bound directions.

Despite recent traffic calming measures with posted signage of 40 km/h on Boland Street we continue to see extremely high speeds of driving in a residential area where children play.

Though I would like to see the development of this site, I believe the significant number of units is far too many for this neighbourhood to maintain the nature of the community. In addition, there is concern that the development will block the view and access of neighbours and community members to the lake and the park, something which we have been paying a premium to have the opportunity to live near.

I would like to see some measures of what will occur in terms of the following:

- pedestrian management for walkways adjacent to the park to limit wind factors which are already significant.
- the pedestrian environment around the development.
- proposed continued access for the park and lake front
- study on shading and how the development will affect light to surrounding street- for example we will no longer have the morning sun.

-light management in terms of ambient light and light pollution in the night sky.

-garbage management around the park parking lot area and side streets other areas in the community due to traffic.

-Proposed significant traffic calming measures by the city as well as by the developers and how traffic will flow in and out of the development.

-sound barriers were possible.

- most importantly a reduction in the number of units.

-will there be access to grocery, cafe and restaurants in the facility will these be accessible to the surrounding community.

We would like to see a reduction in the

Number of units, and or maintain the current height of the building that exists on the site. Otherwise we feel a study to examine how it will affect neighboring properties and community is necessary before such a large development is built.

Sincerely,

Laura and Anthony Tagliaferro

11 Boland Ave.

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Alex Singbush
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 3:32 PM
To: Wendy Kaufman; Maria Gonzalez Santos
Subject: FW: NOTICE OF APPLICATION - file# 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25
Attachments: TO CITY OF SUDBURY.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: COMMENTS

From: Mike Parsons <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 10:13 AM
To: Alex Singbush <Alex.Singbush@greatersudbury.ca>
Subject: NOTICE OF APPLICATION - file# 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Alex.

Please see attached comments regarding "NOTICE OF APPLICATIONS " in connection with old St Joseph's Health Centre, file# 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25.

Thank you.

Michael Parsons
578 Paris Street
Sudbury Ontario. P3B-3B4
[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avast.com

To:

February 14/2024

City of Greater Sudbury.

Alex Singbush.

Manager of Development Approvals, Planning Services Division.

PO Box 5000, Station A, 200 Brady Street, Sudbury, ON P3A-5P3.

alex.singbush@greatersudbury.ca

Hello Alex.

In response to "NOTICE OF APPLICATIONS" regarding the old St Joseph's Health Centre, Sudbury.

The current application for the abandoned St Joseph's Health Centre property presents at least three problems for the citizens of Sudbury who enjoy the benefits of Bell Park.

First, the request for zero set back on the Bell Park side of the proposed construction. This would place an exclusion zone for construction on the Bell Park property, removing that land from the use and enjoyment of people of Sudbury for the duration of construction.

Second, the proposal shows the annex of a public access road that presently runs underneath the old helicopter pad. Rerouting this road would destroy a stand of pine trees and walking path in the park.

Third, the proposal contains no time line for completion of the development. Based on the progress over the last ten or more years, that means Bell Park will be dominated by perpetual construction for decades.

Thank you.

Michael Parsons

578 Paris Street

Sudbury Ontario. P3B-3B4

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Ray Spangler <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:14 PM
To: Alex Singbush
Subject: Notice of Applications File 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To: Mr. Alex Singbush, Manager of Development Approvals.

Re: Notice of Applications

File 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25

Applicant: 2226553 Ontario Inc.

We object to this application.

My reasons are as follows:

- There is no timeline. The applicant has had possession of this property for more than 10 years and it could be vacant for another 10 years. He has left the site in a derelict state without consideration to adjacent property owners or passing traffic. The applicant provides no guaranty that they will continue to develop the property. If development does progress, the site could be under construction for many years causing traffic issues and unsightly conditions.
- The increase of traffic and turning movements on Paris Street will be significant.
- The City will have little control of the building aesthetics or the site landscaping. These structures will be adjacent to Bell Park and will no doubt be unattractive and ordinary apartment buildings.
- A 12, 16 and 20 story building will have an obvious and negative impact on Bell Park. This fact alone should be sufficient reason for Planning Services to reject the application.

