

Karen Chafe

From: CityClerk
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 10:11 AM
To: [REDACTED] CityClerk
Cc: Andrea Roberts; Ann-Marie Cashin; Ashley Murray; Dave Wadden; Jason Sinyard; Karen Chafe; Ken O'Brien; Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett; Planning
Subject: RE: (EXT) Proposed development 11 Tiffany Lane

Good Morning:

We thank you for your feedback and advise that all submissions shall be presented to Council for consideration prior to a final decision being reached on this application.

Elaine Henley

Elaine Henley
City Clerk
t. 576-8202
c. 691-0451

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 7:05 PM
To: CityClerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Proposed development 11 Tiffany Lane

Good evening,

I attended the virtual meeting the other night and raised the issue of the heavy and dangerous traffic on Mount Cashel Road (particularly at school drop off and pick up times) and of the many vacancies at Lanes and Littledale residences, and the fact that Tiffany Village is being marketed as a place for seniors to go for the winter months. I was told that a large number of beds will be required in the coming years. Tiffany Village, Lanes and Littledale are expensive. I didn't get the opportunity to ask about the former Escasoni and Hoyles Home properties on Portugal Cove Road. Would they not be more cost effective for seniors who don't and won't have that much money in their retirement years?

I look forward to Mr. Ladha's response.

Thanks and kind regards,
[REDACTED]

--

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.



Heritage NL

**Comments on Proposed Zoning Amendment for Property Adjacent to Brynmawr
(Steinhauer Assisted Living)**

Submitted by Heritage NL

Jan 2021

Introduction:

Bryn Mawr was designated as a Registered Heritage Structure in 1993 with an application being made by the then owner, Mildred K. Steinhauer. It was designated on the basis of its architectural, historical, and landscape values. It was the country home of the Baird family, prominent St. John's merchants for over a century. The property has been vacant for many years which raises concerns about the future of this heritage structure.

**i) Impacts of Proposed Zoning Change & Site Plan for Steinhauer Assisted Living
Proposal on Bryn Mawr:**

Loss of Context/Scale:

Bryn Mawr was built as a substantial summer home on a large landscaped property. Part of its value lies in the large lot on which it sits, comprised of mature trees and former flower gardens. The residence has recently been sectioned off into a separate parcel of land with property lines tight to the house and the remaining property nearly encircling it. This could permit new development very close to the actual house, thereby losing its historical context. Permitting development of up to 10 stories under the proposed zoning change significantly risks completely overwhelming Bryn Mawr. Even the proposal as submitted, at 6 storeys is out of scale with the building. Particularly problematic is the fact that the proposal seems to intentionally wrap around the front of Brynmawr, providing only a narrow view plane to Portugal Cove Road.

Shadowing:

The shadow study demonstrates that during much of the year Bryn Mawr would be largely in shadow which would be detrimental to a wooden structure which needs sun exposure to remain dry.

Lack of Adaptive Reuse Options:

No use for Bryn Mawr is included in the proposal. A lack of use puts the structure at considerable risk, likely resulting in "demolition by neglect." It seems highly unlikely that

the Bryn Mawr property could ever be sold to another party for development as it is largely hemmed in by the surrounding lot and would be completely overwhelmed by high rise development so close to it.

ii) Appropriate Development:

Appropriate development of a suitable scale that respects the heritage values of the Bryn Mawr property could be both an asset to the city in terms of providing needed housing (e.g., senior's housing) or other amenities and in supporting the adaptive reuse of the existing heritage home. Bryn Mawr could be incorporated into a new development as a focal point, offering a unique selling proposition for new development on the property. See attached document for examples of new development that successfully incorporates heritage structures.

iii) Recommendations:

1. Require the developer to submit a proposal that better respects Bryn Mawr. A binding agreement should be put in place that requires the Bryn Mawr Registered Heritage Structure to be developed/adaptively reused following appropriate heritage standards prior to the construction of any new development on the adjacent property.
2. A medium height of 3 4 storeys would be more appropriate for the property if the integrity of Bryn Mawr is to be maintained, particularly on the east and west sides of the home. A taller density could be considered (e.g., up to 6 storeys on the northern half of the property adjacent to Tiffany Lane that would allow new development to form a backdrop to Bryn Mawr. If the property is rezoned to high density, future councils will have little ability to shape the form of development on the site.

