

COMMENTS ON ROBINSON VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

#134 D07-12-18-0172

#19 D07-12-18-0174

#29 D07-12-18-0164

#36 D07-12-19-0044

INTRODUCTION

In response to the first three above development applications in the Robinson Village neighbourhood a group of 18 residents held a meeting on 18 Jan 2019 at 35A Robinson Avenue to discuss the applications. It was agreed to produce and distribute to all Robinson Village addresses a leaflet asking residents to provide any comments they had on the proposals to the assigned planner. Residents were asked to copy their comments to David Elden, Action Sandy Hill (ASH) member, to enable a summary to be produced identifying the main areas of concern. This summary is intended to be used to inform ASH of RV residents' priorities as ASH develops its position on the applications. It may also be of use to the ward councillor.

Subsequently an application was made for #36 Robinson and a table has now been added collating & summarising comments copied to the author for the proposal for that address.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS #134 D07-12-18-0172, #19 D07-12-18-0174, #29 D07-12-18-0164

Comments by email were received from 31 residents and they have been collated and summarised below. It was possible to identify a number of common areas of concern and then collate the responses. Column 1 is a short form of the area of concern, column 2 is a more detailed description (the italicised sections in column 2 are abstracts from individual commenters emails). Column 3 is the % of commenters addressing each area.

Parking	<p>Believe that buildings should include tenant parking. Object to variance for no parking spaces.</p> <p><i>Primary issue is parking: the current state of parking on the street is not acceptable and in the winter like today we cannot even park on the street.</i></p> <p>-</p> <p><i>Robinson Village does not have any services nearby, so most residents own cars to get their groceries, etc.</i></p>	94%
Mix	<p>Believe that buildings should include a range of units aimed at wide mix of tenants. Feel that current proposal is aimed only at student rental market and will adversely affect the demographic mix in the neighbourhood.</p>	84%

	<p><i>149 transient units will comprise the majority of residences on the street and tip the balance away from emotionally and fiscally dedicated Robinson Village stakeholders to what we all know will be short-term University housing.</i></p> <p>-</p> <p><i>...the nature of the single room rental accommodation would not attract families, who tend to live in one place for a number of years, particularly when schooling is involved. Rather it would be more attractive to a transient population such as students...</i></p> <p>-</p> <p><i>it seems the plan is very focused on student housing with no real plan or space for young families, seniors, or home owners.</i></p>	
Superintendent	<p>Believe that if buildings end up being mostly occupied by students should each have on-site superintendent.</p> <p><i>...no accommodation made for building manager, no point of contact to deal with complaints on site.</i></p>	42%
Rats	<p>Concerned that rats are nesting on existing properties and will be displaced during development; believe should be controlled (bait, traps etc.) prior to construction work starting to avoid rat problem spreading.</p>	39%
Balconies, roof terrace	<p>Concerned that balconies and roof terrace may lead to problems with privacy and noise for neighbours.</p> <p><i>...the buildings are proposed to have rooftop social rooms, as well as balconies at the rear of buildings, and that it is likely that university parties will spill outside of these buildings.</i></p>	45%
Own vs rent	<p>Believe that buildings should include owned units to promote pride of ownership.</p> <p><i>With all rentals, there will be no pride of ownership</i></p>	55%
Traffic	<p>Concerned that developments will lead to increased traffic congestion specifically at Robinson-Lees intersection and when tenants are moving in/out of buildings en masse (as may occur if mostly occupied by students).</p> <p><i>...traffic in and out of the Robinson/Lees intersection is often very congested and will become even more so with intensification. I am often left sitting at that intersection in the mornings on my way to work for quite some time before I am able to pull out onto Lees. Is a traffic light needed at that intersection?</i></p>	26%

Infrastructure /servicing	<p>Concerned that existing infrastructure especially sanitary & storm drainage may be overloaded by extra units in this application especially when additional dev expected occurs. Note that ponding occurs in some areas now during heavy rain or spring melts.</p> <p><i>...sewer drainage and ice build-up at street drains have been issues on Robinson Avenue for years. The proposed developments, which its plans indicate will be surrounded mostly by concrete, are likely to contribute significant runoff exceeding the allowable maxima, thereby compounding existing drainage issues.</i></p>	<p>6%</p>
LRT use	<p>Concerned that developments will not support LRT usage if tenants are mostly students; LRT not likely to be used for regular student home to class journeys.</p> <p><i>...to suggest that students will walk over 600 meters south to the Lees Station in order to travel one stop to the University which is just over 600 meters in the north direction would seem to be naïve.</i></p>	<p>6%</p>
Emergency response/evacuation	<p>Concerned that Robinson Village is already has difficult access for large scale emergency response (e.g. major fire) or evacuation due to only one road in/out; adding large numbers of additional residents increase potential problem.</p> <p><i>I am recalling the night of the fire in City housing ... Fire trucks were parked up alongside the Queensway by the old snow dump in case they were needed, this was a multiple alarm fire. No room for the vehicles. And only one way out !</i></p>	<p>10%</p>
Property value	<p>Concerned development will reduce existing property values.</p> <p><i>I fear that these proposed apartments will drastically change the culture of the neighborhood, and decrease the value of my home.</i></p>	<p>16%</p>
Habitat loss	<p>Concerned that development of existing sites will result in loss of wildlife and plant habitat.</p> <p><i>The proposal erodes further the amount of available green space, since it is replacing three properties with relatively large back yards with a building that occupies most of the property</i></p>	<p>3%</p>
Vehicle access	<p>Concerned about noise/disruption due to vehicle access at side of building not centre.</p> <p><i>Perhaps they should have a look at 124 Robinson...After the fire, the new building took into account all our complaints about the noise and disruption.</i></p>	<p>13%</p>