We also forward further comments which we feel are applicable to this application. I have expressed my concern with this development via several emails to my Councillor over the past years.

The Master Plan for Bell Park calls for the City to purchase any adjacent property that becomes available over time. The City has already ignored this policy as they have permitted residential development adjacent to the park on Facer Street

The previous council should have taken the opportunity to purchase the old hospital site and letting the most valuable piece of property within the City go to a developer was a major mistake. This can now be rectified by the current administration and council by the expropriation of the property. Costs are irrelevant - considering the property would forever belong to the people of the City of Sudbury.

We question the integrity of the applicant. At the first public meeting, they presented architectural renderings for high end condominiums. We later found that they did not build and sell but only built to rent. The condominium plan was a

ploy to get the City and neighboring property owners to approve the development and donate a small piece of land to permit additional parking.

We question the integrity of the City. The building is an eyesore. Why the City has not forced demolition and restoration remains a question and we wonder if the City will continue to allow this applicant to be unrestricted.

There is activity inside the existing building which is a major Health and Safety concern – putting the developer and the City at risk.

We would appreciate notification of the decision on the proposed zoning amendment.

I have also forwarded this email to Councillor Cormier. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions or comments.

Ray and Connie Spangler

530 Ramsey Road, Sudbury



Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Philip Hopkins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2024 10:12 AM
To: Alex Singbush
Subject: FW: Notice of Applications 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25 - 2226553 Ontario Inc

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Attention: Mr Alex Singbush
Manager of Development Approvals
City of Greater Sudbury

Re: Notice of Applications
File: 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25

Dear Mr Singbush,

In reference to the letter I received from yourself (29 January 2024) regarding the Notice of Applications (File: 701-6/23-04 & 751-6/23-25) I would like to make comment on the proposed applicatyoins (1 & 2) outlined in your letter.

As noted below (see address), my wife (Mary) and I reside in a single home dwelling directly on Paris Street some three homes to the north of the proposed rezoning and ultimate construction site. We would like to note for the record that we are wholly in support of both the rezoning and ultimate construction of the joined and multiple use building outlined in your letter of 29 January 2024. Furthermore, we would be supportive of seeing this development move forward as smoothly and unhindered as possible.

In sending this letter of support we fully understand and expect: traffic restrictions and interruptions, some noise matters, some dust and general area "housekeeping" matters and local movement disruptions throughout the development process and that this overall period may last a number of years. We respect this may/will result in some challenges from time to time with us as local residents but fully respect the work and approach here and will support this development in any feasible way we can.

We wish you the greatest success here and know the final outcomes will greatly improve the city and area overall.

Sincerely
Philip Hopkins (& Mary)

Personal details are as follows:

Mary & Philip Hopkins
584 Paris Street
Sudbury, Ontario
P3E 3B4

Phone: [REDACTED] (Philip)

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Arthur Peach <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 11:09 AM
To: Fern Cormier; clerks; 311
Cc: Arthur F Peach
Subject: Referencing Panoramic's proposal for the old hospital property: 700 Paris Street – Item 4.1 on the Agenda Monday, April 219, 2024

COUNCILLOR CORMIER AND CGS CLERK,

I would like this presentation to be received and put on the Agenda for Monday's Planning Committee Meeting.

I will be at the meeting and If possible I would appreciate being able to present orally, personally to the Committee; I trust that you can enable that. I would be happy to take questions.

Thank you, very much
Art Peach, B. Arch. Consultant
For a Better Designed Sudbury
7 Pebblehill Place, Sudbury ON
P3E 5Y9, Tel. [REDACTED]

ARTHUR F. PEACH, B. ARCH., RET. OAA – BUILDING AND URBAN DESIGN CONSULTANT

7 PEBBLEHILL PLACE, SUDBURY, ON P3E 5Y9

T. [REDACTED] E. [REDACTED]

Referencing Panoramic's proposal for the old hospital property: 700 Paris Street –

Item 4.1 on the Agenda

1. When first acquired about 10 years ago Panoramic presented a fairly reasonable plan which I tentatively supported. It provided for a living project with ONE building, in good scale with the neighbourhood, and with PUBLIC amenities, transparent 'through-the-project' access to Bell Park and Lake Ramsey. It was itself presented as an integral part of the Boland Neighbourhood, with public street and sidewalks, paid for by the developer.