Examples of Successful Adaptive Reuse of Historic Residential Structures



Rotman School of Management, Toronto – this historic residence is the focal point of a modern institutional development that respects the scale of the original structure



Fairview House, Vancouver – this historic residential property was developed as the centre piece of a townhouse development in the late 1970s that flanks it on both sides. Surrounding new development is of an appropriate scale for the house. The house serves as commercial office space.

Karen Chafe

From: CityClerk
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:21 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: CityClerk; Ann-Marie Cashin; Andrea Roberts; Ashley Murray; Dave Wadden; Jason Sinyard; Karen Chafe; Ken O'Brien; Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett; Planning
Subject: RE: Brief to City Council re 11 Tiffany Lane

Good Morning [REDACTED]

We thank you for your feedback and advise that all submissions shall be presented to Council for consideration prior to a final decision being reached on this application.

Elaine Henley

Elaine Henley
City Clerk
t. 576-8202
c. 691-0451

From: Ken O'Brien <kobrien@stjohns.ca>
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 8:54 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: CityClerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>; Ann-Marie Cashin <acashin@stjohns.ca>
Subject: FW: Brief to City Council re 11 Tiffany Lane

Hi, [REDACTED]. By copy of this email, the City Clerk will receive your submission and ensure that it reaches all of Council.

Regards,

Ken O'Brien

Ken O'Brien, MCIP
Chief Municipal Planner
City of St. John's – Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
John J. Murphy Building (City Hall Annex), 4th floor (working from home)
Mail: PO Box 908, St. John's NL Canada A1C 5M2
Phone 709-576-6121 (rings to my home) Email kobrien@stjohns.ca www.stjohns.ca

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2021 2:32 PM

To: Ann-Marie Cashin <acashin@stjohns.ca>; Ken O'Brien <kobrien@stjohns.ca>

Subject: (EXT) Fwd: Brief to City Council

Hi Ann-Marie,

Please confirm receipt of this email sent to City Clerk's email several days ago. I received no confirmation of receipt of our document as requested. [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, 21 Jan 2021 at 15:42

Subject: Brief to City Council

To: <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Hi Ann-Marie,

Re: Development Proposal for 11 Tiffany Lane

Please confirm receipt of this document....and that you can open it.. Same text , but in two formats..

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.

A PRESENTATION TO ST. JOHN'S CITY COUNCIL

FROM

THE STONELEIGH CONDO CORPORATION BOARD

146 NEW COVE ROAD

CONCERNING

11 TIFFANY LANE REZ2000001 APPLICATION

JANUARY 20, 2021

Introduction

We are the owners and residents of Stoneleigh, a small condominium building located at 146 New Cove Road, just north of Mount Cashel Road. Our building, which was completed in 2012, has 4 floors including a ground-level parking garage and 3 floors of residential units.

Stoneleigh is tucked away on the east side of New Cove Road, and the north side of our building borders on the large property, which is now the subject of the rezoning and development application **11 Tiffany Lane REZ2000001**. Our south side overlooks Mount Cashel Road and our immediate neighbourhood consists mainly of the family homes on New Cove Road and the surrounding streets: Mount Cashel, Horwood, Cherry Hill and Laughlin Crescent. Further to the east, and currently separated from Stoneleigh by green space, are the condo buildings and townhouses on Tiffany Lane and Tiffany Court, including the Tiffany Village Retirement Residence. Beyond them lies Kenny's Pond Park which contains the 6-storey Kenny's Pond Retirement Home and the Holiday Inn.

The purpose of this document is to comment on the **11 Tiffany Lane REZ2000001** rezoning application and the underlying assumptions contained in the **City of St. John's Decision/Direction Note** dated August 11, 2020. Specifically, we wish to address the notion that rezoning the **11 Tiffany Lane** property from a Residential Medium Density Zone (R2) to an Apartment High Density Zone (A3) would "complement the neighbourhood" by allowing the construction of high-density Personal Care Homes ranging from 6 stories to 10 stories high. On the contrary, we believe that such rezoning would, in fact, be detrimental to our neighbourhood for several reasons.

