

Planning and Environment Committee

Report

18th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
October 21, 2019

PRESENT: Councillors A. Hopkins (Chair), J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, Mayor E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: I. Abushehada, J. Adema, G. Barrett, M. Corby, M. Elmadhoon, D. FitzGerald, P. Kokkoros, A. Lockwood, H. Lysynski, H. McNeely, B. O'Hagan, M. Pease, L. Pompilii, M. Ribera, C. Saunders, M. Tomazincic and P. Yeoman

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 PM

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: J. Helmer
Seconded by: S. Turner

That Item 2.2 BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, and S. Turner

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

2.2 Zoning By-law Amendment - 3493 Colonel Talbot Road (OZ-9032)

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, in response to the letter of appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, received on July 23, 2019, submitted by Siskinds Law Firm, on behalf of 2219008 Ontario Ltd, relating to the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment (OZ-9032) with respect to the application of 2219008 Ontario Ltd, relating to the property located at 3493 Colonel Talbot Road, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to this matter and sees no reason to alter it. (2019-D09)

2.1 Draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: J. Helmer

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines:

a) the staff report dated October 21, 2019, entitled "Draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines" BE RECEIVED for information; and,

b) the DRAFT City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines appended to the staff report dated October 21, 2019 as Appendix “B” BE CIRCULATED to the London Development Institute, Urban League, London Homebuilders Association, London Area Planning Consultants, London Society of Architects, London Society of Landscape Architects, Consulting Engineers – London Chapter, London Area Construction Association, London Transit Commission, Urban Design Peer Review Panel, internal service areas, advisory committees and other relevant external agencies; it being noted that the feedback received through this consultation process will feed into revised City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines and an implementing Official Plan amendment that will be prepared for the consideration and approval of Municipal Council at a future Public Participation Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee in the first quarter of 2020. (2019-D32)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: M. Cassidy

That M. Wallace, Executive Director, London Development Institute, BE GRANTED delegation status at the October 21, 2019 Planning and Environment Committee meeting with respect to the draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, and S. Turner

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 Public Participation Meeting – Demolition Request for Dwelling on Heritage Listed Property - 6100 White Oak Road

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property located at 6100 White Oak Road, the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of this dwelling; it being noted that the Islamic Cemetery of London property located at 6100 White Oak Road remains a heritage listed property on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, as are all cemeteries in the City of London;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individual indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made an oral submission regarding these matters. (2019-P10D/R01)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: M. Cassidy
Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: M. Cassidy
Seconded by: J. Helmer

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.2 Public Participation Meeting – Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium –
3400 Singleton Avenue (39CD-19510)

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 1967172 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 3400 Singleton Avenue:

- a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium by 1967172 Ontario Inc., relating to lands located at 3400 Singleton Avenue; and,
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports issuing Draft Approval of the proposed plan of vacant land condominium;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters. (2019-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: E. Holder
Seconded by: M. Cassidy

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: J. Helmer
Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.3 Public Participation Meeting – 200 Callaway Road (SPA19-086)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 2682207 Ontario Limited / Domus Developments (London) Inc., relating to the property located at 200 Callaway Road:

a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Site Plan Approval by 2682207 Ontario Limited / Domus Developments (London) Inc., to permit the construction of a four storey, sixty unit apartment building, relating to the property located at 200 Callaway Road;

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports issuing Site Plan Approval to permit the construction of a four storey, sixty unit apartment building, relating to the property located at 200 Callaway Road;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individual indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made an oral submission regarding these matters. (2019-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: M. Cassidy

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, and S. Turner

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: M. Cassidy

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.4 Public Participation Meeting – Not to be heard before 5:30 PM – 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West (OZ-9041)

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Summit Properties Ltd., relating to the property located at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 21, 2019 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 29, 2019 to amend the Official Plan by ADDING a policy to section 10.1.3 – Policies for Specific Areas to permit a total of 4,000m² of Office Space;

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 21, 2019 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 29, 2019 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R5/R7/R9/Restricted Office (R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30/RO2) Zone TO a Holding Residential R9 Bonus/Restricted Office Special Provision (R9-7*B()/RO2()) Zone; it being noted that the Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to provide for 3 apartment buildings at a maximum density of 262 units per hectare with the northerly apartment having a maximum height of 18-storeys; it being further noted that the development must substantively implement the site concept plan and elevations appended to the staff report dated October 21, 2019 as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

i) Exceptional Building Design:

the building design shown in the various illustrations contained in Schedule "1" of the amending by-law is being bonused for features which serve to support the City's objectives of promoting a high standard of design:

- A) the inclusion of 6 podium townhouse units, along Beaverbrook Avenue providing a well-defined built edge and creating a positive public interface and human scale at street level;
- B) well-defined principle entrances to all of the apartment buildings;
- C) appropriate setbacks above the podium.
- D) a variety of building materials and building articulation to break up the massing of the building; and,
- E) purpose-designed amenity spaces on top of the 8-storey apartment building and parking structure;

ii) 2 levels of underground parking;

iii) Provision of Affordable Housing:

the provision of 20 “rent controlled” affordable housing units which will include 17 one-bedroom units and 3 two bedroom units with a minimum of 6 affordable units per apartment building. The affordable housing units shall be established by agreement at 90% of average market rent for a period of 20 years. An agreement shall be entered into with the Corporation of the City of London, to secure those units for this 20 year term and the term of the contribution agreement will begin upon the initial occupancy of the last subject bonused affordable unit on the subject site;

c) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 21, 2019 as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 29, 2019 to amend The London Plan to ADD a Specific Policy for The Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor Place Types to permit a maximum height of 18-storeys;

d) the request to amend the Official Plan to ADD a policy to section 10.1.3 – Policies for Specific Areas to permit a total of 4,500m² of Office Space BE REFUSED on the basis that the cumulative office gross floor area of this node will exceed 5,000m² which is inconsistent with the intent of the Office policies;

e) the request to amend The London Plan to ADD a Specific Policy for The Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor Place Types to permit 5,500m² of Office Space BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

i) the new policies of The London Plan have already increased the permissions for the amount of office space permitted within a development from 2,000m² in the 1989 Official Plan to 5,000m² when located within 100m of a transit station; it is considered premature to amend these policies which already increase the office space permissions before they have had an opportunity to be in force and effect;

ii) this potential increase could create a precedent for other transit stations creating the potential removal of office space from the downtown core;

f) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed by-law as the change to the regulation for density:

i) is minor in nature; and,

ii) continues to implement the building design consistent with the development design circulated with the Notices of Application and Public Meeting;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves clauses a), b) and c), inclusive, of this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2014;
- the recommended amendment is consistent with the in-force policies of The London Plan including, but not limited to, the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type policies and the 1989 Official Plan policies;
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of an underutilized property and encourages an appropriate form of development;
- the bonusing of the subject site ensures the building form and design will fit within the surrounding area while providing a high quality design standard;
- the subject lands are located in a location where intensification can be accommodated given the existing municipal infrastructure, location on an arterial road and future rapid transit corridor along with the existing transit services in the area; and,
- the proposed development includes the provision of affordable housing which will be mixed throughout the north apartment building;

it being also noted that the Municipal Council refuses clauses d) and e), inclusive, of this application for the following reasons:

- on the basis that the cumulative office gross floor area of this node will exceed 5,000m² which is inconsistent with the intent of the Office policies;
- the new policies of The London Plan have already increased the permissions for the amount of office space permitted within a development from 2,000m² in the 1989 Official Plan to 5,000m² when located within 100m of a transit station; it is considered premature to amend these policies which already increase the office space permissions before they have had an opportunity to be in force and effect; and,
- this potential increase could create a precedent for other transit stations creating the potential removal of office space from the downtown core. (2019-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 9th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: P. Squire

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 9th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on October 2, 2019:

a) the expenditure of \$250.00 from the 2019 Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) budget BE APPROVED for R. Sirois to attend the 2019 Zero Waste Conference being held October 30-31, 2019; it being noted that the ACE has sufficient funds in its 2019 budget to cover this expense;

b) the expenditure of \$300.00 from the 2019 Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) budget BE APPROVED for D. Szoller to attend the 2019 Sustainability: Trans-disciplinary Theory, Practice and Action Conference being held October 16-18, 2019; it being noted that the ACE has sufficient funds in its 2019 budget to cover this expense;

c) the attached 2019 Work Plan for the Advisory Committee on the Environment BE FORWARDED to the Municipal Council for approval; and,

d) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 to 3.3, inclusive, and 4.1 BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4.2 10th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: M. Cassidy

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 10th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on October 9, 2019:

a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Public Meeting Notice, dated October 2, 2019, from L. Mottram, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment for the properties located at 1018-1028 Gainsborough Road:

i) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to submit the Heritage Impact Assessment related to the above-noted Notice for the November 2019 meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH); and,

ii) the above-noted Notice BE DEFERRED to the November 2019 meeting of the LACH;

b) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property at 6100 White Oak Road, the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of this dwelling; it being noted that the Islamic Cemetery of London property at 6100 White Oak Road remains a heritage listed property on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, as are all cemeteries in the City of London; it being further noted that the presentation, from K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, appended to the 10th meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, was received with respect to this matter;

c) the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage supports the proposed wording and design of the signage for the Medway Valley Heritage Forest Environmentally Significant Area - Sunningdale Access Kiosk Sign, as appended to the agenda; and,

d) clauses 1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 5.3 and 6.1 BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

None.

6. Confidential

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Holder

The Planning and Environment Committee convene, In Closed Session, for the purpose of considering the following:

6.1. Personal Matters/Identifiable Individual

A personal matter pertaining to identifiable individuals, including municipal or board employees, including communications necessary for that purpose, with respect to the 2020 Mayor's New Year's Honour List.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Turner, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

The Planning and Environment Committee convened, In Closed Session, from 4:37 PM to 4:42 PM.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:59 PM.

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Planning & Environment Committee
From: John M. Fleming
Managing Director, Planning and City Planner
Subject: City of London
Draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines
Meeting on: October 21, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner.

- (a) The following information report on the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines **BE RECEIVED** for information; and,
- (b) The DRAFT City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, attached as Appendix "B" **BE CIRCULATED** to the London Development Institute, Urban League, London Homebuilders Association, London Area Planning Consultants, London Society of Architects, London Society of Landscape Architects, Consulting Engineers – London Chapter, London Area Construction Association, London Transit Commission, Urban Design Peer Review Panel, internal service areas, advisory committees and other relevant external agencies.

IT BEING NOTED that the feedback received through this consultation process will feed into revised City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines and an implementing Official Plan amendment that will be prepared for the consideration and approval of Municipal Council at a future Public Participation Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee in the first quarter of 2020.

Background

The Urban Design Program was introduced to the City of London in 2007. Since then, the program has grown and urban design has become a consideration in the review of development applications, development of planning policy and in the review of public facilities and infrastructure projects in the public realm. High quality urban design is recognized as an important component of building a prosperous city; designing livable, walkable neighbourhoods; and creating vibrant mixed-use and commercial areas. It is also an important part of the City's efforts to support a more compact urban structure to help address our impact on climate change.

The need for Urban Design Guidelines arose in order to assist with the review of planning and development applications, as well as public projects such as roads, parks and community centres. Staff, Council and stakeholders identified the need to consider the following:

- Greater certainty on what will be reviewed for development applications
- A clear and easy to use document
- Recognition of unique and varied contexts within London
- Flexibility when implementing policies and allowance for design creativity

Purpose and Use of Guideline Documents

The London Plan

The London Plan provides that, by resolution, City Council may adopt guideline documents to provide direction for the implementation of The London Plan policies, or to

guide the development of a specific area. Guideline documents may contain guidelines that are either too detailed, or require more flexibility in interpretation or implementation than The London Plan policies can provide. Planning and development applications and public works should be reviewed with consideration for their consistency with any applicable guideline document. The adoption of a guidelines document requires an Official Plan amendment and a public participation meeting to allow input from interested parties.

Regulatory Documents and Manuals

Many other policy and regulatory documents will apply during development review and public works projects. The Site Plan Control Bylaw, Engineering Design Standards Manual, Complete Streets Manual, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and any Secondary Plans will prevail if there is a conflict with the City Design Guidelines. The Guidelines are not intended to be regulatory in nature. Flexibility should be applied, and creative and innovative design solutions are encouraged.

Document Structure and Content

Through consultation on the Urban Design Guidelines, it was determined that adequate urban design direction exists within the City Design policies of The London Plan. The most useful tool to add value to the development review process would be a guideline document that provides photographs, diagrams and other illustrations that demonstrate the existing policies of the London Plan, including a variety of ways to implement them in different contexts.

Taking into consideration the comments from stakeholders and staff throughout the evolution of the urban design guidelines, the draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, attached as Appendix “B”, provides the following changes to structure and content:

- A deliberate tie back to the London Plan City Design policies has been provided in the structure of the document.
- The purpose and use of the document as a flexible guideline is more clearly outlined in the introduction as well as its relationship to other policies and standards.
- The guidelines focus on visual representations of the City Design policies through photographs, illustrations and diagrams, with further elaboration through text where more detail is required.

The draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines is structured into the following sections – Character, Street Network, Streetscape, Public Space, Site Layout, and Buildings. These categories have been chosen to specifically relate to the structure of the City Design policies in the London Plan. The sections are further broken down to address specific themes or topics that commonly present themselves through planning and development applications, and public spaces and roads projects. Photographic examples and diagrams are provided to illustrate the concepts, and variations in how the policies may be applied in different contexts are provided.

Design for Equality and Sustainability

The draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines have been prepared with a particular focus on equality and sustainability. The guidelines have been reviewed with a gender lens to evaluate how the design of the built form might impact the wellbeing and safety of all genders, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds. Resulting from that, additional guidelines have been included relating to crime prevention through environmental design and multi-modal transportation options, among other things.

The guidelines have also been reviewed with a sustainability lens, acknowledging that Council has declared a climate emergency. Guidelines have been added to address the need for a more compact urban form, convenient active transportation networks and reducing car-dependency. Staff will continue to review the City-Wide Urban Design

Guidelines with these lenses during further consultation on the draft.

Stakeholder Consultation

Building and Development Liaison Forum

On Wednesday March 6th 2019, City staff met with the Building and Development Liaison Forum. City staff presented the details of the Terms of Reference for the City Design Guidelines to City staff and members of the building and development community. The primary concern heard at this meeting was to ensure the guidelines assist with the implementation of development projects and don't delay the planning and development process.

An update was provided to the Building and Development Liaison Forum on June 13th, 2019.

London Area Planning Consultants

On May 15th 2019, City staff met with the London Area Planning Council. City staff presented the details of the Terms of Reference for the City Design Guidelines to approximately 20 members of the London Area Planning Council.

Concerns and comments from this group included the following:

- A clear understanding of intent (vision, purpose or goal) for all proposed guidelines is required.
- A clear understanding of what is a policy and what is a guideline is required.
- Ensure the images and graphics don't stifle creativity.

London Development Institute

On May 16th, City staff met with the London Development Institute. City staff presented the details of the Terms of Reference for the City Design Guidelines to approximately 10 member of the London development Institute. See Appendix "A" for a summary of comments from the London Development Institute following the meeting.

The comments and concerns raised by this group included the following:

- A clear delineation between what is policy and what is guideline is required.
- A clear understanding of the intent (vision, purpose or goal) of all proposed guidelines is required.
- All guidelines should be amalgamated under one comprehensive document, or provide a clear hierarchy of guideline documents.
- Affordability needs to be included in all levels of the development process.

On September 23rd, City staff met again with the London Development Institute. City staff presented a sample of the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines to approximately 10 member of the London development Institute.

The comments and concerns raised by this group included the following:

- Ensure there is no conflict between these guidelines and existing policy, by-laws, or guidelines
- A clear understanding of what is a policy and what is a guideline is required.
- Provide flexibility to allow for implementation.

Next Steps

The next steps in the process will be to circulate the draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. Staff will continue consultation with stakeholders, internal service areas, advisory committees, external agencies and other interested parties in the refinement of the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines.

**Urban Designer:
A. Lockwood**

The draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will be posted on a Get Involved London webpage for the general public to review and provide comments.

A drop in community information meeting will be organized to allow the public and stakeholder the opportunity to talk to staff about the draft City-wide Urban Design Guidelines.

Upon refinement, Staff will bring forward a report to the Planning and Environment Committee with the revised final City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. The target for this report will be the first quarter of 2020. This will also include a public participation meeting as well as an implementing Official Plan amendment to adopt the document as a guideline under The London Plan.

Conclusion

The City Design section of The London Plan provides policy direction on community structure, public realm and built form. These draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines are intended to assist Staff, the development community and the public by providing illustrated examples of how to implement the City Design policies in various contexts.

This document is to be read in conjunction with other applicable policies, standards and manuals in the review of planning and development applications and public realm projects. The guidelines are intended to be flexible and offer inspiration and guidance, while still allowing for design creativity and innovative responses to unique sites.

The City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will be adopted as a guidelines document under The London Plan.

Prepared by:	Amanda Lockwood, Urban Designer, City Building & Design
Submitted by:	Britt O'Hagan, MCIP, RPP Manager, City Building & Design
Recommended by:	John M. Fleming, MCIP, RPP Managing Director, Planning and City Planner
Note: The opinions contained herein are offered by a person or persons qualified to provide expert opinion. Further detail with respect to qualifications can be obtained from Planning Services	

October 9, 2019

AL

Y:\Shared\City Building and Design\Illustrated City Design Guidelines

Appendix A – Stakeholder Consultation



LONDON DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

May 24, 2019

Mr. John Fleming
Managing Director, Planning and City Planner
City Planning
City of London

Dear Mr. Fleming

LDI recently hosted a meeting with Amanda Lockwood, Urban Designer from the City Planning Department, regarding the consultation process in the development of the "Illustrated City Design Guidelines" for the City of London. In our view, LDI and its members are a vital part of the process in developing the City-wide guidelines stemming from the design policies of the London Plan.

Ms. Lockwood did an excellent job of presenting the process, listening and noting our preliminary concerns that need to be addressed in the first draft of a report to be presented to PEC and Council in July. LDI and its members can, through this process, not only offer opinion on the development of the guidelines but solutions that will work for all stakeholders including Council, staff, the community and the development and building industry.

Our initial thoughts embrace three overall concepts that need to be addressed through the process.

First, we need a clear delineation between what is a policy and what is a guideline. The choice of words is critical in the interpretation of a guideline versus a policy. We want to avoid potential conflicts between our industry and city staff tasked with the responsibility of implementing the vision of the design guidelines emanating from the policies of the London Plan.

In our view, one potential outcome could be a better understanding of the expectations of the design related policies in the London Plan. The resulting clarifications may lead to resolving some of the policy issues that are currently under appeal.

Second, the guidelines must articulate a clear understanding of the "why" or intent of a proposed guideline. What is the vision, purpose or goal of a specific or group of guidelines? This should be in writing and embedded within the guideline document.

In conjunction with the "why" we need flexibility built into the guidelines. Guidelines should not be prescriptive but allow for innovation and flexibility. The guidelines must balance questions of design, functionality and other public policy initiatives such as gender awareness. We need the ability to adapt and adopt to new and innovative ways to integrate the guideline's objectives into the built form that our industry will be creating in the City. The decisions we make today will have a 100-year impact on the City of London.

562 Wellington St., Suite 203, London, Ontario, N6A 3R5

tel. (519) 642-4331

www.londondev.ca

londondev@rogers.com

Urban Designer:
A. Lockwood



LONDON DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Thirdly, all design related guidelines need to be amalgamated under one comprehensive document. As an example, is the current Urban Design Guidelines and the new bird friendly design guideline (yet to be passed) part of the Illustrated City Design Guidelines? Does one take precedence over another? An all-inclusive document should be the "manual" for both the industry and staff.

In addition, any hierarchy of other city planning documents, like heritage district plans, that affect the expectation and implementation of the Illustrated City Design Guidelines must also be clearly identified. Our industry needs certainty and clarity to be able to propose, develop and build in a timely and acceptable manner to achieve London City Council's vision for the built form of our great City.

Finally, we must continue to review all changes and additions to the development process through the lens of affordability. LDI shares City Council's goal of tackling the affordability challenge facing the City of London. LDI is committed to be an active contributor to the process of developing the Illustrated City Design Guidelines that work from both a design and affordability perspective.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Mike Wallace'.

Mike Wallace
Executive Director
London Development Institute

cc Mayor and Council
cc Martin Hayward, City Manager
cc George Kotsifas, Development Manger
cc Amanda Lockwood, Urban Design Planner

562 Wellington St., Suite 203, London, Ontario, N6A 3R5

tel (519) 642-4331

www.londondev.ca

londondev@rogers.com

Urban Designer:
A. Lockwood

Appendix B – Draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines

(DRAFT) City-wide

URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	5	PUBLIC SPACE	25	BUILDINGS	51
POLICY FRAMEWORK	6	Parks and Recreation Master Plan		Massing	
		Location		Active Facades and Pedestrian Orientation	
CHARACTER	9	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)		Residential Facades	
Neighbourhood Character		Privately Owned Public Space (POPS)		Non-Residential Facades	
Cultural Heritage		Landscape Features		High Rise Buildings	
Natural Heritage		Trails, Walkways and Connectivity		Building Materials	
				Signage	
STREET NETWORK	13	SITE LAYOUT	33		
Grid/Modified Grid Street Network		Transition			
Block/Lot Sizing and Configuration		Existing Trees and Topography			
Interface with Higher Order Streets		Building Location			
Pedestrian/Cycling Networks		Loading, Garbage, and Service Areas			
		Residential Driveways			
STREETSCAPE	19	Surface Parking			
Complete Streets		Underground and Structured Parking			
Transit		Drive-Through Facilities			
Traffic Calming		Site Circulation			
Vertical Elements		Bicycle Parking			
Landscaping		Landscaping			
Noise and Retaining Walls		Interface with Public Right-of-way and Public Spaces			
		Amenity Spaces			



Introduction

WHAT ARE URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES?

City Council may adopt guideline documents to provide more detailed direction and context for the implementation of The London Plan policies.

These City-wide Urban Design Guidelines provide complementary written and visual information to assist with the implementation of the City Design policies of The London Plan. They are both more detailed, and more flexible in their interpretation and implementation than The London Plan policies. These guidelines should not be considered as new policy or regulation, but rather an additional tool to assist staff, the development community, streetscape and public space designers, and the public in designing and shaping the built form of the city.

This document does not reconsider the policies of The London Plan. It does not create new regulations or alter the existing regulations in the Zoning By-law, the Site Plan Control By-law, Engineering Standards, or the Complete Streets Manual. Where there is reference to specific dimensions, they are not meant to be regulatory but rather targets based on best practices.

STRUCTURE OF THESE GUIDELINES

This document shares the same structure as the City Design policies in The London Plan. The guidelines are meant to build on the City Design policies by offering more detail on how the policies may be implemented in different contexts. Sub-categories based on common themes and consideration are provided for ease of reference.

The guidelines are flexible in their interpretation, and provide creative and innovative design solutions to meet the intent of The London Plan.

Policy Framework

There are various policy and regulatory documents that will apply to planning and development applications, as well as public works. These City Design Guidelines will be used in conjunction with the following documents:

THE PLANNING ACT

The Planning Act outlines matters of provincial interest that municipalities need to have regard for in carrying out their responsibilities. There is a provincial interest in promoting development that is designed to be sustainable, to support public transit and to be oriented to pedestrians; and, promoting a built form that is well-designed encourages a sense of place and provides for public spaces that are of high quality, safe, accessible, attractive and vibrant.

THE LONDON PLAN

The London Plan is the City's Official Plan and lays out City Council's vision and priorities for the short-term and long-term growth of the city. The London Plan provides direction on the allocation of land uses, the design of built form and the degree of intensity in different areas of the city. The London Plan includes policies related to City Design, which form the basis of these City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. All of the work and investment the City does is to be consistent with The London Plan.

SECONDARY PLANS

Secondary Plans may be established through a comprehensive study of specific existing or future neighbourhoods where it has been deemed important to coordinate the development (or redevelopment) of multiple properties. Secondary Plans provide more detailed policy guidance for that specific area. Where there is a conflict between the policies of a Secondary Plan and The London Plan, the Secondary Plan will prevail. Secondary Plans are identified in The London Plan, policy 1565.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Heritage Conservation Districts are designated pursuant to Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act to recognize and protect areas of the City that are identified as having significant cultural heritage value or interest. To help manage change in these areas, Heritage Conservation District Plans have specific policies and guidelines to ensure that what makes these areas of significant cultural heritage value or interest are conserved. Heritage Conservation Districts are also identified in The London Plan, policy 601. Heritage Alteration Permit approval may be required to make changes to a heritage designated property. Properties may be individually designated pursuant to Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Heritage Alteration Permit approval may be required to make changes to a heritage designated property.


AREA SPECIFIC DESIGN GUIDELINES

Area-specific Design Guidelines may be established for areas or sites with unique contexts or circumstances which require specific direction for their longer-term development. Area-specific Design Guidelines provide detailed guidance on how the community or site should be designed including the site layout, built form and public realm components. These city-wide guidelines will be used to supplement area guidelines, where they exist, to provide a comprehensive picture of how development will fit into the larger city structure. Area-specific Design Guidelines are identified in The London Plan, policy 1716.