2. The current proposal is presented as a Barrier Wall, cutting off public sight lines, excluding public access to the Public Park and Lake Ramsey; a virtual Gated Community with very limited "neighbourliness", "VIBE"; could it be comparable to the WALL on the US southern border, only much worse at 12 to 20 stories high, BOTH meant to EXclude.??

3. In the proposal by Panoramic there is no mention of a market study if indeed one was done. Is this company, our community, aware of the number of possible tenants and owners who would participate in this monster?

What will the range of rents be?

What will be the price range of the condo suites?

Does the proposed development do anything to help solve the affordable housing crisis we are experiencing in Sudbury?

4. What is going to be the cost to the Taxpayers of the city? Will the developer pay for all the additional service infrastructure needed for the development, the public road improvements, the new, traffic controlled intersection that is suggested in the proposal? Remember well...how the city got stuck with nearly a million dollars in unauthorized infrastructure costs that eventually favoured the developer of the KED...even though that proposal was thankfully stopped by the previous Council.

5. What will be the effect to traffic on adjacent Paris Street during construction, and after the finish of the construction? Currently citizens have been subjected to a long period of reconstruction on the nearby Bridge of nations, the entry to our downtown; it's not pretty. Has there been any sort of Traffic Study?

6. As a retired architect and partner in an urban planning practice for over 65 years I think I have some credibility to offer the developer and our planning department. My advice? Back to the drawing board, fellow colleagues. Our friends at Panoramic know, or should know better than to expect approval for this monster development...which will consume us.

7. RE-THINK...RE-PLAN...RE-IDEA THE WHOLE THING...!

If Panoramic really wishes to stay in the good graces of the Residents of Sudbury, they will seriously consider and accept to enter negotiations for a 'Land Swap'.

The land, our land, always has been Public Land, before being acquired by a Private Citizen, and eventually willed to us by that same Private Citizen, who had a lot of Integrity.

I trust the Council and Planners of our great city will recognize and maintain that integrity.

Sincerely,

Arthur Peach

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: George Kaminski <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2024 12:55 PM
To: Alex Singbush
Subject: 700 Paris Street

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

My name is Edward George Kaminski.
I reside at 598 Paris St.

I would like to express my concerns regarding amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-laws with regard to 700 Paris St.

1- I believe the number of proposed units is extremely excessive for a relatively small plot of land. The Applicant is well aware that because of the park/lake location, they can command a premium prices for the condo, retirement and rental units and trying to take advantage of this by requesting a very high density. This is very beneficial for the Developer but would be detrimental to the enjoyment of citizens of this low density residential area.

2- Why is a restaurant necessary for this development? It will only increase traffic and parking issues. Where will the restaurant employees park? Traffic is often backed up from York or Boland St to the Bridge of Nations making it difficult to enter or exit my driveway. Adding a restaurant will only add to the traffic jams, especially during lunch, dinner and rush hours. A commercial use for this property was rejected 10 years ago for the condo development so here they are again hoping to get approval on this round. When the last development was approved in 2012 for 210 units without restaurants, a study projected an increase of over 1,200 vehicle trips on an average week day. This proposal projects less than 450 vehicle trip for 530 units plus restaurants. Interesting how projections can be manipulated to suite an outcome. I have to admit that if I were to purchase a condo in this development, would I really want to have a restaurant open to the public in the same building. Would the condo owners elevators be shared with the restaurant? Will the condo owners be responsible to maintain the elevators? What is the benefit to the condo owner? The proposal also states that the restaurant will also be used for special private events. How would the 21 parking spots allocated for the restaurant be sufficient for the guests, cooks, servers, etc. Will they be relying on the city owned parking lot on the south side of the property? What about the noise from this commercial endeavour?

