

Evans, Victoria

From: Mary MacInnis <marymacinnis@hotmail.ca>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 11:45 PM
To: Mayor of Charlottetown (Clifford Lee); Planning Department
Cc: tmacleod@charlottetown.ca; Duffy, Mike; Ramsay, Kevin; Doiron, Bob; Rivard, Greg; Coady, Jason; Hilton, Melissa; Bernard, Terry; Planning Department; Tweel, Mitchell; Mary MacInnis
Subject: Oct 19,2017 Letter referencing Site Specific Amendment for 55/ 59 Richmond St (PID # 339911 & 339929)

In response to your letter dated Oct 19,2017 referencing site specific Amendments for PID's referenced above , let me start by saying I welcome and support appropriate residential development at 55/59 Richmond St .The proposal included in your letter however has the following concerns:

-My primary concern is limited parking availability in the down town for tenants of the proposed development & their visitors. The development as proposed will not have on –site parking for all units which could result in tenants/visitors of the building needing to find parking in close proximity which is very limited. Also if this development goes ahead as proposed ,the existing 16 parking spaces on PID # 339911 will be eliminated. This parking that is currently available to the public while working down town will no longer be available causing further parking concerns.

- I also have concerns with the close proximity of the proposed building to the existing Rochford condo .Should the project go ahead as proposed the distance between existing buildings and balconies would be very small and could leads to potential security, safety , and privacy concerns . I live in the Rochford condo unit 205 which is on the second floor and adjacent to the proposed development and should the project proceed ,the current environment will be significantly impacted.

- Also concerned about the proposed density of the property and the associated bin requirement for compost,recycled, and waste .There is no indicated area for these bins which would collect in the street on scheduled collection day and have potential for unsightly order issues for neighboring properties.

- Given close proximity to Rochford condos question how easily snow removal and other required maintained safety requirement could be completed.

- I also question if there is any potential structural impact of excavation in close proximity to the Rochford condo .

In closing overall design / density of building does not appear to fit with existing properties including the Rochford condo and I ask that the City not approve the project as presented.

As I stated in my opening comment, I am in favor and support development of an appropriate project of less density and more in keeping with the surrounding properties which would benefit all

Mary MacInnis

Property owner

ROCHFORD Condo #205

41 Richmond St

more. Those other 16 people, they can pay money and go to the parkade. Go over there tonight and it's empty.

Robbie Dover: The process in place of getting more space is based....

Tim Banks: By the demand. There is not a tenant association. We are going to manage the building. We go through a process where we screen the people that come in. It's not a low rental district or some drug infested place; it's a procedure we go through with our occupancy and in this particular case, if we find there is more demand by the people that take us up on our apartments then we will go look for more spaces.

Mary: I share a lot of the concerns expressed here tonight. I am a resident and actually south to the balcony so thank you for removing the one right adjacent to me Tim. I did live in one of your subdivisions before and it was beautiful and appropriate for the area out in Bridle Path. I am in support of good development and appropriate development. The only other comment that I will add that others haven't -- the 16 parking lots. I work in the downtown, most of those parking lots are used when people are working in the downtown area. Every weekend and every evening there is no one in that parking lot so that will displace. There are six of my staff that rent there and concerned of where they will park going forward. That would be a concern.

Mayor Lee: My understanding Mary on those 16 spots is that they are not legal. The lot is not zoned for parking.

Mary: I don't know if they are legal or not but my staff are paying rent to park there during the day.

Mayor Lee: I appreciate that even though it is not in compliance with the bylaw. Any other questions or comments.

Councillor Coady: In both presentations, Mr. Banks and the gentleman representing the condo, they talked about harmonious development. From a professional planning point of view, is this proposal harmonious with the current streetscape?

Alex Forbes: That question is in the existing Planning report. Staff have eluded to our concerns in regard to this development. This development isn't the same as the original development so we eluded to concerns to that side property line as a result of the request for a variance. The particular dilemma on these two properties is that issue of these two buildings coming close to each other has to do with two variances. We eluded to that in the Planning report.

Rory Francis (Greater Charlottetown Chamber of Commerce): I have a noncontroversial statement to make and hope no one is disappointed. There has been much discussion and discord on the issue of residential and commercial development in the greater Charlottetown area. Our Chamber would like to express our support for development in all areas of our great city with the understanding that projects meet the relevant bylaws, zoning regulations and environmental considerations. Appropriate development stands to benefit all residents in terms of the quality of our community allowing for economic growth, job creation and ultimately standard of living for