OTHER APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

In addition to the above, planning and development applications need to meet the direction of various municipal policies and regulations including, but not limited to, the Zoning By-law, Site Plan Control By-Law, the Sign By-law, Access Management Guidelines, the Growth Management Implementation Strategy, Engineering Design Standards, the Ontario Building Code and the Complete Streets Manual. Other Guidelines Documents are identified in The London Plan, policy 1717 to 1722.

Character



NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER

Each site and neighbourhood is unique and has different existing characteristics. The Place Types provide a planned vision for each area, but attention should also be paid to the existing features on the site and how they can contribute to the unique identity for the area and create a sense of place.

1. Strategically locate new parks, pathways and open spaces in central locations, adjacent to natural heritage features, at corners, view termini and adjacent to community facilities to form focal points and provide views throughout the neighbourhood.
2. Provide a cohesive and complementary architectural style throughout new development. Architectural style and form does not need to be the same but should be compatible to create a sense of place.
3. Consider the design of streetscapes, setbacks, façade rhythm, architectural datum lines, and landscaping, to contribute to the unique character of the neighbourhood for new or infill development.
4. Public art can be integrated into new neighbourhoods and development in the following ways:
 - i. creative lighting on buildings or within the public space
 - ii. gateway feature or focal point in unique districts or communities
 - iii. surface treatments and paving patterns
 - iv. into privately owned public spaces or integrated into building facades
 - v. street furniture, tree grates, transit stops and stations





CULTURAL HERITAGE


Protect and enhance existing cultural heritage resources through development that is compatible and highlights important heritage attributes.

1. Highlight distinctive heritage elements by maintaining views to these elements.
2. Design additions to heritage buildings that do not detract from the heritage features. This may include setting back the addition from the heritage resource, or using complementary materials and architectural style.
3. Incorporate materials and architectural cues (rhythm, massing and form) from the surrounding neighbourhood into the design of new buildings, additions and landscapes.
4. Continue visual datum lines from heritage buildings into new adjacent development, including floor, fenestration and cornice heights.
5. Design new development and neighbourhoods around existing cultural heritage resources and landscapes to create focal points and landmarks.


NATURAL HERITAGE

Consistent with the policies of The London Plan, protect and enhance existing natural heritage features by integrating them into the design and layout of the site or neighbourhood.


1. Lay out the street networks and development patterns to provide access and views to natural heritage features, such as creeks and woodlands. Use window streets and strategically locate buildings to provide views to natural features.
2. Locate park space next to natural features to increase views and allow for a buffer from development.
3. Choose building forms and configurations that utilize the existing topography on the side and make efforts to avoid clearing or flattening sites.
4. Resolve changes in elevation within the building form by stepping down across the building length or utilizing techniques such as walkout basements to minimize the use of retaining walls.
5. Integrate the pathway network to provide convenient access and views to natural features.
6. Utilize privately-owned rear driveways or laneways to allow for buildings to front onto natural features.



Street Network



GRID / MODIFIED GRID STREET NETWORK




A grid network of streets provides the most direct, convenient and easy to navigate neighbourhood configuration. Sometimes the grid can be broken or modified to respond to natural features or topography, or to optimize views and access to public spaces, transit and landmarks.


1. Break, curve or modify the street network to protect and enhance natural heritage features, cultural heritage resources and landmarks.
2. Consider the geographic orientation of streets relative to the sun to take advantage of passive solar energy and reduce shading impact on adjacent properties.
3. Protect and introduce views and vistas to parks and public spaces.
4. Use privately-owned rear laneways to reduce the impact of garages and driveways on the streetscape.
5. Along higher-order streets, consider privately-owned rear lanes to access street-oriented built form as a first priority, and window streets only where this cannot be achieved.
6. Strategically locate landmarks and focal points within neighbourhoods to help with wayfinding.
7. Introduce mid-block pedestrian connections for convenient access to transit, destinations and public space.
8. In new Neighbourhoods, the street network should protect for street connections to future development.
9. In Transit Villages, Corridors and Shopping Areas, new public streets should be introduced perpendicular to the higher-order streets to break down large blocks.
10. Where public streets are not possible, private streets or pedestrian connections can be established in a grid network.
11. Rear laneways, pedestrian connections and other private vehicle and pedestrian routes should be located and designed to ensure clear sightlines for safety.
12. Provide through streets instead of cul-de-sacs and crescents.
13. Consistent with the London Plan, a connectivity ratio of 1.5 or higher must be achieved in new neighbourhoods. The connectivity ratio is measured by dividing the number of street segments by the number of nodes, dead ends and cul-de-sacs.

BLOCK / LOT SIZING AND CONFIGURATION

Block and lot sizes and configuration should be appropriate for the scale and intensity of the development on them. Block configuration should promote street-oriented built form and accommodate all required parking and servicing on site. Block and lot sizing should also promote a mix of housing forms.

1. Blocks should be small and walkable, targeting a maximum perimeter of 600m. Block sizes adjacent to the arterial road network will be determined by minimum intersection spacing in the Access Management Guidelines.
2. Design block depths adjacent to higher-order streets to accommodate more intense built form with rear access and parking.
3. Orient lots to front higher order streets.
4. Provide a variety of lot sizes to accommodate a mix of building forms throughout new neighbourhoods.
5. Design corner lots, lots at T-intersections and lots at the end of view termini to be appropriately sized to accommodate enhanced design features, such as glazing, canopies, or height elements, and street-orientation.





INTERFACE WITH HIGHER ORDER STREETS

Locate active building facades along the higher order street edge to promote safety, direct connections and animate the street.

1. Locate more intense forms of development, such as apartment buildings, along higher order streets to minimize vehicle access and parking between the building and the street.
2. In neighbourhoods, consider double frontage house forms and townhouse designs with rear parking.
3. In double-frontage building designs, minimize the front setback of buildings and deliver amenity space such as a front porch, upper level terrace or balcony, or a rear courtyard.
4. Minimize fencing or landscape features that create a barrier between the development and the higher order street. Ensure that any fence treatment is low and decorative, provides direct access to front doors, and allow for clear sight lines for pedestrians and vehicles.
5. Where side-lotting is necessary along higher order streets, locate the garage away from the higher order street and orient the front door and active building portions to the higher order street.
6. Design lots with a size and configuration that avoids exposed rear yards along higher order streets. Use the building to provide privacy and sound barrier as much as possible and reduce fencing next to the street. Side yard fencing should be setback behind the building wall and screened with landscaping.
7. Where rear or side lotting is not possible, window streets may be considered.
8. Consider a shared street design for window streets to provide an extension of the open space.
9. Provide pedestrian connections between the higher order street and the window street.

PEDESTRIAN /CYCLING NETWORKS

Consistent with the City of London Cycling Master Plan, pedestrian and cycling routes should be integrated into the street network. Off-road options may also be provided to supplement the primary cycling routes and allow for convenient access to public spaces, destinations and the trail network.

1. Provide pedestrian and cycling connections mid-block on long blocks, to reduce the travel distance between key destinations, such as transport stops.
2. Mid-block connections may be provided for convenient access from rear parking areas to the fronts of buildings in Transit Villages, Corridors and Shopping Areas.
3. Minimize curves and blind spots when introducing mid-block connections.
4. Design mid-block connections to be wide enough to allow for clear sightlines to and from streets and public spaces.
5. Size and orient lots adjacent to mid-block connections so that development can front onto the connection and reduce the need for blank walls and fencing.
6. Include trees, lighting and landscaping within mid-block connections in a manner that fits within the character of the Place Type.
7. Reduce the number of driveways and vehicle access points on streets that include cycling networks and primary pedestrian routes.
8. Provide benches, bike racks, landscaping and way-finding signage along cycling and primary pedestrian routes, particularly at transit stops and close to intersections.



Streetscape



COMPLETE STREETS

The Complete Streets Design Manual provides specific guidance on how the right-of-way should be designed for different classifications of streets. These City Design Guidelines will provide additional guidance on the interface between development on private property and the public streets.



TRANSIT

Design streetscapes that are comfortable and convenient to access transit.

1. Locate transit stops close to intersections with safe pedestrian crossings, with consultation from the London Transit Commission.
2. Provide an adequately sized hard surface at transit stops between the sidewalk and the curb for accessibility.
3. Consider seating at all bus stops. Shelters should be provided at transit stops with high ridership.
4. Integrate sheltered areas into the design of development in Transit Villages, Corridors and Shopping Areas.
5. Where possible, provide refuge islands where transit stops are next to bike lanes to minimize conflicts.





2i

TRAFFIC CALMING

All streets should be comfortable and safe for pedestrians. Traffic-calming measures can be integrated to change the speed of vehicles and the character of the area.


1. The paved vehicle portion of roads should be as narrow as possible.
2. Integrate the following traffic-calming measures into new streets and as part of street reconstruction in Downtown, Transit Villages, Corridors, Main Streets, and Neighbourhoods:
 - i. Bump-outs
 - ii. Raised intersections
 - iii. Planted medians
 - iv. Streets trees
 - v. Wide boulevards
 - vi. On-street parking
 - vii. Speed Cushions
 - viii. Bike lanes



2iii



2iii






2vi

VERTICAL ELEMENTS

Design streetscapes with coordinated vertical elements in the right-of-way to reduce clutter and contribute to the overall sense of place and unique character of each Place Type.

1. Locate trees, landscaping, signage, utilities and lighting between the curb and the sidewalk to reduce visual clutter and provide a buffer between pedestrians and vehicles.
2. Coordinate the location of the above elements to ensure trees do not block signage or lighting.
3. Landscaping should be low level to avoid blocking sightlines for pedestrians or vehicles, particularly at intersections.
4. Co-locate utilities and put them underground wherever feasible.
5. Wrap utility boxes in public art that adds to the character of the streetscape.





LANDSCAPING


Trees and planting in the streetscape can have a big impact on the character and quality of the area. Landscaping on public streets should use native species, be low maintenance and consistent with the visions of the Place Type.

1. Provide street trees between the sidewalk and the curb on all public street where space permits where possible.
2. In Downtown, Transit Villages, Corridors and other locations with high pedestrian traffic, street trees should be provided in tree grates or formal at-grade or raised planter beds. Silva cells or similar soil storage technology are encouraged for all urban street tree planting.
3. In Neighbourhoods, street trees can be planted in a grass boulevard.
4. Low Impact Development (LID) features should be considered for major street reconstruction projects. LIDs should generally be located between the sidewalk and the curb, unless otherwise directed by the City Engineer.
5. In Downtown, Transit Villages, Corridors and other locations with high pedestrian traffic, curb cuts should be included in any LID design to allow water to drain into planters or vegetated areas.
6. In Neighbourhoods, LID features can be provided where appropriate.
7. The use of LID features can be considered in appropriate streetscape locations and for pedestrian pathways.

NOISE AND RETAINING WALLS

Retaining walls and noise walls should be avoided as they cut development off from the streetscape. Where it is not possible to avoid them, they should contribute positively to the surrounding environment.

1. Locate retaining walls on private property and outside of the City right-of-way.
2. If retaining walls are necessary, they should be designed to include:
 - i. planting beds,
 - ii. seating,
 - iii. terracing, and/or
 - iv. stairs or ramps.(Railings may be required in accordance with the Ontario Building Code).
3. Provide convenient pedestrian connections around retaining walls.
4. If noise walls are necessary, they should be designed to include:
 - i. compatible colours, materials and/or patterns,
 - ii. public art, and/or
 - iii. landscape screening on private property.
5. Break up long expanses of noise walls with different angles or heights.



Public Space




PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan provides specific guidance on where public parks should be located and how they should be designed. These City Design Guidelines will provide additional guidance on the interface between development and parks and other public spaces.

LOCATION

The inclusion of each public space in the design of neighbourhoods and new developments provides a place to meet and gather, create connections, and establish the character and sense of place for the surrounding area.

1. Locate public spaces centrally within new neighbourhoods, bounded by public streets, to form a focal point. Design new neighbourhoods to have 50% of the perimeter of a park bounded by public streets.
2. Locate public open space adjacent to natural features, at corners, view termini and adjacent to community facilities.
3. In the Downtown Place Type, public spaces may take the form of mid-block connections, and plazas/forecourts associated with new development.





- 4. Locate plazas at the corners of new development to serve as an extension of the public sidewalk.
- 5. Introduce civic spaces to dense existing neighbourhoods by providing a more urban, hardscape space for events and gathering.



CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (CPTED)

Creating public spaces that are safe and comfortable is important. The design of public space, and privately owned public space should maintain sight lines and not create hidden spaces.

1. Locate active building walls with windows and doors next to public spaces to maximize passive surveillance.
2. Maintain direct pedestrian routes from the public sidewalk to adjacent buildings.
3. Provide at least two unobstructed ways into and out of the space from the sidewalk should be provided.
4. Vertical elements including plants, landscape walls and furniture should be low enough to maintain open views.



PRIVATELY-OWNED PUBLIC SPACE (POPS)

POPS are encouraged in all Place Types. While privately owned and maintained, these spaces serve as an extension of the streetscape and/or public open space system.

1. The optimal location for POPS is on the south side of buildings and adjacent to public streets to allow sunlight penetration into the space and the building, where possible.
2. Locate POPS on corners where possible and provide entryways and doors into the space.
3. POPS should be designed with a variety of hardscape and softscape materials, coordinated with the adjacent streetscape.
4. Provide mid-block connections on large development blocks to allow pedestrians to walk from the public street through the development block.
5. Mid-block connections may be designed to double as POPS or amenity space for residents and include seating and other site furniture.
6. Mid-block connections should be a minimum 8.0m wide and designed with a variety of hardscape and softscape materials, coordinated with the adjacent streetscape.
7. Mid-block connections may serve as an extension of the multi-use pathway system, or as a outdoor amenity area.



LANDSCAPE FEATURES

Incorporate landscaping and landscape features into the design of public spaces to create a sense of place, support food systems, and assist in achieving the goals of the Forest City chapter of The London Plan

1. Public spaces should be designed with a variety of hardscape and softscape material, coordinated with the adjacent streetscape.
2. Include a variety of seating options, public art and lighting that is appropriate for the Place Type.
3. Plant trees in sod or planting beds to allow for long term growth. Use Silva cells or similar soil storage technology for urban tree planting in plazas, POPS and seating areas.
4. Consider incorporating pollinator-friendly planting and edible foodscapes where they do not cause a conflict with other park elements.
5. Incorporate flexible gathering spaces that allow for neighbourhood programming such as markets, fitness classes and performances.







TRAILS, WALKWAYS, AND CONNECTIVITY

Trails, walkways, play equipment and recreational facilities incorporated in the design of public spaces allow for healthy and active lifestyles

1. The design of public spaces should allow for direct pedestrian routes from the public sidewalk to adjacent buildings
2. Multi-use pathways systems should be provided to support an alternative to sidewalks and extend through all Place Types, consistent with the City of London Cycling Master Plan.
3. The multi-use pathway network should extend from neighbourhoods to public transit stops.



Site Layout




TRANSITION

Different intensities of development and built form can exist together if there is an effort to provide an appropriate transition between the two forms.

1. Transition development down in height and density towards lower intensity Place Types, within the Place Type boundary. This can be achieved by:
 - i. stepping down building heights within a single development block, or
 - ii. stepping down building heights across a number of properties.

2. Consider the use of a 45 degree angular plane to minimize shadow impacts on adjacent development.
3. Increase building setbacks as development transitions away from the most intense, urban places, to provide more landscaping in the public realm.

4. Locate parking areas and open space on site to provide separation and a buffer between new and existing buildings of different intensities.
5. Continue the rhythm of low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise buildings.





EXISTING TREES AND TOPOGRAPHY

Protect and maximize retention of existing grades, natural features and healthy trees on site. These features should help determine the organization of the site and locations of new built elements.

1. Locate buildings and hard surfaces away from trees and natural features.
2. Lay out parking areas to reduce impacts on perimeter trees and clusters of tree.
3. Use landscape islands to terrace large parking areas across sloping sites.
4. Address large grade changes within buildings through techniques such as side or back split buildings, or walk-out basements.
5. Step long buildings down across sloping sites to have multiple grade-related entrances and avoid exposed blank foundations.
6. Where exposed foundations are unavoidable, extend the facade materials to cover them, or use landscape terracing to raise the grade to floor level.
7. Use grade changes to optimize and hide underground parking access.


BUILDING LOCATION

Locate buildings to frame the public realm, create usable amenity space on site and allow for direct and convenient access from the public sidewalk to entrances and between buildings on the same and neighbouring sites.

1. Locate buildings close to the highest order street to create a comfortable pedestrian environment.
2. On corner properties, locate the building at the corner.
3. Locate buildings in line with existing adjacent buildings that are not anticipated to change.




4. Within new development, provide a 1 to 2 metre setback to avoid encroachment of footings, canopies and signage.
5. Orient buildings with their long axis parallel to the streetscape to provide a continuous street wall.
6. Development adjacent to parks, pathways and POPS should be oriented to and frame the open space.
7. Lay out multi-building sites to maintain views to open spaces and focal points, and to define usable amenity space.



8. Multi-building sites should be arranged to maximize the amount of building along the public streets. Additional buildings should be located along the primary drive aisles, and large scale buildings should be located to the rear of the site to minimize the impact of service and loading areas.
9. In Shopping Areas and Urban Corridors, locate buildings at the street edge and parking to the side or rear. Locate and orient entrances to be convenient for people arriving by public sidewalk and by vehicle.





LOADING, GARBAGE AND SERVICE AREAS

Reduce the negative visual and noise impact of loading, garbage and other service areas for on-site users and the public realm.


1. Locate loading, garbage and other service areas within buildings wherever possible.
2. Use wing walls and enclosures made of the same materials as the main building to hide outdoor garage and utility areas.
3. Locate outdoor garbage and services to the rear of the building, or on the side where the rear is not possible.
4. Minimize the width of garbage and loading routes on site and screen them with low landscape walls and planting.
5. Locate utilities to the side or back of buildings and integrate them into the articulation of the building.



RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAYS

Design development to provide a positive interface with the streetscape, maximize pedestrian comfort and safety and encourage social interaction.

1. Limit individual driveways and garages in Downtown, Transit Villages, Corridors and along higher order streets. Instead provide underground or structured parking, or surface parking behind buildings.
2. Provide privately-owned rear laneways for development fronting higher order streets with garages, and parking in the rear of buildings.
3. Minimize the width of vehicle access points for mixed use and multi-family development. Ensure sidewalks continue across driveways.
4. Garages and driveways should not take up more than 50% of the building facade, particularly for attached forms like townhouses.
5. Setback garages behind the main habitable parts of buildings.
6. Where possible, create lot sizes that allow for rear or sideyard parking to avoid vehicles parked between the building and the street.
7. For lots adjacent to open spaces and pedestrian connections, locate garages and driveways on the side furthest away to provide active facades facing the public space and reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.
8. On corner lots, locate the garage and driveway off of the lower order street, close to the interior property line and have the front door and active uses facing the higher order street to provide active facades on the higher order street.
9. Pair driveways to allow sufficient room for trees to grow and for on-street parking.




SURFACE PARKING

The location, configuration, and size of parking areas impacts the experience of pedestrians, transit-users, cyclists and drivers. Sites should provide safe, comfortable, convenient and intuitive access and connectivity throughout.


1. Locate parking areas to the rear or interior side yard of properties.

2. Provide access from lower order streets where possible.
3. Lay out large parking areas in a grid pattern to allow for future infill development.
4. Create a hierarchy of drive aisles and design primary drive aisles to function as local streets. Including the following:
 - i. Sidewalks
 - ii. Demarcated cross walks
 - iii. Tree planting
 - iv. Seating areas
 - v. Pedestrian scaled lighting
 - vi. On-street parking
 - vii. Cycling lanes





5. Design parking lots with pedestrian routes that are aligned and direct from the public sidewalk to buildings and between buildings.
6. Provide large planted islands throughout the parking area.
7. Consider including LID features surrounding and within parking areas through curb cuts and bio-swales to assist with storm water management.
8. Screen parking areas from the public sidewalk with a combination of low landscape walls and planting.
9. Align landscape walls and screening with the front of building facades to provide a continuation of the street wall.
10. Landscape walls should be no taller than 1m and constructed of the same or complementary materials to the building(s) on site.
11. Consider designing parking areas in multi-unit developments as shared spaces with no curbs and enhanced paving materials to provide an extension of the amenity space on site.



UNDERGROUND AND STRUCTURED PARKING

Incorporating parking in buildings or providing parking structures allow for parking to be screened from the public right-of-way, reducing the visual and noise impacts on the public realm. Provide active frontages on the ground floor to allow for direct connections to the public realm as well as the site.

1. Integrate parking structures into the design of apartment buildings and free-standing commercial buildings. Provide active uses on the ground floor of apartment buildings.
2. Provide active uses on the ground floor of parking structures.
3. Consider shared access parking for new and intensified development.
4. Consolidate parking for big box area commercial development where Zoning permits.
5. Locate underground parking entrances away from the public realm .
6. Design parking garages with entrances as a very minimal part of a façade of new buildings.






DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITIES

Design of drive-through facilities to be integrated within the site layout to provide direct and safe pedestrian connections, allow for vehicular flow and reduce impacts on adjacent land uses and the public realm.

1. Locate drive-through facilities in the rear and interior side yard. Do not locate drive-through facilities next to public streets.
2. Design restaurants with drive-through facilities with pedestrian entrances that have direct access to public sidewalks.
3. Provide additional screening, through a mix of landscaping and low landscape walls, where any portions of the drive-through facilities are adjacent to a public street.



SITE CIRCULATION

Provide clear and convenient paths of travel for all users - pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers - to and within the site. Prioritize pedestrian and cyclist safety and convenience.

1. Design parking lots with walkways throughout directly connecting building entrances.
2. Design new development with connections to existing and new pathway systems.
3. Provide a hierarchy of walkways through a site by utilizing different walkway widths and accompanying landscaping.
4. Design parking lots in a grid pattern with drive aisles designed as local streets.
5. Provide crosswalks in parking lots where any walkway crosses a drive aisle.
6. Provide direct walkways from the front entrances of different buildings/developments to other buildings/development and to public sidewalks.
7. Provide landscape islands with a mix of landscaping and shade trees.





- 8. Delineate walkways from vehicle lanes and parking stalls with a change of colour and material and raised from the surrounding drive aisle.
- 9. Design pedestrian walkways through parking lots with pedestrian level lighting.
- 10. Design pedestrian routes to be direct and efficient paths of travel.



- 11. Provide internal or sheltered bicycle storage for residential, office, institutional and industrial developments with convenient access from the sidewalk and cycle routes.
- 12. Locate short-term cycle parking close to commercial building entrances and windows for convenient access and to provide passive surveillance.



BICYCLE PARKING

Incorporate bicycle parking into the design of new development as a component of comfortable and safe bicycling infrastructure.

1. Provide secure interior bike parking for large multi-unit residential, commercial, recreational and institutional buildings
2. Provide bicycle parking in all developments in highly accessible and visible locations, such as adjacent to main entrances.
3. Provide weather protection for bicycle parking whenever possible.





LANDSCAPING

Maintain existing trees on site and incorporate new shade trees to provide shade, screening, and enhance the user experience on site and within the public realm.

1. Incorporate and maximize the retention of mature trees for development of new sites or redevelopment of existing sites.
2. Incorporate mature trees into the design of parking lots by incorporating them into parking islands.
3. Surface parking can incorporate trees into the design through the following techniques:
 - i. In a Low Impact Development system
 - ii. In planters
 - iii. In tree grates
 - iv. Along primary pedestrian routes
 - v. Around the perimeter of the site
4. Provide large shade trees along all interior and exterior property lines where hydro lines allow.


INTERFACE WITH STREETS AND PUBLIC SPACES

New development can support pedestrian activity and safety by providing public entrances, transparent windows and reducing blank walls along public rights-of-way. Providing buildings that directly front onto public spaces that allow for a defined edge and enclosure for the public spaces.

1. Provide principle entrances with direct walkway connections on facades that face public streets, public parks and open space. Incorporate transparent windows into the ground floor design of buildings to create an active frontage along street edges.
2. Provide a 1 to 2 metre setback to accommodate entrances, door swings, and walkways.
3. Clearly identify public entrances with signage, lighting, waiting areas, weather protection, and architectural features.
4. Locate residential units on the ground floor with direct access to the public sidewalk where zoning permits. Incorporate stoop, porch, and patio frontages into these units.
5. Evenly space commercial and residential entrances across the facade. Incorporating multiple entrances creates human scale rhythm and activates the street.

6. Include front doors on all entrances on the ground floor that are lockable from the outside, with an appropriate amount of glazing for the use. Sliding patio doors should only be used on upper floors.
7. Coordinate any built elements located in the setback between the sidewalk and the building with the materials of the building, as well as those of the streetscape.
8. Minimize the use of retaining walls that cut off development and active frontages from the streetscape and pedestrian network.
9. Minimize blank walls and locate them away from areas with exposure to the public realm and pedestrian traffic.






AMENITY SPACES

Include outdoor amenity spaces in the design of neighbourhoods and mixed-use buildings to enhanced the quality of life of residents.