3- I believe the Developer is requesting access to parking from Bell Park Road via Facer and McNaughton Streets. This was rejected 10 years ago for the previous condo proposed development. All traffic was to be accessed from the Boland/Paris intersection. In Living Area 1, there should be minimal impact on local streets. Accessing parking from Bell Park Road will not accomplish this.

Bell Park Road is not a public road. It is a fire route and access route for city vehicles and other limited access for events at the Amphitheatre. If this development is given access to service vehicles, what prevents vehicles from accessing the parking using the same route? There is a proposal to widen and pave Bell Park Road, Does this mean that parkland that is part of the Bell covenant of 1927 will be infringed upon? Would this be legal?

4- The Developer is requesting no setback on the park side of the property. This helps facilitate the proposed high density and also sets a precedent that other developers will request. They are also asking for less distance between buildings so they can increase density. This should be rejected as it sets a negative precedent for other developments. The city should not accept money in lieu of this requirement. Setbacks are legislated for a purpose and exceptions should be limited whenever possible.

5- The Development proposes plenty of landscaping. I trust that the trees planted will be more mature than a few years old so we do not have to wait 20 years before they are mature enough to make a difference.

6- No time frame is mentioned in the proposal. In 2012, the city made many accommodations and changes to the Zoning By-laws to facilitate development, yet the property sat idle until now. The Developer is now requesting approximately a 150% increase in the proposed units without a timeline. What prevents them from leaving this eyesore for another 10 years?

I believe that this property will be developed so let's do this right. The proposal seems to portray that the Developer is doing Sudbury a big favour by developing this property. I hope the City Councillors' will not be blinded by the Developers spin on this project and approve this without seriously considering the negatives. The City has developed an Official Plan and Zoning By-laws. Looking at this proposal, it appears that the Developer ignored this Plan and proposed something that hardly resembles the Plan.. Tell them to re-imagine their proposal to better align with the Official Plan and Zoning By-laws.

George Kaminski

ARTHUR F. PEACH, B. ARCH., RET. OAA – BUILDING AND URBAN DESIGN CONSULTANT
7 PEBBLEHILL PLACE, SUDBURY, ON P3E 5Y9

T. [REDACTED] E. [REDACTED]

REFERENCING PANORAMIC'S PROPOSAL FOR THE OLD HOSPITAL PROPERTY: 700 PARIS STREET –
ITEM 4.1 ON THE AGENDA

1. WHEN FIRST ACQUIRED ABOUT 10 YEARS AGO PANORAMIC PRESENTED A FAIRLY REASONABLE PLAN WHICH I TENTATIVELY SUPPORTED. IT PROVIDED FOR A LIVING PROJECT WITH ONE BUILDING, USING THE EXISTING SHELL AND PROFILE OF THE OLD HOSPITAL, IN GOOD SCALE WITH THE NEIGHBOURHOOD, AND WITH PUBLIC AMENITIES, TRANSPARENT 'THROUGH-THE-PROJECT' ACCESS TO BELL PARK AND LAKE RAMSEY. IT WAS ITSELF PRESENTED AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE BOLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD, WITH PUBLIC STREET AND SIDEWALKS, PAID FOR BY THE DEVELOPER.

2. THE CURRENT PROPOSAL STRIKINGLY DIFFERENT IS PRESENTED AS A BARRIER WALL, CUTTING OFF PUBLIC SIGHT LINES, EXCLUDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE PUBLIC PARK AND LAKE RAMSEY; A VIRTUAL GATED COMMUNITY WITH VERY LIMITED "NEIGHBOURLINESS", "VIBE"; COULD IT BE COMPARABLE TO THE WALL ON THE US SOUTHERN BORDER, ONLY MUCH WORSE AT 12 TO 20 STORIES HIGH, BOTH MEANT TO EXCLUDE.??