	<i>They redesigned it before rebuilding, Community housing building ... The new building is much better ! Main Entrance in the center of the building</i>	
RVBP	<p>Concerned about lack of consultation to date on Robinson Village Building Plan and/or the actual contents of the plan.</p> <p><i>For those of us who in the late 1990's invested our money on a marginal Robinson Avenue- helping to rebuild the family friendly residential nature and sense of neighborhood that comes with owner occupied dwellings- it's baffling why we would not be consulted in the drafting of a vision for the nature of its development moving forward.</i></p>	3%
Bicycle parking	<p>Concerned that bicycle use should be encouraged by provision of more/better bicycle parking.</p> <p><i>offering ... only 26 bicycle spaces – fewer than half the number of proposed units in an area so close to City bicycle paths.</i></p>	3%
Green building	<p>Concerned that building design not green, no LEED rating specified.</p> <p><i>It is striking that in 2019, in a city that has a paucity of environmentally smart buildings, the developers have chosen not to include green elements in their designs. These developments represent an opportunity for the City to encourage the creation of a model for environmentally responsible neighbourhoods</i></p>	3%

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS #36 D07-12-19-0044

Comments by email were received from 11 residents and they have been collated and summarised below. There was significant overlap in concerns between #6 and the other proposals, particularly regarding the unit mix and its impact on the residential diversity in the neighbourhood and parking.

Mix	Believe that buildings should include a range of units aimed at wide mix of tenants. Feel that current proposal is aimed only at student rental market and will adversely affect the demographic mix in the neighbourhood.	100%
Parking	Believe that buildings should include tenant parking per the zoning bylaw. Object to variance for reduced parking spaces.	91%
Noise	Concerned that there will be excessive noise from tenants of proposed building.	64%

Privacy	Concerned that proposed development design will intrude on privacy for residents of existing homes.	55%
Superintendent	Believe that if buildings end up being mostly occupied by students should have on-site superintendent .	45%
Traffic	Concerned that developments will lead to increased traffic congestion specifically at Robinson-Lees intersection and when tenants are moving in/out of buildings en masse (as may occur if mostly occupied by students).	45%
Bicycle parking	Concerned that bicycle use should be encouraged by provision of more/better bicycle parking.	45%
Tenant storage	Concerned that no tenant storage lockers provided	45%
Own vs rent	Believe that buildings should include owned units to promote pride of ownership.	36%
Balconies, roof terrace	Concerned that balconies and roof terrace may lead to problems with privacy and noise for neighbours.	36%
Building mass	Concerned that building mass does not attempt a transition from 9 stories to adjacent 2/3 story homes.	36%
Shadowing	Concerned that building will rob existing properties of light.	27%
Infrastructure/servicing	Concerned that existing infrastructure especially san & storm drainage may be overloaded by extra units in this application especially when additional dev expected occurs. Note that ponding occurs in some areas now during heavy rain or spring melts.	18%
LRT use	Concerned that developments will not support LRT usage if tenants are mostly students; LRT not likely to be used for regular student home to class journeys.	18%
Snow	Concerned that snow cleared from properties in winter will block road or sidewalks.	18%
Construction damage	Concerned about damage to adjacent homes during construction of new building (e.g. subsidence, vibration damage).	18%
Garbage handling	Concerned about how garbage and recycling bins will be removed from building for emptying, especially in winter.	18%
Exhaust	Concerned about noise and odours from building exhausts (parking garage, a/c).	18%
Access for moving	Concerned that move in/out activity will need to be on street no on property and will cause congestion.	18%
Rats	Concerned that rats are nesting on existing properties and will be displaced during development; believe should be controlled (bait, traps etc.) prior to construction work starting to avoid rat problem spreading.	9%
Property value	Concerned development will reduce existing property values.	9%

Habitat loss	Concerned that development of existing sites will result in loss of wildlife and plant habitat.	9%
Emergency response/evacuation	Concerned that Robinson Village is already has difficult access for large scale emergency response (e.g. major fire) or evacuation due to only one road in/out; adding large numbers of additional residents increase potential problem.	9%
Green building	Concerned that building design not green, no LEED rating specified.	9%
Retail	Concerned that ground floor retail will result in odours and garbage problems.	9%
Light pollution	Concerned that adjacent homes will be affected by light pollution from external lighting on the proposed building.	9%

David Elden

David.Elden.ASH@gmail.com

27-Jan-2019

27-Jan-2019
19-Feb-2019
13-May-2019

First issue, 25 comments recorded.
Updated with additional comments received since first issue, 31 total.
Added summary table of comments for #36.