1. Consider amenity spaces to have direct connection to pedestrian networks.
2. Provide amenity spaces adjacent to open spaces when possible.
3. Reduce negative impacts on amenity spaces by ensuring they are well buffered from parking lots, garbage and loading facilities.
4. Provide amenity space on the rooftop of mid or high-rise buildings.
5. Provide amenity space with direct ground floor access in low-rise development.
6. Consider grouping amenity spaces to ensure the space is a functional size.

Buildings









MASSING

1. The massing of buildings should aim to provide between a 1:1 and 1:2 relationship between the height of the street wall to the width of the street to provide a sense of enclosure. 1:1 should be used in more urban context such as Downtown and Transit Villages, and 1:2 elsewhere.
2. Building mass should also step down towards adjacent lower properties that are not anticipated to change, as well as towards lower intensity Place Types. A 45 degree angular plane should be used as a guideline to minimize shadow impacts.
3. Above the streetwall, the building should step back to provide access to sunlight, sky views and create a human scale. A street wall of 2 to 5 storeys generally achieves these goals.
4. Structured parking and service areas should be fully wrapped in active building uses. Vehicular entrances to these areas should be as narrow as possible while still permitting turning movements.

ACTIVE FACADES AND PEDESTRIAN ORIENTATION

Design buildings to provide a comfortable environment for pedestrians within the public right-of-way and within the site.

1. The building base is the bottom 1 to 3 stories of the building and should have a positive interface with the public realm. The base interface is intended to apply to all scales of buildings including low-rise attached units, commercial buildings, and mid- and high-rise buildings.
2. Interior residential and commercial units should be expressed on the exterior of the base through materials and articulation to create a human scale rhythm. This will generally appear as row houses for residential units, and individual store fronts for commercial buildings.
3. Address intersections and corner properties and establish an edge by massing buildings to the corner and providing a height element, material change, or special architectural features.
4. Break up long building facades through articulation and/or material change. Materials should generally wrap around exterior corners and change on interior corners.



5. Blank walls should be avoided where non-active facades cannot be avoided, they should be located away from street-facing facades and minimized where possible. Material changes, building articulation, display windows and creative lighting may be used to make blank walls appear less imposing, but are not a replacement for active ground floor uses.



RESIDENTIAL FACADES

For townhouses and low-rise apartments, provide an appropriate transition of building height, scale, and massing to ensure there are no adverse effects on neighbouring properties and different Place Types. Consideration should be given to the intent and possible future development of neighbouring properties based on the identified Place Type of The London Plan.

1. Raise ground-floor residential units slightly for privacy. Porches, stoops or terraces with landscaping should be provided to offer privacy between ground floor units and the public realm.
2. Provide ground floor residential units with direct access from the public sidewalk to a lockable front door to animate the building facade. A secondary entrance may be provided through a common hallway.
3. Emphasize the exterior entrance through windows, canopies, lighting, and other features. This will also differentiate the ground floor from those above.
4. Differentiate lobby entrances from individual unit entrances through glazing, canopy and/or signage.



NON-RESIDENTIAL FACADES

1. Design non-residential ground floors to be at grade with doors oriented towards the sidewalk with direct access. Consider using raised and removable platforms to allow flexibility to convert residential ground floors to commercial in the long term.
2. Include a high proportion of vision glass to non-residential facades on the ground floors to provide a visual connection into the building and passive surveillance. Window sills should be low and entrances should be highlighted.
3. Provide signage, weather protection and lighting at a human scale, proportional to the width of the unit and integrated into the architecture of the building.
4. Design civic, and institutional buildings as landmarks, and limit access points and larger floor plates. Highlight the entrances through a greater proportion of glazing, larger canopy and/or signage.
5. Industrial buildings may have fewer windows and entrances. The largest proportion of vision glass should highlight the main entrance, in addition to other features such as signage and canopies.




HIGH RISE BUILDINGS

Design high-rise buildings to have a base, middle, and top to reduce the height and mass on the pedestrian environment, allow sunlight and reduce the wind-tunnel effect. The base establishes a human scale façade with active frontage elements. The middle will be visually cohesive but distinct from the base, and the top should provide a finishing treatment.

1. High-rise buildings should generally have a base designed as a low- or mid-rise building.
2. Locate the towers to define usable amenity space with desirable views and access to sunlight. Towers should aim to be stepped back from the base a minimum of 5 metres to create a human-scale streetwall and reduce the wind-tunnel effect.
3. Towers should be designed as point towers, with small floorplates generally designed to fit within a 50 metres diameter circle to avoid long walls, shadow impacts and visual mass.
4. Tower separation should be a minimum of 25 metres on the same property or 12.5 metres from the centerline of roads and interior property lines to protect for future development.
5. Towers may be offset or angled to increase the perceived separation between them, increase access to light, and decrease impacts on adjacent properties.
6. Provide an articulated or sculpted roof form in scale with the building, generally consisting of the top 3-5 storeys to contribute to an interesting skyline. Enclose all rooftop mechanical and elevator equipment within the architectural design of the building.
7. Where two or more towers are in close proximity, the tower heights can be different to contribute to a varied and interesting skyline.
8. The middle of the tower should visually connect the top and the base through the continuation of materials, architectural elements or features.
9. Relate the window placement and design of the base of the building to the tower design.
10. Provide variation going up the tower to add interest. This may include alternating the location of vision glass and opaque materials, or balcony placement.
11. Break down the mass of the building by providing breaks between balconies, with no more than two balconies creating a continuous form.






BUILDING MATERIALS

A diversity of materials in new development will help to visually break up massing, reduce visual bulk, and add interest to the building design. Articulation is a horizontal change (recesses and projections) in building place that helps to break up the length of long buildings.

1. Provide recesses and projections that are a minimum of 1m deep. Relate articulation to the rhythm of interior units where possible. Generally, heavier materials should be projected out from lighter materials.
2. Where there is a horizontal material change, aim to include a slight articulation change to resolve the transition.
3. Recesses and projections should be a minimum 0.3 metres deep in order to be noticeable. Relate articulation to the rhythm of interior units where possible.
4. Generally, heavier materials should be located lower on the building.
5. Provide roof articulation through providing gables, dormers or varying the direction or height of pitched roofs. Roof articulation may also include providing parapets or changes in height on flat roofs.
6. Only provide parapets where they relate to a projection in the façade, or a change in material.



7. Provide a cornice or cap to finish any flat-roofed building portions. The cornice or cap should complement the style of the overall architecture and be appropriately scaled to the building design.
8. Utilize transparent glass and glazing to break up the mass of the building, activate the streetscape and provide passive surveillance for commercial, residential, office, and institutional uses. Design window treatments to be bird friendly.
9. Minimize blank walls and locate them away from areas with exposure to the public realm and pedestrian traffic.
10. Provide windows that are proportionate to the facade they are on. Generally, the space between windows, or between a window and the edge of the facade should be narrower than the window itself.
11. Glazing does not need to be evenly spaced, but minimizing the width of blank walls should be considered.
12. Utilize transparent glass and glazing along storefronts for Main Street, Rapid Transit Corridor, Shopping Area, and Institutional Place Types to maximize passive surveillance and activate public realm.



SIGNAGE

Incorporating the design of signage in the design of new buildings or development will allow for a cohesive design and character for the building and development. The location, size, number, construction, alteration, repair and maintenance of all outdoor signs and signs visible from the exterior premises, including signs located in windows, are regulated by the Sign By-law 2017.

1. Reduce light impacts on neighbouring properties by using:
 - i. Utilize individual lit letters
 - ii. Gooseneck lighting, and
 - iii. Avoiding the use of LED screens and uplit or backlit shadow box lights.

From: Mike Wallace

Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 12:44 PM

To: PEC <pec@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Delegate status to Item 2.1 on the Consent Agenda

Hello

I would like to request delegation status to speak to 2.1 Draft Urban Design Guidelines on the Consent Agenda. The nature of my delegation will be in favour of the consultation process.

Let me know if this is granted.

Thanks Mike

**Mike Wallace, Executive Director
London Development Institute**

562 Wellington Street, Suite 203, London, Ontario N6A

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Planning & Environment Committee

From: George Kotsifas P. Eng.,
Managing Director, Development & Compliance Services and
Chief Building Official

Subject: Application By: 2219008 Ontario Ltd (York Developments)
Address: Zoning By-law Amendment at
3493 Colonel Talbot Road

Meeting on: October 21, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, in response to the letter of appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, received on July 23, 2019 submitted by Siskinds Law Firm on behalf of 2219008 Ontario Ltd relating to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment (OZ-9032) with respect to the application of 2219008 Ontario Ltd relating to the property located at 3493 Colonel Talbot Road, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to this matter and sees no reason to alter it.

Purpose and Effect

The recommended action would advise the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal that Municipal Council is in agreement with their previous decision on June 25, 2019 to approve the requested amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law to permit the courtyard dwellings.

Background

An application to amend the Official Plan and Z.-1 Zoning By-law was received by the City and deemed complete on February 26, 2019. The requested amendment was to allow for 'L-shaped' single detached dwellings with attached garages that project beyond the main dwelling façade as an exemption to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan policies.

The amendment as initially requested potentially allowed for the creation of both the proposed built form as courtyard dwellings, but also the creation of traditional garage fronting and projecting 'snout houses'. Through the application review and input from City departments, the public and relevant panels and agencies, the recommended action was instead to separately define the L-shaped dwellings as 'courtyard dwellings' and to specifically regulate their form to ensure only the requested dwelling form would be permitted instead of less desirable design outcomes that may undermine the intent of the policy.

A Public Participation Meeting occurred before the Planning and Environment Committee on June 17, 2019. The Committee provided direction to amend some of the provisions proposed, including to reduce the proposed minimum glazing provision from 25% minimum to 18% minimum, to limit the maximum garage width to 8m or 45% of the overall building width, and to limit a maximum of not more than 30% of the single detached dwellings in the Silverleaf Subdivision to be of the alternative courtyard dwelling design. Council approved the revised Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment on June 25, 2019 as the following:

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 2219008 Ontario Ltd, relating to the property located at 3493 Colonel Talbot Road:

a) the proposed attached, revised, by-law (Appendix "A") BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 25, 2019 to amend the Official Plan to change Section 20.5 in the Southwest Area Secondary Plan by ADDING a policy to section 20.5.10.1.iii – “North Lambeth, Central Longwoods and South Longwoods Residential Neighbourhoods – Low and Medium Density Residential Built Form and Intensity”;

b) the proposed attached, revised, by-law (Appendix "B") BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 25, 2019 to amend The London Plan to change section 1565_5 by ADDING a policy to section 20.5.10.1.iii – “North Lambeth, Central Longwoods and South Longwoods Residential Neighbourhoods – Low and Medium Density Residential Built Form and Intensity”;

c) the proposed attached, revised, by-law BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 25, 2019 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-8(5)) Zone and a holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h*h-100*R1-8(5)) TO a Residential R1 Special Provision/Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-8(5)/R1-8(_)) Zone and a holding Residential R1 Special Provision/Residential R1 Special Provision (h*h-100*R1-8(5)/R1-8(_)) Zone;

d) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the Planning Act, no further notice be given as the amendments to the proposed by-laws are minor in nature;

An appeal was received on July 23, 2019 from Siskinds Law Firm on behalf of the applicant and appellant 2219008 Ontario Limited (York Developments). A copy of the appeal letter and the reasons for the appeal are attached as appendix 'B' to this report. A date for the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal hearing has not yet been scheduled.

Previous Reports Pertinent to this Matter

OZ-9032 – June 17, 2019: Public Participation Meeting at the Planning and Environment Committee

Conclusion

As analyzed and opined in the previous staff report, the approved amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms to the policies of The London Plan, the Southwest Area Secondary Plan and the (1989) Official Plan. The approved amendment implements an alternative form of residential development for the lands, and appropriately mitigates the impacts of the courtyard dwellings through the Zoning By-law regulations. Development Services staff have reviewed the appeal letter and see no reason to recommend to Council an alteration of its decision relating to this matter.

Prepared by:	Lou Pompili, MPA, RPP Manager, Development Planning
Recommended by:	Paul Yeoman, RPP, PLE Director, Development Services
Submitted by:	George Kotsifas, P.ENG Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and Chief building Official
Note: The opinions contained herein are offered by a person or persons qualified to provide expert opinion. Further detail with respect to qualifications can be obtained from Development Services.	

October 11, 2019

cc: Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions)

cc: Ismail Abushehada, Manager, Development Engineering

Y:\Shared\ADMIN\1- PEC Reports\2019 PEC Reports\16- October 21\Draft 3493 Colonel Talbot Rd OZ-9032 Notice of LPAT Appeal.docx

Appendix A – Location Map



Appendix B

680 Waterloo Street, London, ON N6A 3V8

SISKINDS | THE
LAW
FIRM

EMAIL paula.lombardi@siskinds.com

File No: 864644

Delivered by Direct Drive

July 23, 2019

City Clerk's Office
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
Room 308, 3rd Floor
London, ON
N6B 1Z2

Attention: Catherine Saunders, City Clerk

Re: Notice of Appeal of Zoning By-law No. Z.-1-192759
City of London File No.: OZ-9032
Appellant: 2219008 Ontario Limited (c/o York Developments)
Property: 3493 Colonel Talbot Road, London, Ontario

We are the lawyers for 2219008 Ontario Limited (c/o York Developments), ("Client" or "Appellant") who has an interest in the lands known municipally as 3493 Colonel Talbot Road, City of London, Province of Ontario (the "Property"). We are writing to submit our Client's Notice of Appeal concerning the City of London's passing of Zoning By-law Z-1-192759 (the "By-law").

THE PROPERTY

The Property is situated in the central portion of what is known as the 'Silverleaf' subdivision. The Property is approximately 18.3 hectares in area and has been designed to develop 172 single detached dwellings on what would be considered relatively large lots.

The Property is located in the City of London Southwest Planning Area and is subject to the policies of the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, the applicable policies of the City of London Official Plan (the "1989 Official Plan"), and the in-force policies of the new City of London Official Plan ("The London Plan"). We note that the policies of The London Plan applicable to

DIRECT
TELEPHONE (519) 660-7878
FACSIMILE (519) 660-7879

HEAD OFFICE
TELEPHONE (519) 672-2121
FACSIMILE (519) 672-6065

3960676

the use, form and intensity of development on the Property are under appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (the "LPAT"); LPAT Case No. PL170100.

OVERVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

On July 5, 2019, the Corporation of the City of London (the "City") issued Notices of Adoption for Official Plan Amendment ("OPA No. 667") to the 1989 Official Plan and Amendment No. 4 to The London Plan ("LPA No. 4") under Section 17 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (the "Act"). The City also issued a Notice of Passing to approve Zoning By-law No. Z-1-192759 (the "Zoning By-law Amendment") under section 34 of the Act (collectively referred to as the "Planning Amendments"). The purpose of OPA 667, LPA No. 4 and the Zoning By-law Amendment is to establish site specific policies allowing garages to project in front of the dwelling façade to accommodate the development of courtyard dwellings on the Property.

The Planning Amendments set out above were prepared by the City in response to the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by the Applicant, dated February 19, 2019. The applications submitted by the Appellant sought to allow garages to project beyond the front façade of the single detached dwellings located within the Property zoned 'Residential R1 (R1-8(5))' to support the development of what is referred to as courtyard dwellings. In support of the Planning Amendments, our Clients submitted extensive planning justification, through MHBC planning consultants.

The intent of the Planning Amendments is to:

1. Optimize the development potential for low density residential development within the Property; and,
2. Respond to the current market demand for courtyard housing type on large residential lots.

The Appellant participated extensively in the consultation process associated with the Planning Amendments. On June 14, 2019, the Appellant submitted written correspondence to the City's Planning and Environment Committee (the "Committee"). In its submissions to the Committee, the Appellant expressed concerns with, and made numerous recommended amendments to, the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

The Appellant did not express concerns, or raise any objections, with the proposed policies of OPA No. 667 or LPA No. 4.

In or around February 2019, MHBC prepared and submitted a Planning Justification Report (“**Planning Justification Report**”) to the City on behalf of the Appellant, assessing the merits of the Planning Amendments. The Planning Justification Report was submitted with the Planning Amendments and included an analysis of the Appellant’s proposal supporting its request that courtyard dwellings having a garage projecting beyond the front façade and confirming consistency of the proposal with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (“the PPS”).

The Planning Justification Report confirms that the Planning Amendments satisfy, and are consistent with, the PPS. On June 17, 2019, MHBC on behalf of the Appellant made an oral submission to the Committee to identify concerns with proposed regulations of the Zoning By-law Amendment and identify how the proposed regulations are inconsistent with the PPS.

On June 25, 2019, City of London Council (“**Council**”) adopted the Planning Amendments, with modifications. The Zoning By-law Amendment modified the provisions of Section 5.4 of City of London By-law No. Z.-1 to apply a site-specific ‘Residential R1 (R1-8())’ Zone to the Property.

SUMMARY OF CONCERNS

The Appellant has concerns with two specific regulations of the Zoning By-law Amendment, specifically, the restriction on garage projections and the front garage wall glazing requirement.

These concerns were set out in the Appellants letter dated June 14, 2019 to the City and are outlined below:

1. Garage Projection Requirement

Section b) iv) of the Zoning By-law Amendment limits that the garage depth for courtyard dwellings to a maximum of 8.0 m (26.2 ft) from the main building entrance or porch to accommodate a double car garage. This limitation of courtyard dwellings to double car garages is overly prescriptive, unwarranted and unnecessarily limits the development of the Property.

The concerns identified by the City relating to safe communities are without merit and unrelated to whether two or three car garages are permitted on larger sized lots. The Appellant supports community-wide initiatives to encourage ‘eyes on the street’ and pedestrian-oriented neighbourhoods which are reflected in the design requirements applicable to the proposed development.

680 Waterloo Street, London, ON N6A 3V8



2. Front Garage Wall Glazing Requirement

Section b) v) of the Zoning By-law Amendment prescribes that front garage walls for courtyard dwellings incorporate a minimum of 18% window treatment (glazing). The minimum requirements are excessive and unwarranted when compared to the what is typically provided and required. The Appellant supports design treatments, including glazing, to help enhance the streetscape appearance and seeks to avoid a 'blank wall' design. The Appellant has incorporated strict design standards for the proposed development to ensure that the area is aesthetically pleasing and no "blank walls" face the street.

We are submitting this Notice of Appeal of the Zoning By-law Amendment under Section 34(19.0.2) of the Act.

BASIS FOR APPEAL

Sections b) iv) and v) of the Zoning By-law Amendment propose restrictions on the building form and layout for courtyard dwellings that were neither requested nor supported by our Client as part of the Planning Amendments.

The provisions of the Zoning By-law Amendment restricting the building form and layout of courtyard dwellings are inconsistent with the PPS for the reasons set out below:

1. Policy 1.1.1 of the PPS provides that healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:
 - a. promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long-term;
 - b. accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential (including second units, affordable housing and housing for older persons), employment (including industrial and commercial), institutional (including places of worship, cemeteries and long-term care homes), recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs; and
 - e. promoting cost-effective development patterns and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs.

2. Policy 1.1.3.2 of the PPS provides that land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:
 - a. densities and a mix of land uses which:
 1. efficiently use land and resources;
 2. are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion;
3. Policy 1.4.3 of the PPS provides that planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements by:
 - c. directing the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs;
 - d. promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure, and public services facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed; and
4. Policy 1.7.1 of the PPS provides that long-term economic prosperity should be supported by:
 - b. optimizing the long-term availability and use of land, resources, infrastructure, electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems, and public service facilities;

Sections b) iv) and v) of the Zoning By-law Amendment are inconsistent with the PPS as the City is unable to demonstrate that the restriction placed on garage projections beyond the front façade, and the requirement for a minimum amount of glazing supports efficient development and land use patterns, and accommodates an appropriate range of residential development on the Property.

680 Waterloo Street, London, ON N6A 3V8



The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is inconsistent with the PPS and results in a limitation and restriction on housing choices and fails to support the efficient use of land and resources as required by the PPS.

At the June 14, 2019 Committee meeting the Appellant raised numerous concerns with the Zoning By-law Amendment, among others, showing that the restrictive provisions on courtyard houses, the window glazing and permitted front yard projection are inconsistent with the PPS and fails to provide an appropriate range of housing types and support efficient development and land use patterns.

The Appellant seeks the following modifications to the Zoning By-law Amendment all of which are consistent with the PPS:

1. The maximum garage depth from the main building entrance be increased to 11.5 m (37.7 ft) to allow courtyard dwellings within Property to be configured for both two- and three-bay garages. This regulation provides for a broader mix of single detached dwellings within the Property, while promoting greater variation in building designs, façade treatments, entrance (forecourt) features and landscaping arrangements and is consistent with the PPS.

We note that courtyard homes with 'bonus' rooms above the garage bays are permitted under the applicable existing zoning regulations, as these rooms are considered part of the main building. The proposed courtyard homes integrating three-bay garages and bonus rooms are permitted within the Property and are not subject to the Zoning By-law Amendment as proposed to the Committee and as adopted by Council.

2. The Appellant requested that the minimum glazing requirement for the front façade be reduced to 15% in order to support proportionate, contemporary house designs.

The Appellant is seeking the above modifications to the Zoning By-law Amendment, specifically sections b) iv) and v), all of which are consistent with the PPS. At this time, we reserve our right to submit or raise such other concerns, objections or issues as may become apparent whether related to the concerns identified in this letter or any other provisions of Zoning By-law No. Z-1-192759.

680 Waterloo Street, London, ON N6A 3V8



Please find enclosed a completed Local Planning and Appeal Tribunal ("LPAT") A1 Appeal Form and a cheque in the amount of \$300.00, payable to the Minister of Finance.

Do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or wish to discuss this letter in more detail.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Paula Lombardi".