3. IN THE PROPOSAL BY PANORAMIC THERE IS NO MENTION OF A MARKET STUDY IF INDEED ONE WAS DONE. IS THIS COMPANY, OUR COMMUNITY, AWARE OF THE NUMBER OF POSSIBLE TENANTS AND OWNERS WHO WOULD PARTICIPATE IN THIS MONSTER?

WHAT WILL THE RANGE OF RENTS BE?

WHAT WILL BE THE PRICE RANGE OF THE CONDO SUITES?

DOES THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DO ANYTHING TO HELP SOLVE THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CRISIS WE ARE EXPERIENCING IN SUDBURY?

4. WHAT ARE GOING TO BE THE COSTS TO THE TAXPAYERS OF THE CITY? WILL THE DEVELOPER PAY FOR ALL THE ADDITIONAL SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, THE PUBLIC ROAD IMPROVEMENTS, THE NEW, TRAFFIC CONTROLLED INTERSECTION THAT IS SUGGESTED IN THE PROPOSAL? REMEMBER WELL...HOW THE CITY GOT STUCK WITH NEARLY A MILLION DOLLARS IN UNAUTHORIZED INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS THAT EVENTUALLY FAVOURED THE DEVELOPER OF THE KED...EVEN THOUGH THAT PROPOSAL WAS THANKFULLY STOPPED BY THE PREVIOUS COUNCIL, WE THE TAXPAYERS ARE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG.

5. WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT TO TRAFFIC ON ADJACENT PARIS STREET DURING CONSTRUCTION, AND AFTER THE FINISH OF THE CONSTRUCTION? CURRENTLY CITIZENS HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO A LONG PERIOD OF RECONSTRUCTION ON THE NEARBY BRIDGE OF NATIONS, THE ENTRY TO OUR DOWNTOWN; IT'S NOT PRETTY. HAS THERE BEEN ANY SORT OF TRAFFIC STUDY?

6. AS A RETIRED ARCHITECT AND PARTNER IN AN URBAN PLANNING PRACTICE FOR OVER 65 YEARS I THINK I HAVE SOME PERSONAL CREDIBILITY TO OFFER THE DEVELOPER AND OUR PLANNING DEPARTMENT. MY ADVICE? BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD, FELLOW COLLEAGUES. OUR FRIENDS AT PANORAMIC KNOW, OR SHOULD KNOW BETTER THAN TO EXPECT APPROVAL FOR THIS MONSTER DEVELOPMENT...WHICH WILL CONSUME US.

7. RE-THINK...RE-PLAN...RE-IDEA THE WHOLE THING...!

IF PANORAMIC REALLY WISHES TO STAY IN THE GOOD GRACES OF THE RESIDENTS OF SUDBURY, THEY WILL SERIOUSLY CONSIDER AND ACCEPT TO ENTER NEGOTIATIONS FOR A 'LAND SWAP'.

THE LAND, OUR LAND, ALWAYS HAS BEEN PUBLIC LAND, BEFORE BEING ACQUIRED BY A PRIVATE CITIZEN, BUT EVENTUALLY WILLED TO US BY THAT SAME PRIVATE CITIZEN, WHO HAD A LOT OF INTEGRITY.

I TRUST THE COUNCIL AND PLANNERS OF OUR GREAT CITY WILL RECOGNIZE AND MAINTAIN THAT INTEGRITY.

SINCERELY,


Arthur Peach

RECEIVED

APR 29 2024

PLANNING SERVICES

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: David King <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 1:55 PM
To: Wendy Kaufman
Subject: 700 Paris Street - Proposed O.P and ZBL Amendments

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ms. Kaufman:

I am a property owner (0 Facer Street McKim CON3, Lot5, Plan 50S -Pt. Lot 12, 13, & 14 Inst 2554) adjacent to the subject property.

I viewed online the public meeting held on April 29th, 2024, regarding the proposal. I have some questions and concerns that I would like addressed in the next version of the planning report.