Neighbourhood Profile

Unlike downtown St. John's, which grew upward from the harbour in a relatively unplanned way for several centuries, the north-eastern part of the city benefitted from very careful planning. In the late 1940s the St. John's Housing Corporation bought large tracts of rural land and created "villages" of single family houses. Starting with Churchill Park, these were the city's first planned neighbourhoods and included shopping centres, parks and open spaces designed to separate the villages, and to form a green-belt between them and the existing city. As these new East End residential areas grew, schools, churches, low-rise apartments and low-rise professional buildings were added to create diversified and self-sufficient neighbourhoods.

When Stoneleigh was constructed, it therefore offered an ideal location for condo buyers who wanted to live in a low-rise building in an established family-oriented neighbourhood with nearby walking trails while, at the same time, having easy access to the services provided by the Howley Estates Shopping Plaza (Elizabeth Avenue at Torbay Road) and the Churchill Square commercial area. In addition, the north/south arteries of Portugal Cove Road and Torbay Road, as well as the main east-west roads – Elizabeth Avenue, Prince Philip Drive, Macdonald Drive and Newfoundland Drive – enabled neighbourhood residents to reach any part of the city, as well as the airport and entrances to the Trans-Canada Highway, quickly and with very few traffic problems. In short, Stoneleigh was quickly perceived by condo buyers as a highly desirable place to live in a long-established and well-serviced East End neighbourhood, and this has created stability in the market value of our property.

Evolving Traffic Situation

The only exit for vehicles from Stoneleigh is directly onto New Cove Road, a fairly narrow, two-lane street. There is no alternative route when, for whatever reason, traffic is heavy in front of our driveway. Up until

about 3 years ago, the traffic was manageable and the light at the junction of New Cove Road and Portugal Cove Road allowed us opportunities to emerge safely from our driveway.

Unfortunately the buildings on Tiffany Lane and Tiffany Court are now generating a higher volume of traffic that flows from Tiffany Lane onto Mount Cashel Road, and northbound drivers are increasingly using New Cove Road as their preferred route to the airport and the TCH access ramps. Driver visibility at the intersection of Mount Cashel and New Cove Road is poor because Stoneleigh is set back from the road and is therefore hidden from vehicles heading north.

While our residents have learned, by necessity, to be extremely cautious when making left turns to travel south from our driveway, visitors and service vehicle drivers are not as aware of the danger. And even while being very cautious, many Stoneleigh residents have narrowly escaped being hit broadside by a car that emerged quickly and unexpectedly from Mount Cashel Road while they were in the middle of a left turn. While this occurs in all seasons, it is particularly dangerous in the winter when accumulated snow banks considerably reduce visibility at the intersection.

When both northbound and southbound lanes are congested because of the traffic light, emerging from the Stoneleigh driveway has become extremely dangerous and the risk of serious, and possibly life-threatening, accidents has increased to the tipping point. High-density real estate development on the 11 Tiffany Lane property would inevitably increase the traffic on Tiffany Lane and New Cove Road, and would therefore reduce the quality of life, the safety and the property values in our neighbourhood. This would be particularly true of high-rise Personal Care Homes which increase traffic in the same way that hospitals do - because of the number of staff, visitors, service/supply vehicles and emergency vehicles.

Impact of Proposed High-Rise Buildings Directly North of Stoneleigh

As a low-rise 4-storey building situated below the hill that dominates the Bryn Mawr Property, Stoneleigh will be at the mercy of whatever decisions are made by City Council to permit high-density, high-rise buildings to be erected so close to our property line. The proposal to build two 6-storey assisted-living facilities that will contain a total of 237 units and 2 levels of underground parking is extremely worrisome to the Stoneleigh Condo Corporation considering the close proximity of one of the buildings to our property line. The applicant's request for permission to increase the height of the buildings to 10 stories further increases our concern about its impact.

The footprint of the Phase 1 building provided by the applicant indicates that it would be erected only 6 metres from the Stoneleigh property line. Considering that the 11 units on the north side of Stoneleigh do not receive direct sunlight until late afternoon, even in the summer, the close proximity of a 6-storey (25 m.) building would have a substantial impact on sunlight available to our property, regardless of the angle chosen, and a 10-storey (41 m.) building would completely overshadow us. In addition, the building's influence on wind direction and the possible creation of wind tunnels has yet to be determined.