Handwritten signature

Per:

Paula Lombardi
Partner

c: Client



Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario
Local Planning Appeal Tribunal
 655 Bay Street, Suite 1500
 Toronto ON M5G 1E5
 Telephone: 416-212-6349
 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248
 Website: www.elfto.gov.on.ca

Appellant Form (A1)

Receipt Number (LPAT Office Use Only)

LPAT Case Number (LPAT Office Use Only)

Date Stamp Appeal Received by Municipality/Approval Authority

To file an appeal, select one or more below *

- Appeal of *Planning Act* matters for Official Plans and amendments, Zoning By-Laws and amendments and Plans of Subdivision, Interim Control By-laws, Site Plans, Minor Variances, Consents and Severances, proceed to Section 1A
- Second appeal of a *Planning Act* matter for Official Plans and amendments, Zoning By-Laws and amendments, proceed to Section 1B. NOTE: Bill 139, *Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act*, 2017, allows appeals to the Tribunal of some *Planning Act* matters previously determined by LPAT.
- Appeals of other matters, including Development Charges, *Education Act*, *Aggregate Resources Act*, *Municipal Act* and Ontario Heritage, proceed to Section 1C

1 A. Appeal Type (Please check all applicable boxes) *

Subject of Appeal	Type of Appeal	Reference (Section)
Planning Act Matters		
Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)	17(24)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved or did not approve all or part of a plan or amendment	17(36)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 210 days, or within 300 days if Approval Authority extended the appeal up to 90 days	17(40)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 210 days	22(7)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Council refuses to adopt the requested amendment	
Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of a Zoning By-law	34(19)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – failed to make a decision on the application within 150 days	34(11)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – failed to make a decision within 210 days where the application is associated with an Official Plan Amendment	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – refused by the municipality	
Interim Control Zoning By-law	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law within 60 days (Minister only)	38(4)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of an extension of an Interim Control By-law within 60 days	38(4.1)

Subject of Appeal	Type of Appeal	Reference (Section)
Site Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for a site plan – council failed to make a decision within 30 days	41(12)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal requirements imposed by the municipality or upper tier municipality	41(12.01)
Minor Variance	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application	45(12)
Consent/Severance	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application	53(19)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal conditions imposed	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal changed conditions	53(27)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days	53(14)
Plan of Subdivision	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for a plan of subdivision – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days	51(34)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved a plan of subdivision	51(39)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that did not approve a plan of subdivision	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a lapsing provision imposed by an Approval Authority	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority	51(43)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal conditions - after expiry of 20 day appeal period but before final approval (only applicant or public body may appeal)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal changed conditions	51(48)
1 B. Appeal Type (Please check all applicable boxes) Only for appeal(s) of a new decision or non-decision by municipality or Approval Authority following a previous LPAT Decision (i.e., second appeal).		
Subject of Appeal	Type of Appeal	Reference (Section)
Planning Act Matters		
Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a decision by Approval Authority on an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority) following a LPAT decision	17(24) and 17(49.6)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a decision by Council or Approval Authority on an OP or OPA following a LPAT decision	17(36) and 17(49.6)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a refusal within 90 days by Council following a LPAT decision	22(7) and 22(11.0.12)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a non-decision within 90 days by Council following a LPAT decision	
Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a refusal within 90 days by Council following a LPAT decision	34(11) and 34(26.5)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a non-decision within 90 days by Council following a LPAT decision	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal of a decision by Council following a LPAT decision	34(19) and 34(26.5)

1 C. Other Appeal Types (Please check all applicable boxes)		
Subject of Appeal	Type of Appeal	Reference (Section)
Development Charges Act Matters		
Development Charge By-law	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal a Development Charge By-law	14
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law	19(1)
Development Charge Complaint	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal municipality's decision regarding a complaint	22(1)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days	22(2)
Front-ending Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> Objection to a front-ending agreement	47
	<input type="checkbox"/> Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement	50
Education Act Matters		
Education Development Charge By-law	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law	257.65
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law	257.74(1)
Education Development Charge Complaint	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal approval authority's decision regarding a complaint	257.87(1)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days	257.87(2)
Aggregate Resources Act Matters		
Aggregate Removal Licence	<input type="checkbox"/> One or more objections against an application for a 'Class A' aggregate removal licence	11(5)
	<input type="checkbox"/> One or more objections against an application for a 'Class B' aggregate removal licence	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for a 'Class A' licence – refused by Minister	11(11)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Application for a 'Class B' licence – refused by Minister	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes to conditions to a licence	13(6)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment of site plans	16(8)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have licensee's consent	18(5)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or has licensee's consent to transfer	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant does not have licensee's consent to transfer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Revocation of licence	20(4)	
Municipal Act Matters		
Ward Boundary By-law	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards	222(4)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of a by-law to redivide the municipality into wards	

Subject of Appeal	Type of Appeal	Reference (Section)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards	
Ontario Heritage Act Matters		
Heritage Conservation District	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study area	40.1(4)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district	41(4)
Other Act Matters		
Subject of Appeal	Act/Legislation Name	Section Number
2. Location Information		
Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal * 3493 Colonel Talbot Road, London, Ontario		
Municipality * London		
Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)		
3. Appellant/Objector Information		
Note: You must notify the LPAT of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your LPAT Case/File Number(s) after they have been assigned.		
Last Name Soufan	First Name Ali	
Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation) 2219008 Ontario Limited c/o York Developments		
Email Address ali.soufan@yorkdev.ca		
Daytime Telephone Number * 519-640-8968	ext.	Alternate Telephone Number
Mailing Address		
Unit Number 201	Street Number * 303	Street Name * Richmond Street
		PO Box
City/Town * London	Province * ON	Country * Canada
		Postal Code * N6B 2H8
4. Representative Information		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me		
Last Name Lombardi	First Name Paula	
Company Name Siskinds LLP		
Professional Title Lawyer, LSO#46935M		

Email Address paula.lombardi@siskinds.com				
Daytime Telephone Number 519-660-7878			ext. Alternate Telephone Number	
Mailing Address				
Unit Number	Street Number 680	Street Name Waterloo Street		PO Box
City/Town London		Province ON	Country Canada	Postal Code N9A 3V8
<p>Note: If you are representing the appellant and are not licensed under the Law Society Act, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the LPAT's Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.</p>				
5. Subject Information				
Municipal Reference Number(s) * OZ-9032				
<p>For appeals of Official Plans, Official Plan Amendments, Zoning Bylaws and Zoning By-law Amendments, please see information on the LPAT website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/tribunals/lpat/lpat-process/] detailing the requirement to set out the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal based on requirement A or, for some appeal types, both A and B</p> <p>A: If you are appealing a decision of a Council or Approval Authority, outline which part of the decision is:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent with the Provincial Policy Statement issued under subsection 3(1) of the <i>Planning Act</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fails to conform with or conflicts with a provincial plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fails to conform with an applicable Official Plan</p> <p>Please explain: * See attached letter from Paula Lombardi to the City Clerk's Office, City of London dated July 22, 2019, setting out reasons for appeal.</p>				
And				
<p>B: If you are appealing a non-decision or decision to refuse of a Council for Subsection 22(7) or 34(11), outline how your application brings the Official Plan [22(7)] or Zoning By-Law [34(11)] into:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> consistency with the provincial policy statement, issued under subsection 3(1) of the <i>Planning Act</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> conformity with a provincial plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> conformity with the upper-tier municipality's Official Plan or an applicable Official Plan</p> <p>Please explain:</p>				
For all other appeal types				
Outline the nature of the appeal and the reasons for the appeal				

Oral/written submissions to council

If applicable, did you make your opinions regarding this matter known to council?

- Oral submissions at a public meeting of council
 Written submissions to council

Planning Act matters only

Applicable only to official plans/amendments, zoning by-laws/amendments and minor variances that came into effect/ were passed on or after July 1, 2016. (Bill 73)

Is the 2-year no application restriction under section 22(2.2) or 34(10.0.0.2) or 45(1.4) applicable?

- Yes No

6. Related Matters

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality?

- Yes No

Are there other matters related to this appeal? (For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)

- Yes No

if yes, please provide LPAT Case Number(s) and/or Municipal File Number(s)

7. Case Information

For *Planning Act* appeals selected in Section 1A for Subsections 17(24), 17(36), 17(40), 22(7), 34(11), 34(19), and 51(34):

Detail the nature and/or expertise of witnesses you will have available should the Tribunal Member require oral evidence at the proceeding. (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)

Scott Allen of MHBC Planning Consultants

For all other appeal types :

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.).

Land Use Planner


8. Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted * \$ 300

Payment Method * Certified cheque Money Order Lawyer's general or trust account cheque

9. Declaration

I solemnly declare that all of the statements and the information provided, as well as any supporting documents are true, correct and complete.

Name of Appellant/Representative	Signature of Appellant/Representative	Date (yyyy/mm/dd)
Paula Lombardi		2019 07 23

Personal information or documentation requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13 and the *Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act*. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Planning and Environment Committee

From: John M. Fleming
Managing Director, City Planning and City Planner

Subject: Demolition Request for Dwelling on Heritage Listed Property
at 6100 White Oak Road by the Islamic Cemetery of London

Public Participation Meeting on: October 21, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning & City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property at 6100 White Oak Road, that the Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of this dwelling.

It being noted that the Islamic Cemetery of London property at 6100 White Oak Road remains a heritage listed property on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, as are all cemeteries in the City of London.

Executive Summary

All cemeteries in the City of London are listed on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources. When a demolition request is received for a building or structure on a heritage listed property, a formal review process is triggered pursuant to the requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and the Council Policy Manual. While the Islamic Cemetery of London is a more recently established cemetery, it still has cultural heritage value or interest. The pre-existing dwelling on the property was evaluated using the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 and found to not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest, notwithstanding the significant cultural heritage value of the Islamic Cemetery of London. The Islamic Cemetery of London should remain a heritage listed property, but Municipal Council should consent to the demolition of the dwelling on the property.

Analysis

1.0 Background

1.1 Property Location

The property at 6100 White Oak Road is on the southeast corner of White Oak Road and Manning Drive (Appendix A). The property is located in the former Westminster Township, annexed by the City of London in 1993.

1.2 Cultural Heritage Status

All cemeteries in the City of London have been included on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources since 2006. As the Islamic Cemetery of London, the property at 6100 White Oak Road is considered to be a potential cultural heritage resource.

1.3 Description

The property at 6100 White Oak Road is the Islamic Cemetery of London. The Islamic Cemetery of London was established in 2005-2006. A dwelling was located on the subject property prior to the establishment of the Islamic Cemetery of London. The dwelling was formerly part of a farmstead, however the barn was demolished prior to 1999.

The subject property is approximately 67 acres in size.

1.3.1 Dwelling

The existing dwelling located at 6100 White Oak Road is rectangular in footprint, approximately 40' in width by 30' in depth, with a rear addition (including a garage) (Appendix B). The dwelling is one-and-three-quarters stories in height, with a gambrel roof clad in asphalt shingles. Gambrel roofs are more commonly found on barns and residential buildings of the 1890s – World War I. A gable is located above the front door, centred on the façade. The central doorway is flanked by a window opening to each side.

The dwelling is presently clad in vinyl siding. As identified in several holes in the existing vinyl siding, the dwelling appears to have been constructed of buff brick masonry, and painted several times (see Appendix B, Image 6). The brickwork appears to have been laid in common bond, and may be structural. The brickwork appears to extend to the ground (and likely the foundation walls), however boards applied at the base of the dwelling prevented the confirmation of this detail. A single stack brick chimney projects from the ridge of the gambrel roof.

All of the windows and doors on the main storey of the dwelling have been hoarded in unpainted plywood on the exterior, with the exception of a window on the south façade (which is hoarded with unpainted plywood from the interior) (see Appendix B, Image 7). All of the second storey windows are broken and not hoarded. Some of the concrete sills of the window openings remain exposed.

1.4 History

The Euro-Canadian history of this property begins with the grant of the north half of Lot 20, Concession VII (100 acres) of the former Westminster Township on March 21, 1849 to James B. Strathy (Crinklaw & Bishop 1987, 234). The 1851 Census records Philip Smith, a single man residing in a log cabin on the subject property (Crinklaw & Bishop 1897, 4). The 1861 Census records Philip Smith living on the subject property in a one storey brick house. This suggests that Strathy sold the property shortly after acquiring it in 1849. On September 20, 1877, Philip Smith advertised a farm for sale in *The London Free Press*,

Farm for Sale – North half of Lot 20, 7th Concession, Westminster, 70 acres cleared, remainder hardwood timber, soil clay loam: good brick house, barn, sheds, etc. Orchard of grafted fruit; never failing ell of water; near churches, school and Glanworth Section; terms easy. For further particulars enquire at Philip Smith, Glanworth P.O. (Crinklaw & Bishop 1987, 27).

It is not clear if Philip Smith's advertisement was unsuccessful or the property was sold to an unrelated individual with the same surname.

Robert F. Smith is noted as the occupant of the subject property on the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Middlesex County* (1878) (see Appendix A, Figure 2). A structure is shown in the same approximate location as the existing dwelling, however there are insufficient details to confirm if it is the same structure.

Accessible land registry records for the subject property commence in 1881, with Robert F. Smith taking a \$4,000 mortgage on the property from the Dominion Savings and Loan Society. In 1889, the 100-acre property was sold to Walter W. S. Hunt, and subsequently Charles B. Hunt and John I. G. Hunt in 1897 and to William H. Learn in the same year. The property remained in the Learn family until 1965, when it was sold to Frederick C. and Evalyn E. Thomas for \$28,000. The following year, the southern portion of the property was sold to the Middlesex Broadcasters Ltd. In 1979, the property (appearing to reflect the existing property boundaries) was sold to Peter N. J. and Hubertha A. Ruyter. Several mortgages were taken out. In 1982, under power of sale, the property was sold to Iqbal M. Hussain, Samina Hussain, Mohammed Sarwar, and Razia Sawar; the property was later transferred to Iqbal Hussain and Samina Hussain.

The property was subsequently acquired for the Islamic Cemetery of London. Following a challenge to the Ontario Municipal Board, planning approvals were obtained in 2002 (PL20066). Construction of the Islamic Cemetery of London commenced in 2005.

The dwelling has been vacant and boarded for approximately the past 15 years.

2.0 Legislative and Policy Framework

2.1 Provincial Policy Statement

Section 2.6.1 of the *Provincial Policy Statement* (2014) directs that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.” “Significant” is defined in the *Provincial Policy Statement* (2014) as, in regards to cultural heritage and archaeology, “resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, and event, or a people.”

2.2 Ontario Heritage Act

Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* requires that a register kept by the clerk shall list all properties that have been designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Section 27(1.2) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* also enables Municipal Council to add properties that have not been designated, but that Municipal Council “believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest” on the Register.

The only cultural heritage protection afforded to heritage listed properties is a 60-day delay in the issuance of a demolition permit. During this time, Council Policy directs that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) is consulted, and a public participation meeting is held at the Planning & Environment Committee.

Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* enables municipalities to designate properties to be of cultural heritage value or interest. Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* also establishes consultation, notification, and process requirements, as well as a process to appeal the designation of a property. Appeals to the Notice of Intent to Designate a property pursuant to Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* are referred to the Conservation Review Board (CRB), however the final decision rests with Municipal Council until changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act* arising from Bill 108 come into force and effect.

2.3 The London Plan

The Cultural Heritage chapter of *The London Plan* recognizes that our cultural heritage resources define our City’s unique identity and contribute to its continuing prosperity. It notes, “The quality and diversity of these resources are important in distinguishing London from other cities and make London a place that is more attractive for people to visit, live or invest in.” Policies 572_ and 573_ of *The London Plan* enable the designation of individual properties under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as well as the criteria by which individual properties will be evaluated.

2.5 Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

Municipal Council may include properties on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources that it “believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest.” These properties are not designated, but are considered to have potential cultural heritage value or interest.

The Register of Cultural Heritage Resources states that further research is required to determine the cultural heritage value or interest of heritage listed properties.

3.0 Demolition Request

Written notice of their intention to demolish the house located at 6100 White Oak Road was submitted by the President of the Islamic Cemetery of London and received on September 9, 2019. Staff undertook a site visit of the property, accompanied by the President of the Islamic Cemetery of London, on September 9, 2019. The site visit included an exterior inspection of the property and dwelling.

Municipal Council must respond to a notice of intention to demolish a heritage listed property within 60 days, or the request is deemed consented. During this 60-day period, the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) is consulted and, pursuant to Council Policy, a public participation meeting is held at the Planning & Environment Committee (PEC).

The 60-day period for the demolition request for the property at 6100 White Oak Road expires on November 8, 2019.

4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

4.1 Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The criteria of *Ontario Heritage Act* Regulation 9/06 establishes criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of individual properties. These criteria are:

1. Physical or design value:
 - i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or,
 - iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. Historical or associative value:
 - i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;
 - ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or,
 - iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. Contextual value:
 - i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings; or,
 - iii. Is a landmark.

A property is required to meet one or more of the abovementioned criteria to merit protection under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Should the property not meet the criteria for designation, the demolition request should be granted and the property removed from the *Inventory of Heritage Resources* (Register).

The evaluation of the property using the criteria of *Ontario Heritage Act* Regulation 9/06 can be found below.

4.2 Evaluation

The evaluation arising from this demolition request focuses on the dwelling, and is not a comprehensive evaluation of the entire property at 6100 White Oak Road. The same methodological approach was taken when considering the demolition request for an administrative building at St. Peter's Cemetery (806 Victoria Street, heritage listed property) in 2016.

All cemeteries are understood to have cultural heritage value.

Table 1: Evaluation of existing dwelling 6100 White Oak Road using the criteria of Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06.

Cultural Heritage Value	Criteria	Evaluation
The property has design value or physical value because it,	Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method	<p>The existing dwelling is not a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method. The existing dwelling has been subject to many alterations in the past, some unsympathetic to its original character.</p> <p>The existing dwelling (or portions thereof) may have been constructed prior to 1860 (as noted in the 1861 Census), however the evidence is circumstantial. The masonry has been subject to previous alterations which has compromised its integrity. Additionally, the gambrel roof is unlikely to be original to the dwelling, as are the concrete window sills, which, along with the vinyl siding and replacement windows, demonstrates the volume of alterations to the dwelling.</p>
	Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	The existing dwelling does not appear to demonstrate a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.
	Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	The existing dwelling is not believed to demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
The property has historical value or associative value because it,	Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community	Research undertaken did not identify any direct associations of the existing dwelling with matters of historical or associative value, beyond being located on the property of the Islamic Cemetery of London.
	Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	The existing dwelling is not believed to yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or a culture.
	Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	No information was located to associate the existing dwelling with the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist.

Cultural Heritage Value	Criteria	Evaluation
The property has contextual value because it,	Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area	The dwelling is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area. The area has transition away from its historic agricultural uses with farmscapes. The subject property is the Islamic Cemetery of London, and is surrounded by some agricultural lands, telecommunications towers (to the south), and the W12A landfill (to the north). The area has not evolved in manner which supports or maintains its historic agricultural functions.
	Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings	Changes in land uses have isolated the existing dwelling from its surroundings. It is no longer linked to its surroundings in any substantive way.
	Is a landmark	The existing dwelling is not believed to be a landmark.

4.3 Consultation

Pursuant to Council Policy for the demolition of heritage listed properties, notification of the demolition request was sent to 7 property owners within 120m of the subject property on October 2, 2019, as well as community groups including the Architectural Conservancy Ontario – London Region, London & Middlesex Historical Society, and the Urban League. Notice was also published in *The Londoner* on October 3, 2019.

5.0 Conclusion

The evaluation of the existing dwelling at 6100 White Oak Road found that it did not meeting any of the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 and is therefore not considered to be a significant cultural heritage resource. Municipal Council should consent to the demolition of the existing dwelling.

An evaluation of the subject property at 6100 White Oak Road, including the Islamic Cemetery of London, may have resulted in a different outcome of the evaluation. To ensure that the Islamic Cemetery of London is considered to be a place of potential cultural heritage value or interest, it should remain a heritage listed property on the City's Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

Prepared by:	Kyle Gonyou, CAHP Heritage Planner
Submitted by:	Gregg Barrett, AICP Manager, Long Range Planning and Research
Recommended by:	John M. Fleming, MCIP, RPP Managing Director, City Planning and City Planner

October 11, 2019
KG/

\\FILE2\users-z\pdp\Shared\policy\HERITAGE\REASONS.DES\White Oak Road, 6100 - Islamic Cemetery of London\2018-10-21 PEC Demo 6100 White Oak Road.docx

Appendix A Property Location
Appendix B Images

Sources

Census. 1851, 1861.

Crinklaw, Raymond and Olga B. Bishop. *Glanworth, Westminster Township*. The Aylmer Express Ltd., 1987.

Crinklaw, Raymond and Olga B. Bishop. *Westminster Township South-East of the Thames*. The Aylmer Express Ltd., 1987.

Fisher Archaeological Consulting. Islamic Centre of SW Ontario Proposed Cemetery Archaeological Assessment Stage 1: Background, Stage 2: Assessment & Limited Stage 3: Testing Final Report. CIF#2001-010-006. October 2001. DCAP-004.

Granger, D. R. Ontario Municipal Board. PL20066. November 15, 2002.

Land Registry. LRO-33. North Half of Lot 20, Concession VII, former Westminster Township.

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Middlesex County*. 1878.

Tremaine, G. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West*. 1862.

Appendix A – Property Location



Figure 1: Location of the subject property at 6100 White Oak Road. The dwelling on the subject property is noted.




Figure 2: Extract from the Illustrated Historical Atlas of Middlesex County (1878), showing the north half of Lot 20, Concession VII in the former Westminster Township (red circle). F. Smith is noted as the occupant with a structure on the property.

Appendix B – Images



Image 1: Entrance to the London Islamic Cemetery at 6100 White Oak Road. The dwelling is located in the brush to the left (south) of the entrance.



Image 2: Main (west) façade of the dwelling at 6100 White Oak Road.



Image 3: View of the south façade of the dwelling at 6100 White Oak Road.



Image 4: North façade of the dwelling at 6100 White Oak Road, showing the historic house and the rear addition with garage.



Image 5: Rear (east) façade of the dwelling at 6100 White Oak Road.



Image 6: Detail of the brickwork, underneath the existing vinyl siding. The brick work appears to be buff brick, with several layers of paint applied. The brickwork appears to be laid in a common bond pattern. The brickwork appears to extend to the ground level, however board cladding prevented the confirmation of this detail.



Image 7: The above pictured window on the south façade of the dwelling at 6100 White Oak Road is the only main storey window that is not secured from the exterior (it is boarded from the interior). Also note the concrete window sill.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Demolition Request for Dwelling on Heritage Listed Property – 6100 White Oak Road

- *(Councillor J. Helmer expressing appreciation for the report; believing the evaluation is very good; agreeing with the recommendation that this one should let it go.)*

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Planning & Environment Committee

From: George Kotsifas P. Eng.,
Managing Director, Development & Compliance Services and
Chief Building Official

Subject: Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium 1967172 Ontario Inc.
for 3400 Singleton Ave

Public Participation Meeting on: October 21, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of 1967172 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 3400 Singleton Ave:

- (a) the Planning and Environment Committee **REPORT TO** the Approval Authority the issues, if any, raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium relating to the property located at 3400 Singleton Ave; and,
- (b) the Planning and Environment Committee **REPORT TO** the Approval Authority the issues, if any, raised at the public meeting with respect to the Site Plan Approval application relating to the property located at 3400 Singleton Ave.

Executive Summary

Summary of Request

This is a request by 1967172 Ontario Inc. to consider a proposed Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium. The proposed Plan of Condominium is being reviewed concurrently with an application for Site Plan Approval. The plan consists of 82 dwelling units, within multiple townhouses with a new private road providing access from Singleton Ave. The applicant's intent is to register the development as one Condominium Corporation.

Purpose and the Effect of Recommended Action

The purpose and effect is to report to the Approval Authority any issues or concerns raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium.

Analysis

1.0 Site at a Glance

1.1 Property Description

The property is located on Singleton Ave just south of Westbury Park, west of the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Centre. There is an existing residential neighbourhood to the west and townhomes and future commercial uses to the south. The proposal consists of one low density residential block within a draft plan of subdivision (Block 86, Plan 33M641). The site was originally identified as a potential school site through the plan of subdivision but was never purchased by a school board. The site is currently vacant and is approximately 2.35 ha (5.82 ac) in size. The site has full access to municipal services and is located in an area which is planned for future growth.

1.2 Current Planning Information (see more detail in Appendix C)

- The London Plan Place Type – Neighbourhoods

- (1989) Official Plan Designation – Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential
- Existing Zoning – h*Nf1/h*h-71*h-100*h-104*h-137*R5-4/R6-5 Zone

1.4 Site Characteristics

- Current Land Use – Vacant
- Frontage – 116 metres
- Depth – Varies
- Area – 2.335ha (5.82ac)
- Shape – Irregular


1.5 Surrounding Land Uses

- North – City Park/Residential
- East – Private Community Centre
- South – Residential/Future Commercial
- West – Residential

1.5 Intensification (82 units)

- The 82 unit, cluster townhome development located outside of the Built-Area Boundary and Primary Transit Area

1.6 LOCATION MAP



2.0 Description of Proposal

2.1 Development Proposal

The effect of the application request is to create 82 Vacant Land Condominium units to be developed in the form of cluster townhouse dwellings. Landscaped areas, internal driveways, services, and visitor parking spaces will be located within a common element to be maintained and managed by one Condominium Corporation.

Figure 1: Proposed Vacant Land Condominium

An application for Site Plan Approval (SPA18-136) has also been made in conjunction with the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium. The site plan submission, including servicing, grading, landscaping, and building elevation plans, are under review and will be informed by any comments received through the Vacant Land Condominium Public Participation Meeting. A subsequent application for the removal of holding provisions is also under review and will describe how any issues raised by the public or Municipal Council have been addressed or incorporated.




Figure 2: Proposed Conceptual Elevations





Figure 3: Amenity Space and Landscaping

3.0 Relevant Background

3.1 Planning History

The subject site was created through the Westbury Plan of Subdivision (39T-05509) which received final approval in 2012. The site was rezoned (Z-6915) in 2009 as part of the plan of subdivision process to permit Neighbourhood Facilities or cluster housing with multiple holding provisions also being applied.

Site plan approval along with the removal of holding provision and minor variance applications were submitted in 2018 to accommodate the proposed cluster townhouse development. The requested variances have been approved and the site plan and removal of holding provision applications are now running in parallel with the Vacant Land Condominium application (39CD-19510) which was accepted on July 9, 2019.

3.2 Community Engagement (see more detail in Appendix A)

The requested amendment was circulated to the public on July 24, 2019 and advertised in The Londoner on July 25, 2019. Through the public circulation process some community concerns were raised in regards to the existing park just north of the site and the lack of adequate playground facilities. Respondents felt the park cannot accommodate any increase in residential density in the area. Members of the public also believed the site was to be developed as a school and the development could also create potential parking issues.

Three (3) responses were received during the community consultation period with one of the responses being a standard comment sheet with multiple signatures (20). The comments received by Staff are attached to Appendix "C". The report below addresses these concerns in detail.

3.3 Policy Context

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2014

Land uses within settlement areas shall be based on densities which efficiently use land and resources, and will also capitalize on the existing infrastructure and public service facilities that are planned or available while supporting active transportation (1.1.3.2.a & 1.4.3.d)). The proposal will develop a vacant site that has full access to municipal services within a planned neighbourhood. The subject lands are within a newer plan of subdivision and are designated and intended over the long term for medium density residential uses. The proposed Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

The London Plan

The London Plan is the new Official Plan for the City of London (Council adopted, approved by the Ministry with modifications, and the majority of which is in force and effect). The London Plan policies under appeal to the *Local Planning Appeals Tribunal* (Appeal PL170100) and not in force and effect are indicated with an asterisk (*) throughout this report. The London Plan policies under appeal are included in this report for informative purposes indicating the intent of City Council, but are not determinative for the purposes of this planning application.

These lands are within the "Neighbourhoods" Place Types along a neighbourhood connector which permits a wide range of lower density residential uses at a maximum height of 2.5-storeys.

The City Building and Our Tools policies have also been applied in the review of this application. City Design policies regarding the site layout are supportive of the proposed development as the units abutting the park space to the north provides access to the sidewalk, as well as passive surveillance from the residential dwellings

which front the park with porches overlooking the park space (288*). The proposed development promotes connectivity and safe pedestrian movement within the development and to the surrounding neighbourhood (255*).

