

PRELIMINARY PLANNING REPORT - APPLICATION FOR REZONING IN ORDER TO PERMIT THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMER ST. JOSEPH HOSPITAL SITE FOR 190 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, RESTAURANT AND WELLNESS CENTRE, 700 PARIS STREET, SUDBURY - 2226553 ONTARIO INC.

The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following application.

Report dated June 12, 2012 was received from the General Manager of Growth and Development regarding a preliminary planning report - application for rezoning in order to permit the redevelopment of the former St. Joseph hospital site for 190 residential units, restaurant and wellness centre, 700 Paris Street, Sudbury - 2226553 Ontario Inc.

Letter of concern dated June 1, 2012 was received from Ila Leigh Cook, area resident.

Letter of concern dated June 5, 2012 was received from Evan Roberts, area resident.

Letter of concern dated June 8, 2012 was received from Gerald and Joan Goddard, area residents.

Petition of received May 28, 2012, 2012 was received from Gordon Drysdale, city resident, signed by 428 city residents.

Letter of objection dated June 13, 2012 from Andre Plante and Susan Cook, area residents was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of objection dated June 14, 2012 from Sandra Garofolo, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of objection dated June 15, 2012 from Olive Jean Nasedkin, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of objection dated June 16, 2012 from Hazel Ecclestone, city resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of objection received June 20, 2012 from Catherine O'Connell, city resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of concerns dated June 21, 2012 from Stephane Sauvé, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of concern dated June 24, 2012 from Stephane Sauvé, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern received June 26, 2012 from Oryst Sawchuk, city resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern dated June 25, 2012 from Mike and Carole Parsons, area residents, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of concern dated June 26, 2012 from Gordon Drysdale, city resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of concern dated June 26, 2012 from Stephane Sauvé, area resident was distributed at the meeting.

Petition of objection received June 27, 2012 signed by 16 city residents, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern dated June 27, 2012 from Vani Santi, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter dated June 27, 2012 from Naomi Grant, Chair, Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury was distributed at the meeting.

Michael Allen, the applicant, was present.

The Manager of Development Approvals outlined the application to the Committee.

Mr. Allan gave an electronic presentation regarding the proposed condominium development. He reviewed the current zoning for the abandoned hospital site. He reviewed the objectives for the proposed development; the traffic impact study, the parking plan; and the environmental assessment. He stated the objective of the proposed development is in alignment with the City's Official Plan's mandate to redevelop abandoned land-uses, buildings and infrastructure.

Dr. Robert Evans, city resident, stated he is opposed to the application and gave an electronic presentation. He reviewed the history of the Bell Park covenant and the sale of the property to the Sisters of St. Joseph's. He believes the landscaped open space requirements are not being met; the parking garage abuts onto the property line and the new building rear wall will be offset by 3.5 metres. He is concerned about the traffic on Paris Street; the safety of the adjacent neighbourhoods; and the use of Bell Park Road. He believes the proposal violates the Official Plan as it is not compatible with the surrounding land uses, it is not appropriate for a low density neighbourhood; and this is a new land use that could distract from the open space character and natural aesthetics of the Paris Street corridor.

Catherine O'Connell, city resident, stated she objects to the rezoning. She believes the land should be used only for parkland. She stated a provision should have been made to return the land to the City when it was no longer required to be used as hospital lands or at the very least an easement or access to the entire property should be considered.

Doug Sarvas, city resident, stated he objects to the application as the condominium does not support the Official Plan. He believes the redevelopment and application for rezoning contradicts several objectives, policies developed to manage and direct physical change and its effects on the social, economic and natural environment within the community and quoted excerpts from the OP including: Sections 3.0; 3.2.1; 8.2; 8.3; 8.5.1; 13.1; and 14.1. He feels the land was given to the Sisters of St. Joseph by the community and should be returned to the community for citizens social and healthy well being.

Hazel Ecclestone, city resident, stated the rezoning would fragment Bell Park. She believes the park is a symbol of Sudbury's past, present and future. She stated a four storey parking garage will block the view of Ramsey Lake from Boland Street. She would like to see the property returned to parkland.

Steve May, city resident, stated the Official Plan is Council's promise to citizens for development and believes this development does not fit with the Official Plan. He stated there are clear provisions in the Official Plan, including policies that speak to the reuse of existing institutional buildings. He feels more information is needed before a decision is made for rezoning. He stated there needs to be protection of Ramsey Lake as a drinking water source and is concerned about salt run off into the lake from the development. He feels the Ramsey Lake watershed study should be completed before this development is approved. He suggested the parking requirements be revisited and reduced as it is not necessary due to the proximity to downtown and transit.

Steve May, on behalf of the Sudbury Cyclists Union, stated cyclists use Bell Park Drive to access Bell Park and there should be an agreement to continue this use. He suggested Facer Street be blocked off from left turns onto Paris Street.

Mr. Allan stated salt issues will be reviewed before the site plan is completed and answers should be available at the next meeting. They are reviewing how to mitigate issues from the development with the water source, storm water run-off and landscaping.

Stephane Sauvé, area resident, stated the hospital is an eye sore and needs to be redeveloped. He believes the development is too large for the space available and exceptions to by-laws for new structures should not be considered. He is concerned about the traffic from the north end of the property where the proposed wellness centre and restaurant are to be located, as there was no traffic from this area while the hospital was operating. He believes the residents will use Facer Street and McNaughton Terrace and add considerable traffic to these roads. He is concerned about having condominiums and commercial uses in the same space and who will manage the commercial uses.

Terrace Galvin, city resident, stated the proposed site is important to the City and residents have passion for it due to the history. There is a different meaning to the property when it goes from public to private use and this property needs to be looked at as a whole.

Councillor Caldarell, Ward Councillor, stated the plan of the parking garage will block and alter the view of Ramsey Lake from Boland Avenue. She stated the number of parking spaces should remain as required by the City to avoid parking problems in the future. She does not support the potential setback for the new building in the location of the former Mason Building. She requested the access to Facer Street be reviewed and feels the exit/entrance should be at Boland Avenue and Paris Street.

Mayor Matichuk stated consideration should be given to what could be located on the lot should the zoning remain institutional. She believes this development is an opportunity for good things for the City.

Mr. Allan stated the comments and suggestions have been noted and will be considered. He believes the development can be a win-win situation for the developer and the City.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee resumed in order to discuss and vote on the application.

The following recommendation was presented:

PL2012-140 Craig/Belli: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury receive the comments and submissions made at the Planning Committee Meeting of June 27, 2012 on File 751-6/12-14;

AND THAT Staff complete their review of file 751-6/12-14 by 2226553 Ontario Inc. and schedule a second public hearing on this matter before the Planning Committee, when complete.

YEAS: Councillors Dutrisac, Rivest, Belli, Craig, Kilgour

CARRIED