The applicant's LUAR outlines the plan for the building lighting and external equipment and indicates that the structures will not abut any residential buildings that could be affected by the HVAC equipment and external lighting. However, with only a 6-metre clearance from Stoneleigh's property line, and the reality that our north-side units sit close to that property line, we do not agree with the developer's assessment. The slope of the land above our property line only heightens our concerns about the impact of lighting and

potential noise pollution for our north-side units whose occupants may find their quality of life significantly reduced.

Availability of Long-Term Care Facilities in the East End

The very nature of the 11 Tiffany Lane project is one that would virtually destroy one of the last significant pieces of undeveloped green space in the East End of St. John's in order to create high-density, high-rise towers and adjacent parking areas that are incompatible with the scale and traffic patterns of an established neighbourhood. Moreover, it is not clear why it would be necessary, or even desirable, to rezone prime residential land to increase the significant number of Long-Term Care facilities that already exist in the surrounding area.

There are at least 10 LTC facilities in the North-East End of St. John's and others may be in the planning stages. Two of these facilities, Tiffany Village and Kenny's Pond, are only a 5-minute walk from 11 Tiffany Lane, and all the others represent a 5-10 minute drive. Our neighbourhood is already very "age-friendly" and our senior citizens have a wide choice of retirement homes without having to leave the area.

Appropriate Housing for Vulnerable Elderly Citizens

In the past year the combined effects of COVID-19 and Climate Change have given Canadians many occasions to question the manner in which Long-Term Care facilities have been planned and managed. Infection rates and deaths among vulnerable elderly people in Canadian LTC facilities have been very high during the pandemic. Increasingly severe climate events - whether they be hurricane-force winds, ice or snow storms, floods or fires – can all lead to long-term power failures and other crisis situations that, in some cases, may require the rapid evacuation of LTC residents from buildings.

The **Staff Direction Note** accompanying the rezoning application rightly points out that Personal Care Homes are not currently permitted in the A3 Zone and that a "text amendment" is required to add them. We would respectfully take the position that high-rise, high-density Personal Care Homes are qualitatively different from the LTC facilities that are permitted in the Apartment Low Density (A1) and Apartment Medium Density (A2) zones and that City Council would be wise to consider very carefully the implications of making a text amendment that would constitute a precedent-setting change in the City's development regulations with regard to high-density Personal Care Homes.

Conclusion

The Stoneleigh Condominium Board and our unit owners would welcome the development of new residential units on the 11 Tiffany Lane property that were more compatible with the scale and character of our established neighbourhood which currently has a well-balanced and harmonious mixture of residential homes, service facilities and commercial properties. We have long expected that, at some point, R-2 zoned single-family homes, townhouses or seniors' cottages would be proposed. Our hope was that the developers of these projects would recognize the value of the mature trees on the property and integrate some green space into the project design. None of us ever expected that a proposal such as **11 Tiffany Lane REZ2000001** would rise to the top and be seriously considered by St. John's City Council as a valid reason for rezoning that area. We sincerely hope that our concerns will contribute to a very thorough consultation process with public input before a rezoning decision of this magnitude is made.

Karen Chafe

From: Elaine Henley
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 12:19 PM
To: [REDACTED]; CouncilGroup
Cc: Andrea Roberts; Ann-Marie Cashin; Ashley Murray; Dave Wadden; Jason Sinyard; Karen Chafe; Ken O'Brien; Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett; Planning
Subject: RE: (EXT) Proposed Development on 11 Tiffany Lane / Baird Cottage area

Good Morning [REDACTED]:

Do you want your comments included as a submission for consideration by Council when reviewing this application?

Elaine Henley

Elaine Henley
City Clerk
t. 576-8202
c. 691-0451

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 11:01 AM
To: CouncilGroup <councilgroup@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Proposed Development on 11 Tiffany Lane / Baird Cottage area

Dear Councillor:

We want no on-street parking ban for Mount Cashel Road. If the development on Tiffany Lane causes traffic congestion, then the developers should bear the burden of alleviating that. Traffic problems created by this development should not be inflicted on the residents of Mount Cashel Road who have been here for decades.

A modest proposal: in keeping with the principle that leaders should lead by example, there needs to be, in writing, a regulation that **if** on-street parking is banned on Mount Cashel Road, this same ban will also be placed on all streets where members of City Council reside. Only then can councillors truly understand the consequences for ordinary citizens of Council's decision in this case.