In the Our Tools section of The London Plan, Vacant Land Condominiums are considered based on the following (1709):

1. *The same considerations and requirements for the evaluation of draft plans of subdivision shall apply to draft plans of vacant land condominium;*

The proposed draft plan of vacant land condominium has been evaluated with regards to the review criteria for plans of subdivision. The proposed cluster townhouse dwelling units conform to the Official Plan and The London Plan policies, and have access to municipal services. The access and residential uses proposed are appropriate for the site, and there are no natural features or hazards associated with the site. There is park space directly abutting the site to the north, and existing and future commercial uses proposed in proximate distance to the surrounding neighbourhood. Building elevation plans have been reviewed as part of the site plan submission. The size and style of townhouse dwellings are anticipated to contribute to housing choice and meet the community demand for housing type, tenure and affordability. All grading and drainage issues will be addressed by the applicant's consulting engineer to the satisfaction of the City through the accepted engineering and servicing drawings, future Development Agreement and Site Plan Approval process.

2. *The applicant may be required to provide site development concepts and meet design requirement consistent with the Site Plan Control By-law as part of the consideration of a draft plan of vacant land condominium;*

The draft plan of Vacant Land Condominium is being concurrently considered with an active Site Plan Application. The various requirements of the Site Plan Control By-law will be considered and implemented through a Development Agreement for the lands.

3. *Proposals for vacant land condominiums which will result in units above or below any other unit will not be supported;*

The proposed townhouse units do not result in unit boundaries below or above other units.

4. *Only one dwelling will be permitted per unit;*

There is only one townhouse dwelling proposed per unit.

5. *At the time of registration, structures cannot cross unit boundaries;*

A signed Development Agreement will be required prior to the final approval of the Vacant Land Condominium that will confirm both the location of structures and unit boundaries.

6. *The registration of a proposed development as more than one vacant land condominium corporation may be permitted if the proposal is supportive of comprehensive development and planning goals. The minimum number of units to be included in each condominium corporation will be adequate to allow for the reasonable independent operation of the condominium corporation.*

The proposed cluster townhouse development is to be developed as one condominium corporation.

Southwest Area Secondary Plan

The site forms part of the Southwest Area Secondary Plan (SWAP) and is subject to the development vision and detailed policies of the SWAP. Additionally, the site forms part of the 'North Longwoods Residential Neighbourhood' within the greater area plan.

New development in North Longwoods will reflect the existing character of the neighbourhood and will provide a walkable environment with a pedestrian scale. The built form will be primarily street oriented on all public rights-of-ways. The Low and Medium Density Residential designations apply to most of the existing and planned neighbourhoods of North Longwoods, reflecting land uses established through previous Area Plans and site specific applications.

The primary permitted uses and densities in the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential (MFMDR) designation of SWAP defer to the permitted uses of the MFMDR designation in the 1989 Official Plan. The proposed cluster townhouse development is considered a permitted landuse and the proposed density of 35uph is in keeping with the density permissions of the plan. The proposed vacant land condominium is considered appropriate for the site and meets the intent of providing a mix of housing forms and choice in the neighbourhood.

(1989) Official Plan

The (1989) Official Plan designation for these lands is Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential (MFMDR). The primary permitted uses in the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation shall include multiple-attached dwellings, such as row houses or cluster houses; low-rise apartment buildings; rooming and boarding houses; emergency care facilities; converted dwellings; and small-scale nursing homes, rest homes and homes for the aged (3.3.1. Permitted Uses). The proposed vacant land condominium is in keeping with the range of permitted uses.

Developments within areas designated Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential shall have a low-rise form and a site coverage and density that could serve as a transition between low density residential areas and more intensive forms of development. The takes on a similar scale of development to what exists in the surrounding area allowing for this transition from single detached dwellings to the west and commercial uses to the south and east. The development also provides a density of 35 uph which is less the 75 uph permitted in the MFMDR designation (3.3.3. Scale of Development).

Vacant Land Condominium Application

The City of London Condominium Guidelines have been considered for the proposed Vacant Land Condominium which is comprised of various units and common elements. The City may require applicants to satisfy reasonable conditions prior to Final Approval and registration of the plan of condominium, as authorized under the provisions of subsection 51(25) of the *Planning Act*. In order to ensure that this Vacant Land Condominium development functions properly, the following may be required as conditions of draft approval:

- That site plan approval has been given and a Development Agreement has been entered into;
- Completion of site works in the common elements and the posting of security in addition to that held under the Development Agreement (if applicable), in the event these works are not completed prior to registration of the plan of condominium;
- Confirmation of addressing information and door point numbers;
- Payment of outstanding taxes or local improvement charges, if any;
- Provision of servicing easements for utility providers (such as London Hydro, Union Gas, Bell, etc.);
- The maintenance of any stormwater servicing works including on-site works;
- Arrangements be made dealing with rights of access to and use of joint facilities, and

- responsibility for and distribution of costs for maintenance of joint facilities; and,
- Ensuring that the Condominium Declaration to be registered on title adequately addresses the distribution of responsibilities between the unit owners and the condominium corporation for the maintenance of services, the internal driveway, amenity areas, and any other structures in the common elements.

Zoning By-law No.Z-1

The existing zoning is a Holding Neighbourhood Facility and Holding Residential R5/R6 (h*NF, h*h-100*h*104*h-137*R5-4/R6-5) Zone which permits a range of dwelling types, including the cluster townhouse dwellings proposed. As previously noted the subject site received minor variances for multiple setback requirements which the proposed development is in compliance with. These variances included a front yard setback of 2.83m (9.3'), whereas 6.0m (19.7') is the required minimum; a rear yard setback of 1.74m (5.7'), whereas 6.0m (19.7') is the required minimum; an interior side yard of 5.71m (18.7'), whereas 6.0m (19.7') is the required minimum.

The holding provisions that currently form part of the zone are for the orderly development of the lands through an approved Development Agreement, water-looping and access is available, the Bostwick sanitary sewage pumping station and forcemain are decommissioned and a Traffic Impact Study is prepared. A report addressing each of these items will be brought forward under application H-8967. The proposed vacant land condominium and proposed site plan are consistent with the Zoning By-law and approved variances.

More information and detail is available in the appendices of this report.

5.0 Conclusion

The proposed Vacant Land Condominium is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and in conformity with The London Plan, the (1989) Official Plan, and the Southwest Area Secondary Plan. The proposed cluster townhouse dwelling units are appropriate for the site and permitted under the existing zoning. An Application for Site Plan Approval has also been submitted and reviewed in conjunction with the application for Vacant Land Condominium.

Prepared by:	Mike Corby, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner, Development Services
Recommended by:	Paul Yeoman, RPP, PLE Director, Development Services
Submitted by:	George Kotsifas, P.ENG Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and Chief building Official
Note: The opinions contained herein are offered by a person or persons qualified to provide expert opinion. Further detail with respect to qualifications can be obtained from Development Services.	

cc: Lou Pompili, Manager, Development Planning
cc: Michael Pease, Manager, Development Planning
cc: Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions)
cc: Ismail Abusheheda, Manager, Development Engineering
cc: Heather McNeely, Manager, Development Services (Site Plans)

Appendix A – Community Engagement

Public liaison: On July 24, 2019, Notice of Application was sent to 181 property owners in the surrounding area. Notice of Application was also published in the *Public Notices and Bidding Opportunities* section of *The Londoner* on July 25, 2019. A “Planning Application” sign was also posted on the site.

3 replies were received

Nature of Liaison: The purpose and effect of this zoning change is to approve a Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium consisting of 82 residential units at a density of 35 uph. Consideration of a proposed draft plan consisting of 82 townhouse dwelling units and a common element for private access driveway and services to be registered as one Condominium Corporation. Application has also been made for approval for Site Plan Approval, file SPA18-136.

Responses to Public Liaison Letter and Publication in “The Londoner”

From: Amy Stevens
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 11:24 AM
To: Corby, Mike <mcorby@London.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 3400 Singleton Ave draft plan

Hello,

I am a resident of the Andover Trails community. I received the draft plan for the 3400 Singleton Ave condo block and was wondering if you could provide information on the city’s plan for ensuring an appropriate amount of parks and green space are available for this community. At present, the current playground is overrun with residents from this area, and an addition of 82 further units will make these areas that much more overused.

Are there any plans to deal with this issue?

Much thanks,
Amy Stevens

From: Mihaela Latis
Sent: Friday, August 9, 2019 3:21 PM
To: Corby, Mike <mcorby@London.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] File 39D-19510

Hello,

First of all thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our opinion about this project.

Me and my husband were very disappointed to see that more houses are being built on this lot (3400 Singleton avenue) because when we first moved in this neighbourhood there was a sign there saying that the plan is to build a school. We were very excited about the school idea since our daughter is going to start school soon.

Our concerns are about the seriousness of the builder since further down on Singleton avenue there is an abandoned construction site ... Nuage homes (one day that just stoped working as you can see in the pictures attached) that looks really bad for all the neighbourhood. It’s been a long time since they stopped working so we are

wondering why approve more projects when this one isn't finished.

Other concern is that since this is still just a proposal why did they already start digging and have they're signs up? Don't they have to wait until the plan is approved?

We really think that a school makes more sense than more houses that can lead to over crowded roads and delays in traffic.

Thank you so much,

Mihaela Latis

From: Mandeep Aulakh

Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 10:20 PM

To: Corby, Mike <mcorby@London.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium (3400 Singleton Avenue)

Hello,

We are from the Singleton neighbourhood and we have drafted an objection towards the draft plan of vacant land condominiums, please kindly consider our request.

Thank you

Sincerely, The Singleton Neighbourhood

CITY OF LONDON

DATE - 11 AUGUST 2019

We are from Singleton neighbourhood. We received a notice of planning application (Draft plan of vacant land condominium) at 3400 Singleton Ave London ON

File- 39CD-19510

Application-1967172 Ontario Inc.

We have objections with this plan because of many reasons e.g.

- We already have Small Park for our community and park area becomes more congested due to increase in population of this neighbourhood.
- Parking problem will arise in the community because we are not permitted for street parking as well as already having less parking facility on our street.
- We told during the purchase of our property that this vacant area is for the construction of school, *community purpose*.

Our whole community appeals to city of London for the rejection of this plan.

Agency/Departmental Comments

Bell Canada – July 26, 2019

“The Owner shall indicate in the Agreement, in words satisfactory to Bell Canada, that it will grant to Bell Canada any easements that may be required, which may include a blanket easement, for communication/telecommunication infrastructure. In the event of

any conflict with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities or easements”.

Hydro One – July 30, 2019

No Objections

London Hydro – September 18, 2019

London Hydro has no objection to this proposal or possible official plan and/or zoning amendment.

Servicing the above proposal should present no foreseeable problems. Any new and/or relocation of existing infrastructure will be at the applicant’s expense. Above-grade transformation is required. **Note: A blanket easement will be required. Transformation lead times are minimum 16 weeks. Contact the Engineering Dept. to confirm requirements & availability.**

Stormwater Engineering – August 6, 2019


Please include the following conditions from SWED for the above noted application.

“The Owner acknowledges that the subject lands are part of an accepted Site Plan which was reviewed and processed under the Site Plan Approvals Process (File # SPA18-136) and that the Owner agrees that the development of this site under Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium shall comply with all final approved Site Plan conditions and approved engineering drawings for the current development application. Therefore, any conditions identified in the Development Agreement registered on title and any Private Permanent System(s) (PPS) that includes storm/drainage, Low Impact Development (LID) and SWM servicing works must be maintained and operated by the Owner in accordance with current applicable law.”

UTRCA – August 16, 2019

- No Objection

Appendix B – Additional Maps



 **COUNCIL APPROVED ZONING FOR THE SUBJECT SITE:**

1) **LEGEND FOR ZONING BY-LAW Z-1**

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1 - SINGLE DETACHED DWELLINGS R2 - SINGLE AND TWO UNIT DWELLINGS R3 - SINGLE TO FOUR UNIT DWELLINGS R4 - STREET TOWNHOUSE R5 - CLUSTER TOWNHOUSE R6 - CLUSTER HOUSING ALL FORMS R7 - SENIOR'S HOUSING R8 - MEDIUM DENSITY/LOW RISE APTS. R9 - MEDIUM TO HIGH DENSITY APTS. R10 - HIGH DENSITY APARTMENTS R11 - LODGING HOUSE
 DA - DOWNTOWN AREA RSA - REGIONAL SHOPPING AREA CSA - COMMUNITY SHOPPING AREA NSA - NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOPPING AREA BDC - BUSINESS DISTRICT COMMERCIAL AC - ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL HS - HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL RSC - RESTRICTED SERVICE COMMERCIAL CC - CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL SS - AUTOMOBILE SERVICE STATION ASA - ASSOCIATED SHOPPING AREA COMMERCIAL
 OR - OFFICE/RESIDENTIAL OC - OFFICE CONVERSION RO - RESTRICTED OFFICE OF - OFFICE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RF - REGIONAL FACILITY CF - COMMUNITY FACILITY NF - NEIGHBOURHOOD FACILITY HER - HERITAGE DC - DAY CARE
 OS - OPEN SPACE CR - COMMERCIAL RECREATION ER - ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
 OB - OFFICE BUSINESS PARK LI - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL GI - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL HI - HEAVY INDUSTRIAL EX - RESOURCE EXTRACTIVE UR - URBAN RESERVE
 AG - AGRICULTURAL AGC - AGRICULTURAL COMMERCIAL RRC - RURAL SETTLEMENT COMMERCIAL TGS - TEMPORARY GARDEN SUITE RT - RAIL TRANSPORTATION
 "H" - HOLDING SYMBOL "D" - DENSITY SYMBOL "H" - HEIGHT SYMBOL "B" - BONUS SYMBOL "T" - TEMPORARY USE SYMBOL |
|--|---|

CITY OF LONDON

PLANNING SERVICES / DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**ZONING
BY-LAW NO. Z-1
SCHEDULE A**



THIS MAP IS AN UNOFFICIAL EXTRACT FROM THE ZONING BY-LAW WITH ADDED NOTATIONS


FILE NO:


39CD-19510 MC

MAP PREPARED:

2019/09/18 RC



1:2,500






Legend	
	High Density Residential
	Medium Density Residential
	Low Density Residential
	Commercial
	Office
	Wonderland Road Community Enterprise Corridor
	Main Street Lambeth North
	Main Street Lambeth South
	Open Space
	Institutional
	Industrial
	Commercial Industrial
	Transitional Industrial
	Urban Reserve Community Growth
	Urban Reserve Industrial Growth
	Rural Settlement
	Urban Growth Boundary


<p>CITY OF LONDON Planning Services / Development Services</p> <p>SOUTHWEST AREA STUDY SECONDARY PLAN - LANDUSE -</p> <p>PREPARED BY: Graphics and Information Services</p>	<p>Scale 1:30,000</p> <p>Meters</p>	<p>FILE NUMBER: 39CD-19510</p>
		<p>PLANNER: MC</p> <p>TECHNICIAN: RC</p> <p>DATE: 2019/09/18</p>



CITY OF LONDON
 Department of
Planning and Development
 OFFICIAL PLAN SCHEDULE A
 - LANDUSE -
 PREPARED BY: Graphics and Information Services



FILE NUMBER: 39CD-19510
 PLANNER: MC
 TECHNICIAN: RC
 DATE: 2019/09/18




Legend

- | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Downtown | Future Community Growth | Environmental Review |
| Transit Village | Heavy Industrial | Farmland |
| Shopping Area | Light Industrial | Rural Neighbourhood |
| Rapid Transit Corridor | Future Industrial Growth | Waste Management Resource Recovery Area |
| Urban Corridor | Commercial Industrial | Urban Growth Boundary |
| Main Street | Institutional | |
| Neighbourhood | Green Space | |

This is an excerpt from the Planning Division's working consolidation of Map 1 - Place Types of the London Plan, with added notations.

At the time of the printing of this map, the Rapid Transit EA is in progress. This map shows the Rapid Transit Corridors and Urban Corridors to recognize potential alignments. These Place Types will be modified to align with the results of the EA process for the final version of The London Plan.

CITY OF LONDON
Planning Services /
Development Services
LONDON PLAN MAP 1
- PLACE TYPES -
PREPARED BY: Planning Services



File Number: 39CD-19510
Planner: MC
Technician: RC
Date: September 18, 2019

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium – 3400 Singleton Avenue 39CD-19510

- *(Councillor S. Turner indicating that on the location map, on the parcel, it shows a perhaps a water feature but he is not sure what that feature is as it is hard to see, you can see the shadowing on it.);* Mr. L. Pompilii, Manager, Development Planning, responding that there is no identified water feature on this site; what is depicted in the aerial is puddling water from the adjacent construction work which is typical in this area but there is no identified wetland within this block.); *(Councillor S. Turner advising that in the report on location map 1.6, on the parcel, recognizing that when he looks at the aerial it looks like it is construction overflow but in the parcel map itself it actually has a delineated contour to it, it looks a little odd so he was wondering, it seems odd in its context of where it is that there would be any feature and that is why he is seeking clarification on it.);* Mr. M. Pease, Manager, Development Planning, responding that there was a subsequent minor variance that was associated with this application and that was a matter that was brought up at that time as well, the Ecologist did weigh in and identified to staff that there was no ecological value, which is what Mr. L. Pompilii's point was, more standing water related to the long-term development; adding to that further because he sees more questioning, it was long-standing and these things can get picked up by cartography, by mapping over the course of time and he is not sure if that answers the question, it is a Legacy subdivision as well so these things do get picked up given the age of the subdivision; *(Councillor S. Turner thank you, that is a bit more helpful, it does seem strange if it was just remnant water that staff would map it so that it was picked up by cartography in some way; appreciates that.)*
- *(Councillor A. Hopkins reiterating what staff said about it being a long-standing development in this area as well, it has been going on for a number of years.)*
- Kyle McIntosh, on behalf of the applicant, Ram Developments – advising that, first of all, he just wanted to quickly answer the question about the water on site, too; indicating that this property was used as a big pile of topsoil for multiple years from the subdivision and he thinks that the water that you see in behind the north and east of that pile is just localized water that was blocked when the big pile of topsoil was put there, so that was just a localized area of water pooling from construction activities; stating that he would like to say that they have been working on this project for over a year now, it does comply with the London Official Plan and also the current Official Plan and also the Zoning By-law; pointing out that some of the comments related provided by the public were with regards to why is this not being used as a park or a school, the site has been zoned for Medium Density for quite some time, at least a year now, and it was previously, the School Board is not interested in taking this as a school which is why it has been switched to Medium Density so that zoning is already in place for this development and the development does comply to the zoning.

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Planning & Environment Committee

From: George Kotsifas, P. Eng
Managing Director, Development & Compliance Services &
Chief Building Official

Subject: Domus Developments (London) Inc.
200 Callaway Road

Public Participation Meeting on: October 21, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions **BE TAKEN** with respect to the application of 2682207 Ontario Limited / Domus Developments (London) Inc. relating to the property located at 200 Callaway Road:

- (a) The Planning & Environment Committee **REPORT TO** the Approval Authority the issues, if any, raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Site Plan Approval to permit the construction of a 4 storey, 60 unit apartment building; and
- (b) Council **ADVISE** the Approval Authority of any issues they may have with respect to the Site Plan Application, and whether Council supports the Site Plan Application.

Executive Summary

Summary of Request

The development for consideration is a four (4) storey, 60 unit apartment building on the northwest corner of Callaway Road and Royal Oaks Bend. The site is to be developed with municipal services and vehicular access from Callaway Road. The development proposal is subject to a public site plan meeting in accordance with the holding (h-5) zone regulations set out in the Zoning By-law.

Purpose and the Effect of Recommended Action

The purpose and effect of the recommendation is to report to the Approval Authority any issues or concerns raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for the Site Plan Approval.

Analysis

1.0 Site at a Glance

1.1 Property Description

The subject lands are located at the northwest corner of Callaway Road and Royal Oaks Bend. Callaway Road is classified as a Neighbourhood Connector in The London Plan and a Secondary Collector in the 1989 Official Plan. Royal Oaks Bend, in front of the subject property, is classified as a Neighbourhood Street in The London Plan, and as Local Street in the 1989 Official Plan. Currently the site is undeveloped with a variety of existing mature trees sparsely located on the northern portion of the property.

The land uses surrounding the subject lands are comprised of the following: to the west of the subject site is multi-family residential (street-townhouse) and open space/ storm water management pond, to the north is open space (Pebblecreek Park West), to the east is open space (Pebblecreek Park Central) and an undeveloped parcel that is split

designated as medium / high density residential, and south of the site is an existing open space (Village Commons).

1.2 Current Planning Information (See Appendix 'D')

- 1989 Official Plan Designation – Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential
- The London Plan Place Type – Neighbourhoods Place Type
- Existing Zoning – Residential R6, Residential R7, (h-5, h-99, h-100 R6-5(23) R7(11) with a maximum height of 15.0 metres

1.3 Site Characteristics

- Current Land Use – Undeveloped
- Frontage – 55.59 m (Royal Oaks Bend)
- Depth – 96.98 m (North East – South West)
- Area – 8,023.65 m²
- Shape – Irregular


1.4 Surrounding Land Uses







- North – Open Space (Pebblecreek Park West)
- East - Open space (Pebblecreek Park Central) / undeveloped parcel (MFMDR / MFHDR)
- South – Open Space (Village Commons)
- West – Low-rise Medium Density Residential / Open Space (SWMF – Pebblecreek Park – South)

1.5 Intensification

- The proposed apartment building is located beyond the identified limits of the Primary Transit Area, as identified in Figure 4.23 of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law.

1.6 Location Map



Location Map		Legend	
Subject Property:	200 Callaway Road		Subject Property
Applicant:	2682207 Ontario Ltd		Parks
File Number:	SPA19-086		Assessment Parcels
Created By:	Rob Carnegie		Buildings
Date:	9/17/2019		Address Numbers
Scale:	1:2000		
Corporation of the City of London			

2.0 Description of Proposal

2.1 Development Proposal

The development for consideration is a four (4) storey, 60 unit apartment building on the northwest corner of Callaway Road and Royal Oaks Bend. Due to site grading constraints, access to the proposed development is provided from Callaway Road, adjacent to an existing medium density street-townhouse development. Functionally, the driveway into the development provides a direct fire route access to the principle entrance of the apartment building, and to the surface parking area located to the rear of the development.

Ninety Four (94) surface parking spaces (including three (3) accessible spaces) are provided at grade. The parking area is well landscaped with tree planted islands, sod and planting to create a continuous, visual green screening from both interior / rear yards and the front / exterior side yard along Royal Oaks Bend and Callaway Road. The developer has also incorporated a low wall / wrought iron fence along the easterly side yard to provide additional visual screening of the surface parking lot from Royal Oaks Bend.

The apartment building is four storeys in height, and is comprised of a mix of materials to create visual interest. Materials include, aluminum eaves, fascia, and soffits; aluminum siding, railings, and guards with tempered glass; prefinished hardie board siding, stone veneer; and a prefinished metal roof. The main entrance is located at the south side of the building, fronting Callaway Road.

In keeping with The London Plan's objective to create pedestrian friendly streetscapes, the building setback is proposed at 1.5 m along Royal Oaks Bend and 3.0 m at the closest point along Callaway Road. The developer has also proposed ground level units that provide direct access to the City sidewalk. These proposed setbacks and forecourt areas strengthen the public realm by creating a positive pedestrian space and interactive street edge against the adjacent Village Commons Park. Additionally, the placement of the building in the south east corner of the site provides an increased buffer setback distance of 13.2 m to the neighbouring street townhouse development.

Detailed plans of the development are contained in Appendix 'A' of this report.

3.0 Relevant Background

3.1 Planning History

The subject lands are located in the City of London within the Sunningdale North Area Plan. Amendments to the Official Plan were approved in April 2005 to designate the area with various forms of Low Density Residential, Multi-Family Medium Density Residential, Multi-Family High Density Residential, Business District Commercial and Open Space. The Sunningdale North Area Plan also provided community planning and design principles to support the development of a distinctive, attractive and self-sustaining community. Design principles and policies for the subject lands are also contained in the 2006 Council approved Upper Richmond Village Urban Design Guidelines.

Zoning By-law Amendment Application (Z-6842)

At a Planning Committee meeting held on June 17, 2008, staff recommended that a draft plan of subdivision for the northwestern corner of Richmond Street and Sunningdale Road be approved. Staff also recommended that a Zoning By-law amendment, which sought to permit various forms of residential housing, open space, and a mix of commercial, retail office and institutional uses be approved. Special provisions included in the zoning were implemented to encourage an appropriate mix of land uses, lot coverage, densities, height, gross floor areas, reduced yard setbacks, among others.

The subject lands at 200 Callaway Road were re-zoned from Urban Reserve Zone (UR4) and Open Space Zone (OS5) to a Holding Residential R6 Special Provision /Residential R7 Special Provision (h-5 h-99 h-100 R6-5(23)/ R7(11)) Zone to permit various forms of cluster housing and apartment buildings at a minimum / maximum density of 35 units per hectare and a maximum height of 12 metres, as well as apartment buildings for senior citizens, universally accessible and emergency care establishments at a minimum density of 40 units per hectare to a maximum of 60 units per hectare, with a maximum height of 12.0 metres.