Like most Sudbury residents, I would like to see the former hospital demolished and replaced with public space, or a development that is aesthetically pleasing, blends in with the natural environment and is forward thinking in terms of architecture, storm water management and active transportation. This property is one of the premier development sites in the City and needs to be developed with thought and care as it will impact the Lake Ramsey land scape for future generations.

In my view, the subject proposal has a number of issues that need to be addressed. In particular, the **number of dwelling units** being proposed, the **height of the buildings** and the associated issues of **parking, traffic flow, stormwater management and active transportation**.

Given the length of time that it has taken to develop this property, I am skeptical of the developers' intentions and fear that they are simply trying to "up zone" the property to try and maximize its value only to turn around and flip the property to another developer which will further delay the redevelopment of this property.

Number of dwelling units being proposed:

First, I would like the background section of the planning report provide an outline of the planning/development history for this site. I recall that after the property was purchased from the Sisters of St. Joseph, the developer was proposing to utilize the existing structure of the hospital to redevelop the site for condominium units.

Was an Official Plan (O.P) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBL) required at that time?

If so, what was proposed and approved in terms of the number of dwelling units, parking, and access to the property?

What does the current O. P. designation and ZBL provide for in terms of the number of dwelling units and parking?

What does the proposed O.P. and ZBL amendment provide for in terms of the number of dwelling units and parking?

Has there been any issues identified by City departments in the past associated with the subject property that need to be addressed/rectified with the proposed development? I would like the planning report to identify these to ensure that they are addressed when the site is redeveloped.

Heights of the proposed buildings:

I understand from the public hearing that the developer has submitted a sun and shadow report. However, I was unable to locate this report online.

My concerns relate to the proposed heights of the buildings and the transition in building heights from the McNaughton and Boland Street neighborhoods; the shadow effect on both Paris Street and Bell Park during different parts of the day, and the Lake Ramsy viewscape.

In short, I would like to see I would like to see the height restrictions of any of the buildings limited to 8 Stories or 32 meters, which I understand to be the current height restrictions for the property.

Parking:

Despite the developer’s proposal to provide 592 parking spaces for the Condo/Apartment/Senior units under the proposed buildings, I am concerned that there is still insufficient parking for the size of the development proposal and a limited amount of above ground parking to accommodate visitors and staff to the units and the proposed restaurant. I foresee issues with overflow parking impacting the Facer Street entrance to Bell Park as well as the City owned parking area for Bell Park to the south of the proposed development.

As a user of the General Hospital in the past, I recall there was insufficient parking at that time and visitors and staff had to park in the area south of the Hospital.

Traffic Flow:

Parris Street is one of the busiest thorough fares/ access points to the south end of Sudbury. I would like the traffic study to address how this development proposal would impact traffic flow and in particular how to address traffic calming along Paris Street.

Consideration to having traffic lights at the intersection of Facer Street and Paris Street would slow traffic, reduce the number of vehicle accidents turning east onto Facer Street and allow for safer pedestrian access to Bell Park from the west side of Paris Street to Facer Street.

I would also recommend that bus pull off areas be provided on Paris Street (north and south bound) near the Boland Street entrance to the development in order to reduce traffic build ups.

Stormwater Management:

It is well known that the water quality in Ramsey Lake continues to be impacted by stormwater runoff from the roadways and developments in the Ramsey Lake watershed. When questioned by Councillor Leduc about how stormwater runoff from the proposed development and snow storage would be managed, the consultant for the developer indicated the “City’s stormwater protection group is satisfied with what is being proposed as the site less than one hectare in size”.

I find this response to irresponsible as uncontrolled runoff from this dense development will surely impact water quality in Ramsey Lake.

There needs to be a separate and thorough study on how stormwater runoff will be managed (in terms of quantity and quality) from the 592 underground parking spaces, roof tops, surface parking and snow storage before an increase in building density is considered.

Active Transportation:

Given that the proposed development is adjacent to Bell park with access points to both the north and south portions of the development, it is important that active transportation be considered and linked to those access points.

If you have any questions or require clarification of my comments, my contact information is below.

Sincerely,

David King

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]