Thanking you for your service to our city and for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.

Karen Chafe

From: CityClerk
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:24 AM
To: [REDACTED] CityClerk
Cc: [REDACTED] Andrea Roberts; Ann-Marie Cashin; Ashley Murray; Dave Wadden; Jason Sinyard; Karen Chafe; Ken O'Brien; Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett; Planning
Subject: RE: (EXT) Re - rezoning application for 11 Tiffany Lane

Good Morning:

We thank you for your feedback and advise that all submissions shall be presented to Council for consideration prior to a final decision being reached on this application.

Elaine Henley

Elaine Henley
City Clerk
t. 576-8202
c. 691-0451

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 10:42 AM
To: CityClerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: (EXT) Re - rezoning application for 11 Tiffany Lane

Office of the City Clerk,

Our names are [REDACTED] and we live at [REDACTED] the property at 11 Tiffany Lane. For the record, we are opposed to the rezoning of the land at 11 Tiffany Lane to the Apartment High Density (A3) Zone to allow the construction of high rise (6 to 10 floors) Personal Care Homes.

If this application were to be approved it would negatively impact us personally and the neighbourhood in the following ways:

1. Congestion in traffic - The number of vehicles from residents, service providers, emergency vehicles and visitors associated with the proposed high density Personal Care Homes would dramatically increase the traffic in the general area including Tiffany Lane, Mount Cashel Road and New Cove Road. Mount Cashel and New Cove Road are already congested, especially during high traffic times. I can not speak personally to Tiffany Lane. During high traffic times, in the morning and in the late afternoon to early evening, it can be difficult to exit our driveway onto New Cove Road. Additionally, Mount Cashel also gets congested as cars attempt to exit the street onto either Torbay Road or New Cove Road. Often cars are backed up past our house on New Cove Road waiting at the New Cove Road and Portugal Cove Road traffic lights. The congestion of traffic will get worse if this project were to go ahead. I would also like to point out that there is a fire station located on New Cove Road, and as such, New Cove Road serves as a main fire route for emergency vehicles. If traffic on New Cove Road were to get even more congested this could pose a problem for

emergency vehicles. If this has not already been considered in the traffic study I think it should be added. Traffic is a main concern for many residents with young children, such as us.

2. Loss of community diversity - In the immediate vicinity there are Personal Care Homes already located on Tiffany Lane and around Kenneys Pond. Within a 1-10 minute drive from this neighbourhood there are multiple more. The demographic of this neighbourhood is classified as elderly given the number of personal care homes and the smaller bungalow style homes. The addition of another Personal Care Home will only age the neighbourhood even further and drive young families to other areas of the city. I think the focus should be on attracting young families to this area to even out the demographic. There are multiple great schools including MQP, Vanier, Macdonald Drive and Rennies River in this neighbourhood. Townhouses and single family homes would be our development of choice. Ourselves along with many other young families that we know would be lined up to buy a modern style single family home in this neighbourhood, which would help even out the demographic and increase the diversity of the neighbourhood.

3. Loss of aesthetic appeal - Based on the design presented during the virtual Public Meeting on January 20, 2020, one of the buildings will be in close proximity [REDACTED] of our house/property boundary. Given the height of the proposed buildings this development will block our view of everything. From the main floor we will no longer be able to even see the sky from that direction which will block out a lot of light, and since we are a townhouse all windows are essential to bring natural light into our homes. This will also result in a loss of privacy by tens if not hundreds of residents as our back patio will have no privacy from the back of the southern building.

4. Financial Impact - We understand the land will be developed eventually, I believe there are much better options that would benefit the community. Based on the virtual Public Meeting held on January 20, 2020, the developers first choice in development is townhouses and single family homes, which happens to be what the community also wants for this land. The decision, based on the developers response to a question during the public meeting, on the development of Personal Care Homes, is based on how they can get the best return on their investment. As homeowners of an adjacent property, we also wish for a positive return on our investment. When the time comes for us to sell our home, the loss of privacy, natural light, increased traffic and loss of diversity will only serve to negatively impact the value of our home. It would be very disappointing if the city approved the development of such structures to the financial detriment of the surrounding neighborhoods. We have been invested in this neighborhood for 6 years, and many of the residents have been here for multiple decades paying high municipal taxes. We deserve better than the proposed option.