Zoning of the subject lands was passed by City Council on June 23, 2008 and the subdivision was draft approved on July 4, 2008. A revision to the draft plan was requested by the land owner subsequent to initial approval and was granted on June 13, 2011.

Zoning By-law Amendment Application (Z-8130)

A staff initiated Zoning By-law amendment for 200 and 275 Callaway Road, and 180 and 200 Village Walk Boulevard was heard at Planning and Environment Committee on February 26, 2013. The amendment, in keeping with the 1989 Official Plan, sought to change the R6 Special Provisions Zones R6-5(23); (R6-5(24); and R6-5(26) Zones by deleting the minimum / maximum density of 35 units per hectare and replacing it with a minimum density of 30 units per hectare, while also permitting a maximum density of 75 units per hectare. It also increased the maximum permissible building height to 15.0 metres as opposed to the existing 12.0 metre maximum. The proposed amendment was passed by City Council and came into force and effect on March 5, 2013.

Site Plan Control Application

In April 2019, Development Services received a request for site plan consultation for the subject property. Consultation identified the requirement for minor variances to meet specific aspects of the special provisions zone. The Owner subsequently applied for and received three minor variances from the Committee of Adjustment decision A.068/19 respecting an increase to the proposed exterior side yard setback, and reductions to the 3rd and 4th storey 1.0 metre step back requirements of the portion of the building facing the exterior side yard and front yards.

In August 2019, the subject application of this report, being a Site Plan Control Application (file SPA19-086) for a four (4) storey, 60 unit apartment building, was received by the City of London. Conditional approval was issued on September 16, 2019. A resubmission to address comments made as part of the City response to the application was provided on June 17, 2019. Comments have been provided at the time of this reports submission. Outstanding items are identified in Section 4 of this report.

3.3 Community Engagement (see more detail in Appendix B)

Notice of Application

On September 5, 2019 Notice of Application was posted in the Londoner, and circulated to residents within 120m of the subject lands

Notice of Public Meeting

On October 3, 2019 Notice of Public Meeting was posted in the Londoner, and circulated by regular mail to within 120m of the subject lands.

Comments

At the time of this report, 2 email comments were received. Comments received can be summarized as follows:

- Density – Concerns of over population of the area
- Fencing – Request for information regarding fencing of adjacent properties
- Parking – limited parking in the area for guests

Details with respect to the comments provided through circulation are found in Section 4 of this report.

3.4 Policy Context

Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS)

The PPS encourages intensification and redevelopment where it can be accommodated, which takes into account the existing building stock and the suitability of existing or planned infrastructure (1.1.3 PPS). The proposal will develop an undeveloped site that has full access to municipal services within a developing mixed use neighbourhood. Land use within settlement areas shall be based on densities that efficiently use land and resources, and are appropriate for and efficiently use the infrastructure and public service facilities that are planned or available and support active transportation ((1.1.3.2.a) & 1.4.3.d)). The proposal efficiently utilizes public services within a developing mixed use neighbourhood. Further, the proposed development will assist in achieving an established intensification target for built up areas, consistent with the goals of Municipal Council and in accordance with the PPS (1.1.3.5).

The proposed development is consistent with the policies of the PPS as it will facilitate the development of an undeveloped site within a settlement area. The proposed development introduces an efficient form of development within a mixed residential area, along an existing Neighbourhood Connector (Secondary Collector), proximate to transit. No new roads or infrastructure are required to service the site, therefore the development makes efficient use of existing services. As such, the recommended amendment is consistent with the policies of the PPS.

The London Plan

The subject site is located within the Neighbourhoods Place Type of The London Plan at the intersection of a Neighbourhood Connector (Callaway Road) and a Neighbourhood Street (Royal Oaks Bend).

The Our Strategy section of The London Plan establishes key directions to guide planning and development in our neighbourhoods. The developer's proposal seeks to achieve key directions by achieving cost-efficient growth patterns through planned subdivisions; promoting and developing affordable housing options to attract diverse populations to the city; and developing housing options within close proximity to employment lands. Additionally, the proposal seeks to build a mixed-use compact city by providing a development that achieves a compact, contiguous pattern of growth by developing inward and upward; and intensifying development within the Urban Growth Boundary to protect valuable agricultural lands.

Beyond the key directives, the Neighbourhoods Place Type seeks to create a strong neighbourhood character, sense of place and identity; creative attractive streetscapes, buildings, and public spaces; provide a diversity of housing choices; encourage well-connected neighbourhoods; provide opportunities for close employment lands; and locate close to parks, pathways, and recreational opportunities that strengthen community identity and serve as connectors and gathering spaces. The applicant's proposal achieves the above by providing a high level of design detail that directly faces the street, providing an alternative more affordable housing option in a development neighbourhood, increases density in close proximity to employment lands, providing direct access from ground floor units onto the city sidewalks, and location of the development adjacent to park lands.

Taking the above into consideration, the development is considered to be in conformity with The London Plan.

1989 Official Plan

The subject site is designated Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential in the 1989

Official Plan, which permits multiple-unit residential developments having a low-rise profile, with a maximum height of 4-storeys and a density of 75 units per hectare (3.3.3 i) and ii)). As such, the applicant's proposal for a 4-storey, 60 unit (75 units per hectare) apartment building is consistent with the intent of the 1989 Official Plan.

Z.-1 Zoning By-law

The subject lands are zoned Residential R6, Residential R7, (h-5, h-99, h-100 R6-5(23) R7(11)). For the purpose of this development, the R6 zone permits the proposed apartment building with a maximum height of 15.0 metres, a minimum density of 30 units per hectare and maximum density of 75 units per hectare. Setback, coverage, parking, and area regulations of the By-law are also being met. The proposed development meets the requirements of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law.

4.0 Key Issues and Considerations

4.1 Use

The use is contemplated in The London Plan and 1989 Official Plan. The Neighbourhoods Place Type strives for attractive streetscapes, buildings, and public spaces, to create strong neighbourhood character with a sense of identity, diversity in housing choices allowing for affordability and giving people opportunity to remain in neighbourhoods as they age, and to be safe, comfortable convenient and provide attractive alternatives for mobility, and parks, pathways, and recreational opportunities that strengthen the community serving as connectors and gathering spaces (*Policy 916_). The Site Plan Control application proposes a 60 residential unit apartment, which is located at the intersection of a Neighbourhood Connector (Callaway Road) and Neighbourhood Street (Royal Oaks Bend). Access to transit, pathways, and green spaces are available to the site.

4.2 Intensity

The Site Plan Control application proposes a 60 unit (75 units per hectare) apartment building, which is within the maximum permitted within the zoning for the lands (75 units per hectare). The intensity complies with the Zoning By-law and intensity allowed in The London Plan, and density of the 1989 Official Plan.

4.3 Form

Under the Neighbourhoods Place Type within The London Plan, new residential development should provide for frontage onto streets, and create both vibrant and recreational spaces (*Policy 919_ and 920_). Direct pedestrian access into the building and connection to City sidewalk are provided to address the policies of The London Plan. Additionally, Policy *259_ states that building should be sited with minimal setbacks from public rights-of-way and public spaces to create a street wall/edge and establish a sense of enclosure and comfortable pedestrian environment, which is achieved in the proposed building location.

4.4 Landscaping

The subject lands are located adjacent to a Tree Protection Area and public park, with limited existing trees on site. While there is not many trees on-site to maintain, the developer has exceeded their required tree and shrub planting ratios. The development proposes the removal of three (3) trees on-site. As part of the landscaping plan for the development, the applicant is proposing 93 trees throughout the site, in keeping with key direction 4 Policy 58_9 of The London Plan, which seeks to strengthen our urban forest by planting more and better maintain trees and woodlands. Along the westerly property line, 9 trees are proposed in various locations adjacent to the existing development to provide a visual buffer. Additionally, pollinator species are utilized to help achieve Policy 58_16 of The London Plan to establish London as a key pollinator sanctuary. The landscaping for the site meets the requirements of the Site Plan Control By-law.

4.5 Privacy and Fencing

Fencing for the site is provided along the westerly property line adjacent to the existing townhouses. The proposed fence is a 1.8m privacy fence to be installed in accordance with the Site Plan Control By-law. Through special provisions in the Development Agreement, Staff will require the privacy fence be maintained along all common property lines. The applicant has also provided a decorative 1.2 metre iron and stone fence along the exterior side yard and front yard. Details of this fence were provided on the second submission landscape drawings.

4.6 Garbage

In accordance with Site Plan Control By-law, the applicant is to provide an internal garbage and recycling storage room as the primary storage area. An external separate staging area is proposed along the easterly property line to accommodate for garbage pick-up. Garbage bins will be required to be returned to the internal storage area following collection.

4.7 Signage

Signage is not regulated by the Site Plan Control. Rather, the placement of signs is regulated by the Sign By-law, and administered by the Building Division. The sign By-law acknowledges aims to ensure that signage minimize impacts on nearby private and public property, avoid public health and safety hazard, and that they are compatible with their surroundings. These are achieved through a number of regulations including, size, placement location, quantity, and brightness.

4.8 Noise and Parking

Due to site grading considerations, the rear surface parking area is lower at the easterly property line adjacent to Royal Oaks Bend and matches grade to the westerly property boundary. Due to building location, the majority of the rear at grade parking area is located beyond the existing neighbouring townhouse development. Fencing, landscaping, and minimal grade changes to the west are anticipated to provide buffering and separation from the abutting residential areas.

Setback of the parking area, proposed at 3.9 metres at the westerly property boundary, 3.0 – 4.0 metres to the northern property boundary, and approximately 9.0 metres to the easterly boundary, exceed the requirements of the Site Plan Control By-law, where a minimum setback of 1.5m is required.

With respect to noise from mechanical equipment, rooftop mechanical is enclosed within a mechanical penthouse enclosure or are surrounded by rooftop parapets. Also noise attenuation measures through fencing and landscaping help to minimize noise pollution to neighbouring properties.

4.9 Lighting

The applicant submitted a photometric plan (lighting plan) as part of the first submission. The plans provided show that light infiltration on abutting westerly parcels is not occurring. Three light standards are located along the westerly edge of the parking area, adjacent to the rear and side yards of the abutting residential uses. The light fixtures proposed are downward facing and function in a manner which has limited light dispersion so as to reduce impact on abutting uses.

4.10 Outstanding Site Plan Comments

First submission site plan control comments were provided to the applicant on September 16, 2019. The applicant subsequently submitted revised drawings to staff on September 20, 2019. From that submission staff are advising the applicant that the following matters remain outstanding:

1. A section 28 permit is required from the Upper Thames River Conversation Authority (UTRCA) as the subject lands are regulated.
2. Outstanding site engineering matters related to storm water management.
3. Applicant requires Holding Zone provisions removal prior to site plan approval.
4. Applicant to enter into a Development Agreement prior to site plan approval.

5.0 Conclusion


The proposed Site Plan is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, has regard to The London Plan, and is in conformity with the City of London 1989 Official Plan. The application has been reviewed in accordance with the Z.-1 Zoning By-law, and, as proposed, complies with the regulations of the By-law. The proposed Site Plan and elevations will result in development that will not conflict with the character of the area, and is in compliance with the Site Plan Control By-law.

Prepared by:	Dan FitzGerald Site Development Planner, Development Services
Recommended by:	Paul Yeoman, RPP, PLE Director, Development Services
Submitted by:	George Kotsifas, P.Eng. Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official
The opinions contained herein are offered by a person or persons qualified to provide expert opinion. Further detail with respect to qualifications can be obtained from Development Services.	

October 11, 2019
DM/df

CC: Heather McNeely, Manager, Development Services (Site Plans)
Michael Pease, Manager, Development Planning

Elevations



Appendix B – Public Engagement

At the time of this report, staff received two email responses with respect to this application:

From:
To: [FitzGerald, Dan](#)
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] File # spa19-086 4 story 60 unit apartment complex at 200 Callaway Rd.
Date: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 4:02:45 PM

Mr. Fitzgerald as owner of 275 Callaway rd. unit #112, I am opposed to the change in the planning act. I believe the area should be kept as a townhouse configuration. The area will become far too populated and the apartment complex will reduce the value of all the townhouses in the area, which may well reduce the taxation amount available to the city of London. Traffic is already a consideration and parking for the townhouses is already limited for guests.

Mr. Eglinton as Property Manager, if others in the area are concerned, please add my name to that list.

From:
To: [FitzGerald, Dan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 200 Callaway road
Date: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:52:12 PM

Hi Dan,

I received some mailings today about 200 Callaway rd plans. I live at 242 just 2 doors down from the property.


Is there anyway I can get better quality pictures of the site plans? I want to see what kind of privacy fence is planned between the storm pond/ units adjacent to the storm and the new building property.

The drawings that were provided are way too blurry and lack detail, I can't make out what they say.


Thank you,
Andrew Coutts

Appendix C –The London Plan, Official Plan Map and Zoning excerpts

The London Plan




Official Plan Excerpt




Legend	
	Downtown
	Enclosed Regional Commercial Node
	New Format Regional Commercial Node
	Community Commercial Node
	Neighbourhood Commercial Node
	Main Street Commercial Corridor
	Auto-Oriented Commercial Corridor
	Multi-Family, High Density Residential
	Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential
	Low Density Residential
	Office Area
	Office/Residential
	Office Business Park
	General Industrial
	Light Industrial
	Regional Facility
	Community Facility
	Open Space
	Urban Reserve - Community Growth
	Urban Reserve - Industrial Growth
	Rural Settlement
	Environmental Review
	Agriculture
	Urban Growth Boundary

CITY OF LONDON
 Department of
 Planning and Development
 OFFICIAL PLAN SCHEDULE A
 - LANDUSE -
 PREPARED BY: Graphics and Information Services



FILE NUMBER: SPA19-086
 PLANNER: DF
 TECHNICIAN: DM
 DATE: 2019/10/01

Zoning Excerpt



COUNCIL APPROVED ZONING FOR THE SUBJECT SITE:

1) **LEGEND FOR ZONING BY-LAW Z-1**

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1 - SINGLE DETACHED DWELLINGS R2 - SINGLE AND TWO UNIT DWELLINGS R3 - SINGLE TO FOUR UNIT DWELLINGS R4 - STREET TOWNHOUSE R5 - CLUSTER TOWNHOUSE R6 - CLUSTER HOUSING ALL FORMS R7 - SENIOR'S HOUSING R8 - MEDIUM DENSITY/LOW RISE APTS. R9 - MEDIUM TO HIGH DENSITY APTS. R10 - HIGH DENSITY APARTMENTS R11 - LODGING HOUSE
 DA - DOWNTOWN AREA RSA - REGIONAL SHOPPING AREA CSA - COMMUNITY SHOPPING AREA NSA - NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOPPING AREA BDC - BUSINESS DISTRICT COMMERCIAL AC - ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL HS - HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL RSC - RESTRICTED SERVICE COMMERCIAL CC - CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL SS - AUTOMOBILE SERVICE STATION ASA - ASSOCIATED SHOPPING AREA COMMERCIAL
 OR - OFFICE/RESIDENTIAL OC - OFFICE CONVERSION RO - RESTRICTED OFFICE OF - OFFICE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RF - REGIONAL FACILITY CF - COMMUNITY FACILITY NF - NEIGHBOURHOOD FACILITY HER - HERITAGE DC - DAY CARE
 OS - OPEN SPACE CR - COMMERCIAL RECREATION ER - ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
 OB - OFFICE BUSINESS PARK LI - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL GI - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL HI - HEAVY INDUSTRIAL EX - RESOURCE EXTRACTIVE UR - URBAN RESERVE
 AG - AGRICULTURAL AGC - AGRICULTURAL COMMERCIAL RRC - RURAL SETTLEMENT COMMERCIAL TGS - TEMPORARY GARDEN SUITE RT - RAIL TRANSPORTATION
 "h" - HOLDING SYMBOL "d" - DENSITY SYMBOL "H" - HEIGHT SYMBOL "B" - BONUS SYMBOL "T" - TEMPORARY USE SYMBOL |
|--|---|

CITY OF LONDON

PLANNING SERVICES / DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**ZONING
BY-LAW NO. Z.-1
SCHEDULE A**



FILE NO:

SPA19-086 DF

MAP PREPARED:

2019/10/01 DM

1:3,000

0 15 30 60 90 120 Meters

THIS MAP IS AN UNOFFICIAL EXTRACT FROM THE ZONING BY-LAW WITH ADDED NOTATIONS

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 200 Callaway Road (SPA19-086)

- Barbara Rosser, Planner retained by 2682207 Ontario Limited and she has Michael Mesha and Tyler Fletcher here as well who are the applicants in this matter; advising that they have reviewed the planning report and certainly feel it is detailed and there is not a lot that she can add to it; reiterating the opinions that are expressed with regard to Provincial Policy Statement consistency, conformity with the London Plan and the 1989 Plan and conformity with the Zoning By-law and she would just add that in the summer of 2019 there was a variance application that was circulated to the neighbours and so there was some notification at that time that this was the proposed development; regarding the items that are noted as outstanding she would just indicate to the Committee that a permit was submitted on October 10 to the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority for permission so that is in process; as was noted, the only outstanding engineering matter relates to stormwater management and that is under review by staff; the holding zone application has been submitted in September and they believe that this site plan approval and execution of the DA is the final requirement for the holding zone removal; hoping that by the end of the week we may be able to execute the Development Agreement and submit the security; hoping that these recommendations will go forward, both from the Committee and Council.

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

**To: Chair and Members
Planning & Environment Committee**

**From: G. Kotsifas P. Eng.,
Managing Director, Development & Compliance Services and
Chief Building Official**

**Subject: Summit Properties Ltd.
676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West**

Public Participation Meeting on: October 21, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Summit Properties Ltd. relating to the property located at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West:

- (a) The proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "A" **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting on October 29, 2019 to amend the Official Plan by **ADDING** a policy to section 10.1.3 – Policies for Specific Areas to permit a total of 4,000m² of Office Space;
- (b) The proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "B" **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting on October 29, 2019 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in part (a) above, to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Residential R5/R7/R9/Restricted Office (R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30/RO2) Zone **TO** a Holding Residential R9 Bonus/Restricted Office Special Provision (R9-7*B(_)/RO2(_)) Zone;

The Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to provide for 3 apartment buildings at a maximum density of 262uph with the northerly apartment having a maximum height of 18-storeys. The development must substantively implement the site concept plan and elevations attached as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

- i) Exceptional Building Design

The building design shown in the various illustrations contained in Schedule "1" of the amending by-law is being bonused for features which serve to support the City's objectives of promoting a high standard of design.

- i. The inclusion of 6 podium townhouse units, along Beaverbrook Avenue providing a well-defined built edge and creating a positive public interface and human scale at street level;
 - ii. Well-defined principle entrances to all of the apartment buildings;
 - iii. Appropriate setbacks above the podium.
 - iv. A variety of building materials and building articulation to break up the massing of the building;
 - v. Purpose-designed amenity spaces on top of the 8-storey apartment building and parking structure;
- ii) 2 levels of underground parking
 - iii) Provision of Affordable Housing

- The provision of 20 “rent controlled” affordable housing units which will include 17 one-bedroom units and 3 two bedroom units with a minimum of 6 affordable units per apartment building. The affordable housing units shall be established by agreement at 90% of average market rent for a period of 20 years. An agreement shall be entered into with the Corporation of the City of London, to secure those units for this 20 year term and the term of the contribution agreement will begin upon the initial occupancy of the last subject bonused affordable unit on the subject site.
- (c) The proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "C" **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting on October 29, 2019 to amend The London Plan to **ADD** a Specific Policy for The Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor Place Types to permit a maximum height of 18-storeys;
 - (d) The request to amend the Official Plan to **ADD** a policy to section 10.1.3 – Policies for Specific Areas to permit a total of 4,500m² of Office Space **BE REFUSED** on the basis that the cumulative office gross floor area of this node will exceed 5,000m² which is inconsistent with the intent of the Office policies;
 - (e) The request to amend The London Plan to **ADD** a Specific Policy for The Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor Place Types to permit 5,500m² of Office Space **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:
 - i) The new policies of The London Plan have already increased the permissions for the amount of office space permitted within a development from 2000m² in the 1989 Official Plan to 5000m² when located within 100m of a transit station. It is considered premature to amend these policies which already increase the office space permissions before they have had an opportunity to be in force and effect.
 - ii) This potential increase could create a precedent for other transit stations creating the potential removal of office space from the downtown core.
 - (f) Pursuant to Section 34(17) of the Planning Act, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice **BE GIVEN** in respect of the proposed by-law as the change to the regulation for density:
 - i. Is minor in nature and
 - ii. Continues to implement the building design consistent with the development design circulated with the Notices of Application and Public Meeting.

Executive Summary

Summary of Request

The requested amendment is to permit a site-specific bonus zone to allow for a mixed-use building and 2 apartment buildings which will include a total of 417 residential units (235uph). The requested amendment will also permit additional office space up to a maximum of 4500m² gross floor area bringing the total density to 262uph.

Purpose and the Effect of Recommended Action

The recommended Official Plan and zoning amendment will permit an 18-storey (62 metres) mixed-use building (office/residential) with a total of 199 residential units and an additional 1,715m² of office space (2,777m² currently exists and is proposed to be retained). A 16-storey apartment building is proposed to contain 142 residential units which includes 6 townhouse units fronting Beaverbrook Ave. An apartment building with a height of 8-storeys is proposed containing 76 residential units with a rooftop amenity space. Parking for the proposed development will include 730 spaces within a new parking structure (mixed underground and above ground) and 42 spaces provided at grade outside of the structure. The bonus zone shall be implemented through a development agreement to facilitate the development of the requested apartment

building in return for the provision of affordable housing, 2 levels of underground parking and the construction of the high quality form of development illustrated in Schedule “1” of the amending by-law

Rationale of Recommended Action

1. The recommended amendment is consistent with the PPS 2014.
2. The recommended amendment is consistent with the in-force policies of The London Plan including, but not limited to, the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type policies and the '89 Official Plan policies.
3. The recommended amendment facilitates the development of an underutilized property and encourages an appropriate form of development.
4. The bonusing of the subject site ensures the building form and design will fit within the surrounding area while providing a high quality design standard.
5. The subject lands are located in a location where intensification can be accommodated given the existing municipal infrastructure, location on an arterial road and future rapid transit corridor along with the existing transit services in the area.
6. The proposed development includes the provision of affordable housing which will be mixed throughout the north apartment building.

Analysis

1.0 Site at a Glance

1.1 Property Description

The subject site is comprised of multiple lots. The lots fronting Beaverbrook Avenue are, or were previously used for single detached dwellings while the remaining portion of the site is currently used as office space and surface parking. To the east of the site is a large cemetery, west and south of the site are apartment uses and to the north is currently open space.

1.2 Current Planning Information (see more detail in Appendix D)

- Official Plan Designation – Multi Family, High Density Residential
- The London Plan Place Type – Rapid Transit Corridor/Neighbourhood Place Type
- Existing Zoning – R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30/RO2 Zone and R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30 Zone

1.3 Site Characteristics

- Current Land Use – Office/Single Detached dwellings
- Frontage – Oxford Street West (50.8m/166.7ft), and Beaverbrook Avenue (150.1m/492.5ft),
- Area – 1.77 ha (4.37 acres)
- Shape – Irregular

1.4 Surrounding Land Uses

- North – Draft Approved Subdivision/Open Space
- East – Cemetery
- South – Apartment Buildings/Townhomes
- West – Mid Rise Apartment buildings/Cemetery

1.5 Intensification (417 units)


- The proposed residential units represent intensification within the Built-area Boundary
- The proposed residential units are inside of the Primary Transit Area

1.6 Location Map



LOCATION MAP

Subject Site: 676-700 Beaverbrook Ave. & 356 Oxford St. E.
File Number: OZ-9041
Planner: Mike Corby
Created By: RC
Date: 09/30/2019



Corporation of the City of London
Prepared By: Planning and Development

Scale 1:1500

Legend

-  Subject Site
-  Buildings
-  Driveways/Parking Lots
-  Parking Lot Edges

2.0 Description of Proposal

2.1 Development Proposal

The proposal is for 1 mixed-use building and 2 apartment buildings which will include a total of 417 residential units (235uph). The mixed-use building (office/residential) will be 18-storeys (62 metres) in height with a total of 199 residential units and approximately 1,715m² of office space. A 16-storey apartment building is proposed to contain 140 residential units which includes 6 townhouse units fronting Beaverbrook Ave, and an apartment building with a height of 8-storeys in is proposed containing 76 residential units with a rooftop amenity space. Parking for the proposed development will include 730 spaces within a new parking structure (underground/above ground) and 42 spaces provided at grade outside of the structure with amenity space on top.

3.0 Relevant Background

3.1 Requested Amendment

The requested amendment is to add a Policies for Specific Areas under Chapter 10 of the 1989 Official Plan to permit a total of 4,500m² of Office Space (2,777m² existing and an additional 1,715m² proposed) where 2,000m² is currently permitted along with an amendment to The London Plan to add a Specific Policy for The Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor Place Types to permit an aggregate maximum total of 5,500m² of Office Space within 100m of a transit station. The policy would also permit a maximum height of 18-storeys where 16-storeys is the maximum height.

