

## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 19-A-022      **Version:** 2      **Name:**  
**Type:** Deputation      **Status:** Received  
**File created:** 3/1/2019      **In control:** City Council  
**On agenda:** 3/4/2019      **Final action:** 3/4/2019  
**Title:** PURSUANT TO SECTION 4.16 OF PROCEDURAL BY-LAW 2013-072, CITY COUNCIL CONSIDERED A REQUEST BY MS. ANDREA ATTRIDGE TO PROVIDE AN EMERGENCY DEPUTATION IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION 19-G-042, ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION (FARRAGE DEVELOPMENT) - 46, 50, 52 AND 56 PATTERSON ROAD AND PART LOT 30, PLAN 959, PART 1, PLAN 51R-39651 (WARD 1). UPON A VOTE OF CITY COUNCIL BEING TAKEN, MS. ATTRIDGE WAS PERMITTED TO ADDRESS CITY COUNCIL.

DEPUTATION BY ANDREA ATTRIDGE REGARDING MOTION 19-G-042, ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION (FARRAGE DEVELOPMENT) - 46, 50, 52 AND 56 PATTERSON ROAD AND PART LOT 30, PLAN 959, PART 1, PLAN 51R-39651 (WARD 1)

Ms. Andrea Attridge of 204 Crawford Street provided a deputation in opposition to motion 19-G-042 concerning Zoning By-law Amendment Application (Farrage Development) - 46, 50, 52 and 56 Patterson Road and Part Lot 30, Plan 959, Part 1, Plan 51R-39651 (Ward 6).

Ms. Attridge provided details associated with the location of her property in relationship to the proposed development. She advised that she is not opposed to the area being redeveloped, but she noted that she believes that the Special Provisions proposed for the site specific by-law should not be approved and she suggested that for the development the number of proposed units be reduced from 46 to 30 units. Ms. Attridge expressed her concerns associated with the impact that this the development will have on the established neighbourhood and the amount of public consultation that took place for this development. She advised that she does not believe that the applicant did as much as it could have to minimize the impacts on the neighboring property owners. Ms. Attridge further expressed her concerns with several other matters related to the proposal, including the impact on property values, ongoing noise and dust from construction activity, possible drainage problems, potential increase in noise and that the proposed vision for the whole area which was put forward by the developer and she noted that she felt that this vision should be put forth by City staff.

A member of Council asked a question of Ms. Attridge and received a response.

**Sponsors:****Indexes:****Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. 190304 ADDITIONS DEP - ZBA 46, 50, 52 and 56 Patterson Rd

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
3/4/2019	2	City Council	Received	

**PURSUANT TO SECTION 4.16 OF PROCEDURAL BY-LAW 2013-072, CITY COUNCIL CONSIDERED A REQUEST BY MS. ANDREA ATTRIDGE TO PROVIDE AN EMERGENCY DEPUTATION IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION 19-G-042, ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION (FARRAGE DEVELOPMENT) - 46, 50, 52 AND 56 PATTERSON ROAD AND PART LOT 30, PLAN 959, PART 1, PLAN 51R-39651 (WARD 1). UPON A VOTE OF CITY COUNCIL BEING TAKEN, MS. ATTRIDGE WAS PERMITTED TO ADDRESS CITY COUNCIL.**

**DEPUTATION BY ANDREA ATTRIDGE REGARDING MOTION 19-G-042, ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION (FARRAGE DEVELOPMENT) - 46, 50, 52 AND 56 PATTERSON ROAD AND PART LOT 30, PLAN 959, PART 1, PLAN 51R-39651 (WARD 1)**

Ms. Andrea Attridge of 204 Crawford Street provided a deputation in opposition to motion 19-G-042 concerning Zoning By-law Amendment Application (Farrage Development) - 46, 50, 52 and 56 Patterson Road and Part Lot 30, Plan 959, Part 1, Plan 51R-39651 (Ward 6).

Ms. Attridge provided details associated with the location of her property in relationship to the proposed development. She advised that she is not opposed to the area being redeveloped, but she noted that she believes that the Special Provisions proposed for the site specific by-law should not be approved and she suggested that for the development the number of proposed units be reduced from 46 to 30 units. Ms. Attridge expressed her concerns associated with the impact that this the development will have on the established neighbourhood and the amount of public consultation that took place for this development. She advised that she does not believe that the applicant did as much as it could have to minimize the impacts on the neighboring property owners. Ms. Attridge further expressed her concerns with several other matters related to the proposal, including the impact on property values, ongoing noise and dust from construction activity, possible drainage problems, potential increase in noise and that the proposed vision for the whole area which was put forward by the developer and she noted that she felt that this vision should be put forth by City staff.

A member of Council asked a question of Ms. Attridge and received a response.