We do not believe that this application should be approved until the decision around the fate of the Baird Cottage has been decided. To be frank, the Baird Cottage has not and continues to not be maintained. It is dilapidated with multiple broken windows and poses a fire hazard. Vagrants often surround and inhabit the empty building and the property is full of rats. If the Cottage is not looked after and is falling apart what is the heritage status on the building really protecting? It will eventually fall down or burn down, both of which are safety hazards. The heritage status at this point serves nothing more than preventing the neighbourhood from getting the type of development which they and the developers want.

We thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns and opinions on the matter and hope they are taken into consideration when looking at the application in question.

[REDACTED]

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.

From: CityClerk
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 12:28 PM
To: [REDACTED] CityClerk
Cc: [REDACTED], Andrea Roberts, Ann-Marie Cashin, Ashley Murray, Dave Wadden, Jason Sinyard, Karen Chafe, Ken O'Brien, Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, Planning
Subject: RE: (EXT) 11 Tiffany Lane

Good Afternoon:

We thank you for your feedback and advise that all submissions shall be presented to Council for consideration prior to a final decision being reached on this application.

Elaine Henley

Elaine Henley
City Clerk
t. 576-8202
c. 691-0451

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 9:15 AM
To: CityClerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: (EXT) 11 Tiffany Lane

Good morning,

My husband and I live near the proposed development at 11 Tiffany Lane and would like to add our comments to the record.

- We walk through Baird's Lane daily to take advantage of nearby walking trails. The proposed development would greatly increase traffic in this area and detract from its walkability.
- The property currently houses several mature trees and developing two six-storey buildings with the associated parking and access will detract from the esthetics of the area, not just the property. It will essentially turn the street into an alley of institutions.
- The proposed development will have a negative impact on the value of the Bryn Mawr property, a property we believe should be protected as a heritage property.
- The Tiffany Lane/ Kenny's Pond area is already home to several senior residences and care homes. Any new development should look to diversify the area: either a different use or attract a diverse resident base. We have noticed an increase in young families and cultural diversity in our area in recent years and this is something we wish to see continue to sustain the neighbourhood.
- Finally, our greatest concern is that buildings like the former Hoyles-Escasoni building remain vacant eyesores while the City entertains destroying mature trees to allow new developments.

Please do not rezone the property at 11 Tiffany Lane.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.

From: CityClerk
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 12:27 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Andrea Roberts, Ann-Marie Cashin, Ashley Murray, Dave Wadden, Jason Sinyard, Karen Chafe, Ken O'Brien, Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, Planning
Subject: FW: (EXT) Rezoning Application - 11 Tiffany Lane
Attachments: Office of the Clerk.docx

Good Afternoon:

We thank you for your feedback and advise that all submissions shall be presented to Council for consideration prior to a final decision being reached on this application.

Elaine Henley

Elaine Henley
City Clerk
t. 576-8202
c. 691-0451

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 7:09 PM
To: CityClerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>; planning@st.johns.ca
Subject: (EXT) Rezoning Application - 11 Tiffany Lane

2021-01-20

Office of the Clerk

City of St. John's

RE: APPLICATION FOR REZONING, 11 TIFFANY LANE

We are writing in reference to the rezoning application for property at 11 Tiffany Lane. Would you please pass our comments along to the appropriate officials.

We reside at [REDACTED]. Our home was constructed in 1944 and has been occupied by the [REDACTED] continually since that time. As such, we have some appreciation of the growth and changes in the area over the years.

We note the original Baird cottage, known as Bryn Mawr at civic 154 New Cove Road, is excluded from this application. Built in 1907, Bryn Mawr was recognized in 1993 by the province's Heritage Foundation and designated a heritage property by the City in 2016. Owing to its historical, architectural value, and given its uncertain future, it was included among the top ten endangered places by the National Trust for Canada in 2017.

We understand the bulk of the land on which Bryn Mawr is situated has now been severed from the original deed, ostensibly to facilitate this proposal. Our concern, in part, is that the scope and configuration of the development is at odds with the heritage character of the property.