The requested amendment also includes a Zoning By-law amendment **FROM** a Residential R5/R7/R9/Restricted Office (R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30/RO2) Zone **TO** a Residential R9 Bonus/Restricted Office Special Provision (R9-7*B(_)/RO2(_)) Zone. The bonus zone would permit a maximum density of 262uph and maximum height of 62 metres in return for eligible facilities, services and matters outlined in Section 19.4.4 of the Official Plan. Other provisions such as setbacks and lot coverage are also considered as part of the bonus zone.

3.2 Community Engagement (see more detail in Appendix B)

Through the public circulation process two comments were received from abutting property owners who had concerns about the loss of privacy and potential noise and vibrations impacts during construction. The comments received by Staff are attached to Appendix "C".

3.3 Policy Context (see more detail in Appendix C)

Provincial Policy Statement, 2014

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2014 provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use and development. Section 1.1 Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns of the PPS encourages healthy, livable and safe communities which are sustained by accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential, employment and institutional uses to meet long-term needs. It also promotes cost-effective development patterns and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs. The PPS encourages settlement areas (1.1.3 Settlement Areas) to be the main focus of growth and development. Appropriate land use patterns within settlement areas are established by providing appropriate densities and mix of land uses that efficiently use land and resources along with the surrounding infrastructure, public service facilities and are also transit-supportive (1.1.3.2).

The policies of the PPS require municipalities to identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock [1.1.3.3] while promoting appropriate development standards which facilitate intensification, redevelopment and compact form [1.1.3.4] and promoting active transportation limiting the need for a vehicle to carry out daily activities [1.1.3.2, 1.6.7.4].

The PPS also promotes an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents (1.4 Housing). It directs planning authorities to permit and facilitate all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and wellbeing requirements of current and future residents, and direct the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs. It encourages densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, and the surrounding infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed.

In accordance with section 3 of the Planning Act, all planning decisions “shall be consistent with” the PPS.

The London Plan

The London Plan is the new Official Plan for the City of London (Council adopted, approved by the Ministry with modifications, and the majority of which is in force and effect). *The London Plan* policies under appeal to the *Local Planning Appeals Tribunal* (Appeal PL170100) and not in force and effect are indicated with an asterisk throughout this report. *The London Plan* policies under appeal are included in this report for informative purposes indicating the intent of City Council, but are not determinative for the purposes of this planning application.

The subject site is located in a Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type which permits a range of residential, retail, service, office, cultural, recreational, and institutional uses. Mixed-use buildings are encouraged while large floor plate, single use buildings will be discouraged. Where there is a mix of uses within an individual building, retail and service uses will be encouraged to front the street at grade (Permitted Uses, *837_). Rapid Transit Corridors require a minimum height of 2-storeys or 8m and permit a maximum height of 8-storeys. Through Type 2 bonusing up to 12 storeys in height can be achieved or when the property is located on a Rapid Transit Corridor. When a property is within 100m of rapid transit stations on a Rapid Transit Corridor 16-storeys can be achieved through Type 2 bonusing. Development within these Corridors will be sensitive to adjacent land uses and employ such methods as transitioning building heights or providing sufficient buffers to ensure compatibility. Lot assembly is encouraged to help create comprehensive developments and reduce vehicular accesses to the street and to allow for coordinated parking facilities. Lots will be of sufficient size and configuration to accommodate the proposed development and to help mitigate planning impacts on adjacent uses. The Zoning By-law will include regulations to ensure that the intensity of development is appropriate for individual sites (Intensity, *840_).

Similar to the 1989 Official Plan, all planning and development applications will conform with the City Design policies of *The London Plan*. Buildings should be sited close to the front lot line, and be of sufficient height, to create a strong street wall along Corridors and to create separation distance between new development and properties that are adjacent to the rear lot line. The mass of large buildings fronting the street should be broken down and articulated at grade so that they support a pleasant and interesting pedestrian environment. Large expanses of blank wall will not be permitted to front the street, and windows, entrances, and other building features that add interest and animation to the street will be encouraged. Development should be designed to implement transit-oriented design principles while buildings and the public realm will be designed to be pedestrian, cycling and transit-supportive through building orientation, location of entrances, clearly marked pedestrian pathways, widened sidewalks, cycling infrastructure and general site layout that reinforces pedestrian safety and easy navigation. On-street parking within Corridors is encouraged wherever possible while surface parking areas should be located in the rear and interior side yard (Form, *841)

1989 Official Plan

The Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation is intended to accommodate large-scale, multiple-unit forms of residential development which includes low-rise and high-rise apartment buildings (3.4.1. Permitted Uses). Within the Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation net residential densities will normally be 150 units per hectare (60 units per acre) or less outside of Central London (3.4.3. Scale of Development). The scale of development is also controlled through specific criteria generally applied to large areas designated MFHDR. The policies encourage a mixing of housing types, building heights and densities while providing for a transition in scale, diversity of housing forms and where possible locate the high-rise structures closest to activity nodes (shopping and employment centres) and points of high accessibility (arterial roads, transit service). Massive, at-grade or above-grade parking areas shall not dominate the site and all developments should conform to the urban design principles in Section 11.1.

The Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation identifies that Council, under the provisions of policy 19.4.4. and the Zoning By-law, may allow an increase in the density above the limit otherwise permitted by the Zoning By-law in return for the provision of certain public facilities, amenities or design features (3.4.3. Scale of Development, Density Bonusing).

4.0 Key Issues and Considerations

Through the circulation process no public concerns were expressed. The report below addresses the relevant planning policies and how they relate to the proposed application in detail.

4.1 Issue and Consideration # 1 - Use

Provincial Policy Station, 2014 (PPS)

The proposed development is in keeping with the PPS as it contributes to the range and mix of residential uses and promotes a cost-effective development pattern helping reduce servicing cost, land consumption and will develop multiple consolidated properties that can be considered underutilized as there is currently a single storey office building, surface parking, and 2 single detached dwellings on the property [1.1.1]. The proposed development is within a settlement area helping establish an appropriate land use pattern that contributes to the density and mix of land uses in the area. The development will both benefit and support the existing resources, surrounding infrastructure and public service facilities in the area (1.1.3 Settlement Areas). The subject site is located in close proximity to two community commercial nodes and a large auto oriented commercial corridor which provide convenient amenities, employment and shopping destinations to the area. The site is also considered to be transit supportive as it along a future rapid transit corridor and on an arterial road (Oxford St W) with frequent transit service. The subject site is also in close proximity to Wonderland Road North, which is another arterial road, providing multiple bus routes (1.1.3.2) contributing to a healthy, livable and safe community.

The PPS also promotes an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents (1.4 Housing). It directs planning authorities to permit and facilitate all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and wellbeing requirements of current and future residents, and direct the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs. The proposed development is in keeping with the PPS as it contributes to the existing mix of housing in the area and will provide 20 affordable housing units which are to be split between the three apartment buildings helping meet the social, health and wellbeing requirements of current and future residents. The development also takes advantage of the existing infrastructure and public service facilities that exist and will be available to support current and projected needs.

The London Plan

The subject site is located along a Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type and is within 100m of a transit station. The proposed apartment building and office uses are in keeping with the permitted uses of The London Plan. However, the proposed office space results in an aggregate GFA over 5000m² within 100m of the transit station which is not in keeping with the policies of The London Plan. Further analysis is provided in section 4.4. (Permitted Uses, *837_).

Official Plan

The proposed apartment use is considered a main permitted use within the requested MFHDR designation. Small scale office uses are also considered as integral and compatible land use with high density residential uses and are permitted as a secondary use (3.4.1. Permitted Uses, Secondary Permitted Uses iv).

4.2 Issue and Consideration # 2 - Intensity

Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS)

The PPS requires municipalities to identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock [1.1.3.3]. The proposed High Density Residential development is in an appropriate location currently designated for High Density uses and provides an ideal form of development to promote intensification. It is located along a future rapid transit corridor and arterial road, having access to existing bus routes, and nearby amenities. The surrounding building stock is predominately apartment buildings varying in scale which provide a similar built form and intensity as the proposed development. The proposed intensity of the development can be accommodated on the subject site and within the surrounding context with minimal impacts. The PPS also encourages densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, and the surrounding infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed [1.4.3(d)]. The proposed development meets the intent of this PPS policy.

The London Plan

Although The London Plan does not identify density limits within the policy framework, it does control how intense lands can develop through specific criteria. The proposed development is generally in keeping with the intensity policies of the Plan. One of the proposed apartment buildings is being recommended at a height of 18-storeys, whereas The London Plan contemplates a maximum height of 16-storeys for apartment buildings near transit stations. However, the relevant policies are still under appeal and are not the in-force policies that apply to this application. The proposed 18-storey apartment building contributes to the overall form of the development in the area which is considered appropriate within this transitional period between Official Plans.

The proposed office space within the development, combined with the existing office space, will result in an aggregate total of more than 5,000m² of GFA within 100m of a transit station which exceeds the permissions of The London Plan. This issue has been separated out and reviewed under section 4.4 of this report.

The proposed development is in keeping with the remainder of the Rapid Transit Corridor policies as it is sensitive to adjacent land uses through the use of townhomes along Beaverbrook Ave with a setback above the units to help create a compatible human scale along the street resulting in a comfortable pedestrian environment. The larger heights have been located in areas along the arterial roads/transit corridor where they will have the least amount of impact while the 8-storey apartment is located closer to the existing 3-storey and 7-storey apartment buildings to the west helping maintain compatibility with the abutting property.

The subject site is composed of an assembly of lots helping create a property of sufficient size and configuration which can accommodate the proposed use and allow for the creation of a comprehensive development while reducing the number of vehicular access points along Beaverbrook Avenue. The development also provides a coordinated parking facility through structured/underground parking in the rear of the development and surface parking which is internal to the site (Intensity, *840_).

Bonusing Provisions Policy *1652 outlines the framework and public facilities, services, or matters that can be provided in order to achieve the requested increases in height in keeping with the recommended bonusing provisions. Type 2 bonusing in The London Plan is currently under appeal however, the bonusing requirements and process is similar to that of the 1989 Official Plan. Further analysis has been provided through review of the bonusing criteria of the 1989 identified below.

1989 Official Plan

The MFHDR designation provides three ranges of net density within the City excluding provisions for bonusing. In the case of the subject site it is located outside of the Downtown and Central London and is therefore permitted a maximum density of 150 unit per hectare (3.4.3. Scale of Development). As previously indicated, the applicant has applied to increase the density above the permitted 150 uph to 262 uph through bonusing provisions. Density bonusing can be approved by Council, under the provisions of policy 19.4.4. and is a tool used to achieve enhanced development features, which result in a public benefit that cannot be obtained through the normal development process, in return for permitting increased heights and densities. The Planning Act provides legislation which allows municipalities to use bonusing provisions in their Official Plan in return for facilities, services, or matters, as are set out in the By-law. The proposed building form and design (discussed in Section 4.3- Form), the provision of 20 affordable housing units, and 2 levels of underground parking, all of which may not otherwise be implemented through the normal development approvals process, allow the proposed development to qualify for Bonus Zoning in conformity to the policies of the Official Plan. These bonusable features are outlined in the Staff recommendation.

In order to implement the identified items for bonus zoning, section 19.4.4 iv) of the Official Plan states that:

“As a condition to the application of bonus zoning provisions to a proposed development, the owner of the subject land will be required to enter into an agreement with the City, to be registered against the title to the land. The agreement will deal with the facilities, services, or matters that are to be provided, the timing of their provision, and the height or density bonus to be given.”

Bonus zoning is implemented through a development agreement with the City that is registered on title to the lands. The development agreement is intended to “lock in” the design features and other public benefits that will be incorporated into the form of development to merit the additional height and density. Through the site plan approval process, the proposed development will be reviewed to ensure that all facilities, services and matters that have warranted bonus zoning have been incorporated into the development agreement. These design features are highlighted in the recommendation and the amending by-law which attaches the illustrations as Schedule “1”.

4.3 Issue and Consideration # 3 - Form

Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS)

The proposed development is in keeping with the PPS as it provides an opportunity for intensification at an appropriate location taking into account the existing building stock in the area. The proposed development has considered the surrounding building stock by positioning its tallest portions at appropriate locations on the site where impacts on the surrounding buildings will be reduced. The proposal has been reviewed by the Urban

Design Peer Review Panel and City Staff to ensure that an appropriate development standard is established to help implement the intensification of the subject site. The building's design and location help promote active transportation as they provide the ability for pedestrian and bicycles to access the nearby facilities helping limit the need for a vehicle to carry out daily activities in conformity with the goals of the PPS [1.1.3.2, 1.6.7.4].

The London Plan

The London Plan requires that all planning and development applications conform to the City Design policies and the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type policies provide specific form policies. The proposed development is in keeping with these policies as the building is sited near the front lot line along Beaverbrook Ave and provides a podium height that creates a strong street wall along this portion of the property. The use of townhome style units along Beaverbrook Ave contribute to the pedestrian environment and reduce the scale of the 16-storey apartment along the street. The overall development uses stepbacks and a variety of different materials and articulation to help reduce the overall massing of the buildings and create a pleasant and interesting pedestrian environment throughout the development while reducing large expanses of blank wall along the street and internal to the site. Although no on-street parking is provided at this location, the development is able to provide surface parking internally and in underground/structured parking in keeping with the Form Policies of the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type. The subject site also provides the ability to have convenient pedestrian access to the future transit station at Beaverbrook Avenue and Oxford Street East. These connections will be reviewed in further detail during the site plan stage (Form, *841).




Aerial View Looking Southeast

1989 Official Plan


The proposed form of development has made a strong effort to maintain a scale and rhythm that responds to the surrounding land uses. The development's ability to provide for a continuous active street wall along the Beaverbrook Avenue frontage, with either street facing townhouse units or office space occupying the street frontage within the building podium provide a positive interface for pedestrians. The buildings provide a unique design variation while providing for appropriate scale/ rhythm/ materials/ fenestration. The use of appropriate stepbacks for the tower portions of the buildings provide for an appropriate human scale along the Beaverbrook Avenue frontage and create appropriate separation between the abutting properties. The main pedestrian access points for the buildings use a high level of windows and glazing helping create a prominent entrance feature clearly identifying the main entrance to the buildings. The

development also positions the height and massing at appropriate locations where the impacts of the height will be limited on the abutting properties.

The Official Plan also ensures that all developments conform to the Urban Design principles in Section 11.1. As part of a complete application the applicant provided an Urban Design Brief and attended the Urban Design Peer Review Panel to identify how the above-mentioned policies have been achieved through the building design and form. The proposed development was well received by Staff and the Urban Design Peer Review Panel. Staff had limited concerns with the initial submission and suggested that two additional townhome units be provided along Beaverbrook Avenue as well as extending the northerly podium further east towards Beaverbrook to help improve the interface along Beaverbrook Ave. The applicant was successful in meeting these two requests improving the overall development along Beaverbrook Avenue.



Original Site Layout with 4 townhouse units and turnaround



Revised Site Layout with 6 townhouse



Aerial View along Beaverbrook Ave (Illustrates additional townhouse units and the building extension towards Beaverbrook Ave to better address the street).

The Panel provided some additional comments for consideration in working through the site design. The applicant addressed some of these items as they were able to eliminate the driveway configuration that was located on the east side of the northerly tower between the building and Beaverbrook Ave resulting in safer and improved pedestrian connections, reduce conflicts and awkward vehicular movements. Staff and the applicant reviewed the organization of the height in regards to switching 8 and 16-storey towers. After reviewing the shadow study and confirming that a substantial setback is provided above the townhouse units along Beaverbrook Ave, Staff is of the opinion that the original configuration is most appropriate and helps limit impacts on the property to the west. Staff are supportive of the overall design and changes made by the applicant and believe it is in keeping with the Urban Design principles in Section 11.1

More information and detail is available in Appendix B and C of this report.

4.4 Issue and Consideration # 4 – Office Area

As previously mentioned, The London Plan permits a maximum aggregate GFA of 5,000m² within 100m of a transit station. The requested amendment was for an Official Plan amendment to The London Plan to allow for a maximum aggregate GFA of 5,500m² within 100m of a transit station to facilitate development of the new office space in addition to the existing office space on the subject site and neighbouring property. Maintaining the GFA caps on office development outside of downtown has been a core principle of both Official Plans. The available permissions of 5,000m² is a sufficient amount of office space for the area which will be consolidated at this corner of the Transit Station area.

The application also requested an Official Plan amendment to the 1989 Official Plan to permit approximately 4,500m² of Office on the subject site where only 2,000m² is permitted. This amendment was required in order to mirror the requested amendment in The London Plan and permit the total amount of office space that would be on the subject site. Staff is recommending that the request to exceed the 5,000m² of office GFA identified in The London Plan (for the broader transit area) be refused and are therefore recommending refusing the companion request to permit 4,500m² on the subject site which, when combined with the neighbouring office property, will exceed 5,000m² in the broader transit area. However, Staff is recommending that a Specific

Area Policy to permit a total of 4,000m² of office GFA be approved for the subject site which will meet the future office gross floor area policies of the London Plan.

Through the current 1989 Official Plan, Council has the ability to apply Specific Area policies like the one mentioned above. The adoption of Policies for Specific Areas may be considered where the change in land use is site specific and is located in an area where Council wishes to maintain existing land use designations, while allowing for a site specific use.

Recognizing that offices are a permitted use at a maximum aggregate GFA of 5,000m² within 100m of a transit station through the policies of The London Plan, the recommended amendment to the 1989 Official Plan to apply a Specific Area Policy to permit 4,000m² on the subject site is appropriate as it would be site-specific and recognize that the current policy regulations do not accurately reflect the intent of Council with respect to the future use of the land. The recommended office space would be permitted in the future policy context outlined in The London Plan and the recommended Specific Area Policy is appropriate to facilitate this use until the future policies are in-force and effect.

Therefore, it is recommended that the request to amend The London Plan and Official Plan to permit Office GFA in excess of 5,000m² be refused and an alternative recommendation be introduced which would permit a GFA for office uses at the maximum permissions of the London Plan at a total GFA of 5,000m².

More information and detail is available in Appendix B and C of this report.

5.0 Conclusion

The recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and conforms to the 1989 Official Plan policies and the in-force policies of The London Plan including the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type policies. The proposal facilitates the development of an underutilized property and encourages an appropriate form of development. The bonusing of the subject site ensures the building form and design will fit within the surrounding area while providing a high quality design standard. The subject lands are situated in a location where intensification can be accommodated given the existing municipal infrastructure, the nearby arterial streets, existing public transit, and large open space corridor with passive recreational trails in the area. The proposed development also includes the provision of affordable housing which will be mixed throughout the development.

Prepared by:	Mike Corby, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner, Development Services
Recommended by:	Paul Yeoman, RPP, PLE Director, Development Services
Submitted by:	George Kotsifas, P.ENG Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and Chief building Official
Note: The opinions contained herein are offered by a person or persons qualified to provide expert opinion. Further detail with respect to qualifications can be obtained from Development Services.	

September 26, 2019

cc: Michael Tomazincic, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Current Planning

\\FILE1\users-x\pdda\Shared\DEVELOPMENT SERVICES\11 - Current Planning\DEVELOPMENT APPS\2019 Applications 9002 to\9041OZ - 676-700 Beaverbrook Ave and 356 Oxford St W (MC)\PEC Report\PEC-Report-Template-AODA-DS-Mar2019.docx

Appendix A

Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)
2019

By-law No. C.P.-1284-

A by-law to amend the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 relating to 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West.

The Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. Amendment No. (to be inserted by Clerk's Office) to the Official Plan for the City of London Planning Area – 1989, as contained in the text attached hereto and forming part of this by-law, is adopted.
2. This by-law shall come into effect in accordance with subsection 17(27) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13*.

PASSED in Open Council on October 29, 2019

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading – October 29, 2019
Second Reading – October 29, 2019
Third Reading – October 29, 2019

AMENDMENT NO.
to the
OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE CITY OF LONDON

A. PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT

The purpose of this Amendment is to add a policy in Section 10.1.3 of the Official Plan for the City of London to permit a maximum gross floor area of 4000m² for office uses.

B. LOCATION OF THIS AMENDMENT

This Amendment applies to lands located at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West in the City of London.

C. BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The recommended amendment is consistent with Policies for Specific Areas of the Official Plan and the Rapid Transit Corridor policies of The London Plan. The recommendation provides for the comprehensive development of the subject site resulting in an appropriate and compatible use and form of development.


D. THE AMENDMENT

The Official Plan for the City of London is hereby amended as follows:

1. Section 10.1.3 – Policies for Specific Areas of the Official Plan for the City of London is amended by adding the following:

676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West

In the Multi-Family, High Density Residential Density designation at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West in addition to the uses permitted in the Multi-Family, High Density Residential Density, a total gross floor area of 4,000m² of office space may be permitted.



Appendix B

Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)
2019

By-law No. Z.-1-19_____

A by-law to amend By-law No. Z.-1 to rezone an area of land located at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West .

WHEREAS Summit Properties Ltd. has applied to rezone an area of land located at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West, as shown on the map attached to this by-law, as set out below;

AND WHEREAS upon approval of Official Plan Amendment Number (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office) this rezoning will conform to the Official Plan;

THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

- 1) Schedule "A" to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by changing the zoning applicable to lands located at 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West, as shown on the attached map comprising part of Key Map No. A.106, from a Residential R5/R7/R9/Restricted Office (R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30/RO2) Zone to a Holding Residential R9 Bonus/Restricted Office Special Provision (R9-7*B(_)/RO2(_)) Zone.
- 2) Section Number 4.3 of the General Provisions in By-law. No. Z-1 is amended by adding the following Special Provision:

4.3) B(_) 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West

The Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to provide for 3 apartment buildings at a maximum density of 262uph with the northerly apartment having a maximum height of 18-storeys, the easterly building having a maximum height of 16-storeys, and the westerly building having a maximum height of 8-storeys. The development must substantively implement the site concept plan and elevations attached as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

- i) Provision of Affordable Housing

The provision of 20 affordable housing units which will include 17 one-bedroom units and 3 two bedroom units with a minimum of 6 affordable units per apartment building. The affordable housing units shall be established by agreement at 90% of average market rent for a period of 20 years. An agreement shall be entered into with the Corporation of the City of London to secure those units for this 20 year term and the term of the contribution agreement will begin upon the initial occupancy of the last subject bonused affordable unit on the subject site.

- ii) 2 levels of underground parking

The following special regulations apply within the bonus zone upon the execution and registration of the required development agreement(s):

- a) Regulation[s]
- i) Height (maximum) 62 metres (203.4ft)
 - ii) Density (maximum) 262uph (106upa)
 - iii) Interior Side Yard (Floors 1-2) (minimum) 3.46 metres (11.35ft)
 - iv) Interior Side Yard (floors 3-8) (minimum) 6.0 metres (19.68ft)
 - v) Exterior Side Yard (floors 1-3) (minimum) 0 metres (0ft)
 - vi) Exterior Side Yard (floors 4-18) (minimum) 8.0 metres (26.25ft)
 - vii) Rear Yard (Floors 1-2) (minimum) 4.0 metres (13.12ft)
 - viii) Rear Yard (Floors 1-8) (minimum) 3.2 metres (10.5ft)
 - ix) Rear Yard (Floors 9-16) (minimum) 11.0 metres (36.10ft)
 - x) Lot Coverage (maximum) 74%
 - xi) Setbacks for existing developments shall be recognized as existing on the date of passing of this By-law.
- 3) Section Number 12 of the Residential R8 Zone is amended by adding the following Special Provision:
- 12.4) RO2() 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West
- a) Regulation[s]
- i) Office Gross Floor Area (maximum). 4000m² (43,056 sqft)

The inclusion in this By-law of imperial measure along with metric measure is for the purpose of convenience only and the metric measure governs in case of any discrepancy between the two measures.

This By-law shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with Section 34 of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P13*, either upon the date of the passage of this by-law or as otherwise provided by the said section.


PASSED in Open Council on October 29, 2019.

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading – October 29, 2019
Second Reading – October 29, 2019
Third Reading – October 29, 2019


AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE "A" (BY-LAW NO. Z.-1)



File Number: OZ-9041
Planner: MC
Date Prepared: 2019/10/10
Technician: DM
By-Law No: Z.-1-

SUBJECT SITE 

1:1,500

0 5 10 20 30 40
 Meters




Schedule "1"



356 OXFORD STREET
East Elevation

EAST + WEST TOWERS

Schedule "1"



Schedule "1"

356 OXFORD STREET
North Elevation

EAST + WEST TOWERS



Schedule "1"



356 OXFORD STREET
South Elevation

EAST + WEST TOWERS

Schedule "1"

356 OXFORD STREET
East Elevation

NORTH TOWER



Schedule "1"



Schedule "1"




Schedule "1"



356 OXFORD STREET
South Elevation

NORTH TOWER

Schedule "1"



Appendix B – Public Engagement

Community Engagement

Public liaison: On April 10, 2019, Notice of Application was sent to 42 property owners in the surrounding area. Notice of Application was also published in the *Public Notices and Bidding Opportunities* section of *The Londoner* on April 11, 2019. A “Planning Application” sign was also posted on the site.