The fate of Bryn Mawr is uncertain in that it is currently the subject of litigation between its new owners and the City of St. John's. In advance of a resolution of that matter, the current rezoning proposal seeks to develop the severed acreage in a manner that we fear would isolate, dwarf, and overshadow - literally and figuratively - the heritage structure.

We do not take issue with the owner's right to utilize lands surplus to that reasonably required for the future restoration and reoccupation of Bryn Mawr. How those lands are developed however could severely impact the suitability of Bryn Mawr as a private residence, or in the alternative, its utility as a re-purposed commercial property for such uses as a boutique hotel.

The test, therefore, that Council must apply to this application is to hypothesize that the owners of Bryn Mawr and the adjacent severed lands are not one and the same but rather discrete entities with diverging, even conflicting interests. Council must ask itself then if approval of this application – against the interests of a prospective owner/occupier of the heritage structure - would constitute a fair and reasonable use of its discretionary powers.

For greater certainty the default position Council must adopt is that Bryn Mawr is and will remain a designated heritage property, and therefore demands protection in its own right. Council's obligation to the integrity and longer term viability of the structure cannot be swayed or obviated by the common ownership of the two properties, nor by any stated or implied willingness to accept a diminution in the value of one in exchange for a substantial enhancement in the value of the other.

Against this backdrop, we submit the prospect of sandwiching Bryn Mawr between two high rise, high traffic monoliths is not only an unreasonable exercise of discretionary authority but would be tantamount to condemning the heritage structure to obscurity and thereby greatly diminish its value. Indeed we believe it would presage its continued decay and eventual demolition.

Beyond its impact on Bryn Mawr as a viable heritage structure, Council's deliberations must, of course, include a host of other issues. Among these is the concentration of medium and high density structures in the area and the implications for traffic flow. As witnessed by the construction of the Stoneleigh condo at the juncture of New Cove, Mount Cashel and Laughlin, planning missteps invariably give rise to traffic challenges.

The convergence of vehicles accessing and egressing Stoneleigh and the adjacent streets substantially impaired the flow of traffic on New Cove and Portugal Cove roads. It necessitated a traffic light and re-alignment of Portugal Cove at New Cove – neither of which has proven optimal.

Indeed the existing traffic problems confronting long-time residents of Portugal Cove and New Cove roads in this area can be traced to a lack of planning and Council foresight dating back to the sixties. The construction of the six storey Brentwood Towers and other high-density accommodations in the area was approved despite objections regarding traffic flows and street safety.

Those mistakes ultimately imposed significant costs of mitigation on the City. Property was purchased and the street widened to four lanes - ultimately five in some sections to accommodate turning lanes. Those measures did little to solve the underlying problem and indeed created something of a raceway for speeding cars. Such experiences ought to be a cautionary note for those inclined to dismiss or diminish the importance of proper planning.

While this application calls for egress onto Tiffany Lane, it will inevitably worsen traffic issues in the general area. It will add greatly to the existing demands on Tiffany from the myriad of condos, seniors' homes and apartment buildings on that street. It will also add to congestion on Mount Cashel and significantly exacerbate problems at the Mary Queen of Peace church and school, the parking lots of which are currently used as a connector to Torbay Road.

For these reasons, and in keeping with the principles of mixed-density urban planning, we recommend the present application be rejected. We support the recommendation of others that the site be reserved for single family or upscale multi-unit accommodations with the proviso that any such subdivision be designed to highlight – not obstruct or obscure – Bryn Mawr and the adjacent green belt areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.

Karen Chafe

From: Karen Chafe
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 3:15 PM
To: Karen Chafe
Subject: FW: (EXT)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 12:57 PM
To: Debbie Hanlon
Subject: (EXT)

Hello Ms. Hanlon,

Can you tell me what is happening with this Bryn Mawr proposal? It was on council agenda last week but you didn't meet and now it's not there?

For the record, I can't for the life of me imagine why you on council would think it is alright to approve ploughing down the natural area next to Bryn Mawr. Sure heritage buildings are great to preserve but that place is great because of what's around it. These are grand old trees and gardens. I just don't get why you think that is ok. Same thing with that big building downtown beside the Kirk that you think it is alright to plough down nature for these developers, well it isn't right.

I hope you can get back to me with some answers,
[REDACTED]

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.