2 replies were received

Nature of Liaison: The purpose and effect of this Official Plan and zoning change is to permit a new development which consists of 1 mixed-use building and 2 apartment buildings which will include a total of 415 residential units (235uph). The mixed-use building (office/residential) will be 18-storeys (62 metres) in height with a total of 199 residential units and approximately 1,715m² of office space. A 16-storey apartment building is proposed to contain 140 residential units which includes 4 townhouse units fronting Beaverbrook Ave. An apartment building with a height of 8-storeys in is proposed containing 76 residential units with a rooftop amenity space. Parking for the proposed development will include 730 spaces within a new parking structure (underground/above ground) and 42 spaces provided at grade outside of the structure. Possible amendment to the Official Plan to add a site specific policy under Chapter 10 of the Official Plan to permit a total of 5,000m² of Office Space (2,777m² existing and an additional 1,715m² proposed) where 2,000m² is currently permitted.

Possible amendment to the London Plan to **ADD** a Specific Policy for The Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor Place Types to permit an aggregate maximum total of 5,500m² of Office Space within 100m² of a transit station. The policy would also permit a maximum height of 18-storeys where 16-storeys is the maximum height.

Possible change to Zoning By-law Z.-1 **FROM** a Residential R5/R7/R9/Restricted Office (R5-5/R7*D150*H30/R9-7*H30/RO2) Zone **TO** a Residential R9 Bonus/Restricted Office Special Provision (R9-7*B(_)/RO2(_)) Zone. The bonus zone would permit a residential density of 235uph and maximum height of 62 metres in return for eligible facilities, services and matters outlined in Section 19.4.4 of the Official Plan. Other provisions such as setbacks and lot coverage may also be considered through the re-zoning process as part of the bonus zone. **Responses:** A summary of the various comments received include the following:

Concern for:

- Loss of privacy
- Potential construction impacts on abutting buildings

Responses to Public Liaison Letter and Publication in “The Londoner”

Written
ERNEST NG, MCIP, RPP Development Manager 11 Church Street, Suite 401, Toronto, Ontario M5E 1W1
Rick ten Haaf 350 Oxford Street W, Suite 102 London, Ontario

Agency/Departmental Comments

London Hydro – April 23, 2019

London Hydro has no objection to this proposal or possible official plan and/or zoning amendment. Any new or relocation of the existing service will be at the expense of the owner.

Upper Thames River Conservation Authority – May 1, 2019

The UTRCA has no objections to this application. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Development Services – Engineering – August 7, 2019

The City of London's Environmental and Engineering Services Department offers the following comments with respect to the aforementioned Application:

- Transportation will be requesting a holding provision for an updated Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA), and for the implementation of any recommendations of an accepted TIA
 - The conclusions need to reflect the required external works to support safe and efficient access to the site
 - Please provide a diagram or figure illustrating the trip distribution being used and reference in the appendix the traffic count or other source used for the distribution conclusion
 - Please provide a table showing delay/los/queue for each individual movement for the given intersection analysis
 - The analysis should be undertaken acknowledging only two access will be permitted to Beaverbrook Avenue (northerly access to be closed, access to Oxford restricted to right in/ right out)
 - Sight line analysis should be conducted using a design speed of 70km/h on Oxford Street West and a design speed of 60km/h on Beaverbrook as the posted is 60km/h on Oxford and 50km/h on Beaverbrook this is in keeping with the City's Design Specifications and Requirements Manual

The following items are to be considered during the development application approval stage:

Water

- All existing water services cannot be reused and will need to be decommissioned.
- Additional water related comments will be provided upon future review of this site.

Transportation

- Road widening dedication of 24.0m from centre line required on Oxford Street West
- Road widening dedication of 10.75m from centre line required on Beaverbrook Avenue
- Access to Oxford Street West will be restricted to right in/ right out via a median in accordance with City standards
- The northerly access to Beaverbrook will not be permitted and will need to be closed and restored to City standards
- Left turn lanes will be required to support access to the two southerly access to Beaverbrook Avenue.
- Oxford Street West is a proposed Rapid Transit Corridor and the council-approved Environmental Project Report (EPR) engineering drawings can be found at the City of London BRT website at: <https://www.londonbrt.ca/epr/> (refer to Appendix A: West Corridor, page 5 of 17 or attached);

- With the implementation of center-running transit lanes on Oxford Street West, a raised median will be constructed. Therefore, turning movements will be restricted to right in/ right out at the driveway entrance to 356 Oxford Street West; and
- There is a BRT station proposed at the intersection of Beaverbrook Avenue and Oxford Street West.

Stormwater

- As per plan # 2401, only the municipal 356 Oxford Street West was provided with a 6" connection to the existing 600mm storm sewer on Oxford Street West. Changes in catchment area size or C value or both will trigger the need for on-site SWM controls. The design of on-site SWM controls shall be provided as part of a required SWM Servicing Report and shall include but not be limited to flow restrictor sizing, required storage volume calculations, etc., all in accordance with the approved City Standard Design Requirements for Permanent Private Stormwater System (PPS) which include LID alternatives.
- Depending on the condition of the existing 6" PDC or the need to service the site from Beaverbrook Ave, the existing 525mm storm stub on Beaverbrook Ave will need to be extended to the south limit of the site (i.e. South limit of the current 676 Beaverbrook Ave).
- For the proposed 42 surface parking spaces, the owner shall be required to have a consulting Professional Engineer addressing the water quality to the standards of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Applicable options could include, but not be limited to the use of oil/grit separators, catchbasin hoods, bioswales, etc. along with the required inspection/sampling maintenance hole.
- Any proposed LID solution should be supported by a Geotechnical Report and/or hydrogeological investigations prepared with focus on the type of soil, its infiltration rate, hydraulic conductivity (under field saturated conditions), and seasonal high ground water elevation.
- Additional SWM related comments will be provided upon future review of this site.
- The subject lands are located in the Medway Creek Subwatershed. The Owner shall provide a Storm/Drainage Servicing Report demonstrating compliance with the SWM criteria and environmental targets identified in the Medway Creek Stanton Drain and Mud Creek Subwatershed Study that may include but not be limited to, quantity/quality control, erosion, stream morphology, etc.
- The Owner agrees to promote the implementation of SWM Best Management Practices (BMP's) within the plan, including Low Impact Development (LID) where possible, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- The owner is required to provide a lot grading plan for stormwater flows and major overland flows on site and ensure that stormwater flows are self-contained on site, up to the 100 year event and safely conveys up to the 250 year storm event, all to be designed by a Professional Engineer for review.
- The Owner shall allow for conveyance of overland flows from external drainage areas that naturally drain by topography through the subject lands.
- Stormwater run-off from the subject lands shall not cause any adverse effects to adjacent or downstream lands.
- An erosion/sediment control plan is required to identify all erosion and sediment control measures for the subject site and that will be in accordance with City of London and MECP (formerly MOECC) standards and requirements, all to the specification and satisfaction of the City Engineer. This plan is to include measures to be used during all phases of construction. These measures shall be identified in the Storm/Drainage Servicing Report.

Wastewater

- The outlet for the site is the 250mm sanitary sewer on Oxford Street West.

Housing Development Corporation - October 9, 2019

In modification to the letter from HDC to the City of London Development Services, I am noting the following agreed upon amendments to the recommended affordable housing bonus zone conditions:

1. *The revised number of affordable units shall be modified to twenty (20) units in total (from the previously noted 22) consisting of:*
 - i) *17 one-bedroom units; and*
 - ii) *3 two-bedroom units.*

2. *We agree to a greater distribution of the units between the 3 buildings as noted in your email, understanding that:*
 - i) *As in all cases, the term of the contribution agreement begins upon the initial occupancy of the last subject bonused affordable unit on the subject site – regardless of the building;*
 - ii) *Any reallocation of the affordable units between buildings must be retained on the subject property, and must adhere to all other original provisions including that there is no concentration of the subject affordable units so that no single building or building area (floor or location) is perceived or defined as hosting the subject bonus unit; and*
 - iii) *Any relocation of the affordable units between buildings cannot disrupt a sitting tenant, their established rent, or other rights.*

3. *All other parameters will be maintained as per our letter of recommendation, including:*
 - i) *the agreement will remain as the defined 20 year term starting upon occupancy of the last (20th) affordable unit; and*
 - ii) *all units will be at 90% of the Average Market rents as defined within the letter of recommendation.*

By copy to Michael Tomazincic, these modifications will be provided by Civic Administration within or as an addendum to their report to the Planning and Environment Committee of Municipal Council and these and the other originally established criteria will be confirmed within an agreement and associated encumbrance on title to secure the affordable housing bonus zone provisions, subject to the will and decisions of Council.

Appendix C – Policy Context

The following policy and regulatory documents were considered in their entirety as part of the evaluation of this requested land use change. The most relevant policies, by-laws, and legislation are identified as follows:

Provincial Policy Statement, 2014

- Section 1.1 Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns
- 1.1.3 Settlement Areas
- 1.1.3.2
- 1.1.3.3
- 1.1.3.4
- 1.6.7.4
- 1.4 Housing

In accordance with section 3 of the Planning Act, all planning decisions 'shall be consistent with' the PPS.

City of London Official Plan

3.4. Multi-Family, High Density Residential

3.4.1. Permitted Uses
3.4.2 Location
3.4.3. Scale of Development

11.1. Urban Design Policies

19.4.4. Bonus Zoning

The London Plan


Rapid Transit and Urban Corridor
Permitted Uses (837)
Intensity (840)
Form (841)
Bonusing Provisions (1652)



Z.-1 Zoning By-law

Site Plan Control Area By-law


Appendix D – Relevant Background

Additional Maps





CITY OF LONDON
 Department of
 Planning and Development
 OFFICIAL PLAN SCHEDULE A
 - LANDUSE -
 PREPARED BY: Graphics and Information Services



FILE NUMBER: OZ-9041
 PLANNER: MC
 TECHNICIAN: RC
 DATE: 2019/09/30

Appendix E – Urban Design Peer Review Panel Comments/Response

The Panel provides the following feedback on the submission to be addressed through the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendment application:

The Panel commends the applicant on the explanation of the design approach within the urban design brief and is supportive of a number of design elements expressed in the brief including:

- The rooftop amenity areas
- Street townhouses adjacent to Beaverbrook Avenue
- The variation in building design, while remaining tied to a design theme
- Building footprints
- The mix of uses

The Panel recommends the following:

- At the site plan stage, incorporate strong pedestrian connections between the buildings and Beaverbrook Avenue.
- Street presence and clear pedestrian connections, particularly to rear building, should be considered to add prominence to the lobbies.

From a CPTED perspective, consider in the design how residents of the third tower will navigate/access the amenity areas.

- The proponent and staff should evaluate the west side yard setback to confirm its appropriateness if future redevelopment occurs on the adjacent parcel.
- The lower level interface with existing office should be further explored also considering future redevelopment opportunities. Plan for redevelopment possibilities at the north end of the property, from a massing perspective at minimum.
- Consolidate two of the driveways along Beaverbrook Avenue to improve pedestrian connections, reduce conflicts and awkward vehicular movements.
- Organization of height – explore additional variation in height across the whole site. Consider switching 8 and 16 storey towers such that the proportion of the 8 storey relates better to the street. Evaluate shadow impacts through this analysis. A stepback from Beaverbrook would also be beneficial in addressing human scale along the street.
- Break down middle portion of façade to reduce the appearance of the length.
- Wind analysis will be important through detailed design.
- Consider screening/interface of the façade along the parking garage ramp to enhance the pedestrian experience.
- Review the townhouse aspect of the project along Beaverbrook Avenue to further consider the bay structure and its integration with the podium.
- The relationship of balconies to the overall mass of the building should be further explored through detailed design.

Concluding comments:

The Panel supports the overall design concept with the integration of the design recommendations noted above.

Applicants Response to the UDPRP Comments – August 27, 2019

The enclosed materials were previously revised to address comments received from the Urban Design Peer Review Panel, and additional changes have been made in response to comments received from City Staff. The following is a list of comments received from the UDPRP and staff and how the revised materials address them, or our response to the comment:

- *At the site plan stage, incorporate strong pedestrian connections between the buildings and Beaverbrook Avenue.*
- *Street presence and clear pedestrian connections, particularly to the rear building, should be considered to add prominence to the lobbies.*

The existing office along Beaverbrook Avenue has a proposed forecourt connecting the public sidewalk with the existing entrance. The proposed townhouses along Beaverbrook Avenue have direct sidewalk access from the proposed units to the public sidewalk. Additional sidewalk connections from the main entrances of the proposed apartment building also connect out to Beaverbrook Avenue.

- *From a CPTED perspective, consider in the design how residents of the third tower will navigate/access the amenity areas.*

Pedestrian crossovers will clearly mark the pedestrian connections for residents from the third tower to the amenity features contained within and on top of the parking podium, and roof top amenity areas. Further details can be explored at the Site Plan Approval stage.

- *The proponent and staff should evaluate the west side yard setback to confirm its appropriateness if future redevelopment occurs on the adjacent parcel.*

The proposed setback is 6.0m, whereas 9.6 is required. Given the angular footprint of the proposed building the building sets back to 8.5 m for most of the façade. Given the minor reduction, we are confident that future development on the lands to the west can be achieved without negative impact from the proposed development.

- *Consolidate two of the driveways along Beaverbrook Avenue to improve pedestrian connections, reduce conflicts and awkward vehicular movements.*

While the three driveways remain, the most northerly driveway is only for service vehicles (garbage/recycling), and the central driveway will act as the main entrance for the proposed development and existing office buildings. The southerly connection continues to services to the parking structure.

- *Organization of height – explore additional variation in height across the whole site. Consider switching 8 and 16 storey towers such that the proportion of the 8 storey relates better to the street. Evaluate shadow impacts through this analysis. A setback from Beaverbrook would also be beneficial in addressing human scale along the street.*

The 8 and 16 storey towers are remaining as originally proposed. Additional shadow impacts have been included to reflect that during prime afternoon sun times during the summer months, the towers in their current positions provide sun areas on the roof top amenity space, whereas if the towers were switched the amenity space would be entirely shaded affecting the residents enjoyment of the amenity area. To better emphasize the human scale along Beaverbrook Avenue, the proposed townhouses have been pulled towards the street an additional 1.5m to better emphasize the podium. Additionally, two townhouse units have been added to increase the size of the podium affect and further screen the tower from the public realm. Additional tree plants between the public sidewalk and proposed tower will further reduce the impact from the tower on the public realm.

- *Break down middle portion of façade to reduce the appearance of the length.*

The staggering of the balconies from the different elevations help break up the single planes of the long elevations, reducing the impact.

- *Wind analysis will be important through detailed design.*

Comment acknowledged; additional studies can be explored at the time of SPA.

- *Consider screening/interface of the façade along the parking garage ramp to enhance the pedestrian experience.*

Additional detailing can be explored at the SPA stage. The ramp is screen in part with a brick façade, however a large portion of the parking garage is enclosed to permit light from the structure is spill onto the internal driveway and sidewalks.

- *18-storey tower should be brought forward to be in line with townhouses to the south.*

The northerly tower has been brought forward and the proposed residential lobby and office uses flipped to provide a new drop-off for the office from the internal driveway, and for the residential use from a new layby internal to the site. The new internal turn-around will allow visitors to exit the site back onto Beaverbrook as the Oxford Street West access is proposed to be a right-in/right-out only which will restrict westerly travel along Oxford Street West.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 676-700 Beaverbrook Avenue and 356 Oxford Street West (OZ-9041)

- *(Councillor S. Turner with respect to the interpretation of the 5,000m² within 100m of a transit station, there currently is not one; how do we square that peg.);* Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that the reason we were able to make that interpretation is because there are images and maps in The London Plan which identify the Rapid Transit Corridor as well as those stations and so, while there is no physical rapid transit vehicle going down Oxford Street there are still locations for the offices prescribed in policy; *(Councillor S. Turner just in follow-up, those principles seem to be; perhaps he will save this for arguments and discussion.)*
- *(Mayor E. Holder maybe a more pointed question, if there was no rapid transit station would staff still have the same concerns with respect to the size of the office.);* Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that there might be cause for more concern without the location of that transit stop, it is the transit station location that validates up to 5,000m² without that, in fact, they would probably be recommending less; *(Mayor E. Holder so it is a good thing the Plan has that in it then at least at this point in time; he can go either way on this; has there been discussion with the applicant with respect to the impacts of the size of office space allowed and determinations as to whether that project would proceed if it was of that size and magnitude versus the requested 5,500m².);* Mr. M. Corby, Senior Planner, responding that they have had discussions with the applicant and they are here if you want them to speak to it about the amount of office space we are recommending; indicating that he does believe this works for their client, the use they are seeking to put in there is considered a public use and will not be affected by the gross floor area cap if they were to be below it or exceed it; *(Mayor M. Holder based on that comment he will wait to see if the applicant or their representative wishes to speak to that issue.)*
- Casey Kulchycki, Senior Planner, Zelinka Priamo Limited, representing Summit Properties Limited, the landowner and applicant for this proposed development - thanking staff and staff of Housing Development Corporation, we have met and consulted on this project over the last eight to ten months quite extensively with regards to the office space, affordable housing and other elements regarding urban design for the development and we have reviewed the staff report and we are in full agreement with the recommendation that is in front of you tonight; diving into the office space discussion a little bit, the current owner leases the office space currently on the property to the Local Health Integration Network (LHIN); pointing out that, as some of you may be aware, the Ford government is in the process of consolidating these LHIN's and prior to that announcement, this certain location was already crammed into their existing office space and they were looking to double it prior to that announcement, subsequent to the Ford announcement, LHIN is now looking to become a hub for the London area and surrounding area so they are actually looking to expand even beyond what they had initially thought they were going to require; relating to the location, while they understand staff's recommendation has always been for office space to be in the downtown core, LHIN's demanding client relations and day-to-day operations are not conducive to a downtown location which is why they are looking to expand at their current head office location at Beaverbrook Avenue and Oxford Street; so those LHIN's demands and requirements for the expansion were kind of the driving forces behind the proposed office space for this development; advising that through the consultation with staff, we were able to get LHIN into a Public Use designation which kind of relieves the pressure on the Official Plan Amendment requirement with regards to the office space which is why we were agreeable to the recommendation that is in front of you which is lesser than the amount than we were originally requesting.

Advisory Committee on the Environment

Report

9th Meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Environment
October 2, 2019
Committee Room #4

Attendance PRESENT: M. Bloxam (Chair), K. May, R. Sirois, D. Szoller and
A. Tipping and J. Bunn (Committee Secretary)

ABSENT: J. Howell, M. Ross, M.D. Ross, A. Thompson

ALSO PRESENT: S. Armstrong, G. Barrett, J. Grinstead, J.
Stanford, and D. Turner

The meeting was called to order at 12:16 PM.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Scheduled Items

2.1 Updates - 60% Waste Diversion Action Plan, Hefty EnergyBag Pilot Project and Community Energy Action Plan

That it BE NOTED that the attached presentation from J. Stanford, Director, Environment, Fleet and Solid Waste, with respect to an update on the 60% Waste Diversion Action Plan, the Hefty EnergyBag Pilot Project and the Community Energy Action Plan, was received.

3. Consent

3.1 8th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

That it BE NOTED that the 8th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on September 4, 2019, was received.

3.2 Municipal Council Resolution - 7th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution, from its meeting held on September 17, 2019, with respect to the 7th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, was received.

3.3 Notice of Planning Application - Zoning By-law Amendment - 21 Norlan Avenue

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application, dated September 18, 2019, from C. Parker, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment related to the property located at 21 Norlan Avenue, was received.

4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

4.1 Sub-Committee Status Update

That it BE NOTED that a verbal update with respect to the Waste Sub-Committee, from R. Sirois, was received.

5. Items for Discussion

5.1 Conference Subsidy Request

That the expenditure of \$250.00 from the 2019 Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) budget BE APPROVED for R. Sirois to attend the 2019 Zero Waste Conference being held October 30-31, 2019; it being noted that the ACE has sufficient funds in its 2019 budget to cover this expense.

5.2 Conference Subsidy Request

That the expenditure of \$300.00 from the 2019 Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) budget BE APPROVED for D. Szoller to attend the 2019 Sustainability: Trans-disciplinary Theory, Practice and Action Conference being held October 16-18, 2019; it being noted that the ACE has sufficient funds in its 2019 budget to cover this expense.

5.3 2019 ACE Work Plan

That the attached 2019 Work Plan for the Advisory Committee on the Environment BE FORWARDED to the Municipal Council for approval.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:07 PM.


Why Waste?

Updates:

1. 60% Waste Diversion Action Plan
2. Plastics & the Hefty® EnergyBag™ Pilot Project
3. Resource Recovery Strategy
4. EA for Proposed W12A Landfill Expansion
5. Community Energy Action Plan

Prepared for ACE – October 2, 2019

Jay Stanford, Director,
Environment, Fleet & Solid Waste



Why Waste? #1

- 21 actions
- split into 6 categories
- Operating \$6.5 million
- Capital \$15 million

60% Waste Diversion Action Plan

What's in the garbage?

Category	Percentage
Commercial/Collectors' organics	45%
Garbage	20%
Other organics	15%
Best Buy	7%
Other Recyclables	10%
Paper/Recyclable materials	3%


Single Family Homes


Category	Percentage
Commercial/Collectors' Organics	40%
Garbage	20%
Other Organics	15%
Best Buy	15%
Other Recyclables	10%


Apartments


Waste Management Working Group: July 13, 2018
Civic Works Committee: July 17, 2018
Municipal Council: July 24, 2018
Community Engagement: July 25 – September 27, 2018

Why Waste? getinvolved.london.ca




 Status (subject to MYB deliberations)	
Action	Brief Status – Tentative Timing
Blue Box (Blue Cart) Programs	
1. Increase capture of recyclables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial initiative; staff time
New (or Expanded) Recycling Programs & Initiatives	
2. Bulky Plastics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing pilot Currently no stable long term market for expansion
3. Carpets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial initiative
4. Ceramics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drop-off at EnviroDepots in Spring/Summer 2020; Consider Ban Fall 2020
5. Clothing/Textiles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin developing awareness strategy Winter 2019/2020

 Status (subject to MYB deliberations)	
Action	Brief Status – Tentative Timing
New (or Expanded) Recycling Programs & Initiatives (cont.)	
6. Small Metal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-annual collection Fall 2021 (coincide with other collection changes)
7. Furniture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wooden furniture drop-off at W12A EnviroDepot starting Spring/Summer 2020; semi-annual collection 2021
8. Mattresses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial initiative
Curbside Organics Management Program	
9. Curbside Green Bin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff working on design, operational and implementation details
10. Implement bi-weekly garbage	



Status (subject to MYB deliberations)

Action	Brief Status – Tentative Timing
Multi-residential Organics Management Program	
11. Mixed Waste Processing Pilot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall 2020/Winter 2021 (depends on facility availability)
Other Organics Management Programs	
12. Food Waste Avoidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development underway, early 2020 roll-out
13. Home Composting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsidize composters, event sales beginning 2020
14. Community Composting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide financial support Winter/ Spring 2020



Status (subject to MYB deliberations)

Action	Brief Status – Tentative Timing
Waste Reduction/Reuse	
15. New Coordinator Position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summer 2020
16. Financial Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for community initiatives beginning Fall 2020
17. Reduce Container Limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further examination Winter/Summer 2020 (after operational details for Green Bin are finalized)
18. Clear Bags	
19. User Pay	
20. Resident Incentives	
21. Additional Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional reporting (including waste reduction) Summer 2020

Why Waste? **How much food waste?**

Diversion/Recovery Opportunities	London % of Waste	Others (GB) % of Waste
Avoidable food waste	23%	8% - 11%
Unavoidable food waste	12%	6% - 9%
Other Organics, Pet waste	25%	15% - 20%
All Organics	~60%	~30% - 40%




Why Waste?

Value of Food Waste Avoidance



Local Research (Western University), local Pilot Projects and experience in Canada, USA and Europe






- **\$450 to \$600 per household (\$80 to \$100 million/year) in avoidable food**
- **10% reduction = \$8 to 10 million saved locally**




Why Waste?

Green Bin Implementation Decisions

- Materials to collect
- Size(s) available
- Choices for residents
- Delivery
- Monitoring
- Replacement

				
EXTRA LARGE LARGE 360 litres	LARGE 240 litres	MEDIUM 120 litres	SMALL 80 litres	COMPACT 46.5 litres
Depth: 34.5" Width: 25" Height: 44.5"	Depth: 27.5" Width: 24.5" Height: 43"	Depth: 21.5" Width: 19" Height: 37.5"	Depth: 20" Width: 16" Height: 34.5"	Depth: 12" Width: 11" Height: 27"



Why Waste?

Green Bin Implementation Decisions








- Single or co-collection vehicles
- Level of automation



Why Waste?

Green Bin Implementation Decisions

What goes in the green bin?

Food Products
(all consumable foods, raw or cooked)

- Butter, margarine, grease, lard (solid)
- Cake, cookies and candy
- Coffee grounds, filters and tea bags
- Dairy products, eggs and shells
- Fruits and vegetables (raw or cooked)
- Herbs, spices and sauces
- Meat, fish and shellfish (including bones)
- Nuts and shells
- Pasta, bread, cereals, rice and grains

Paper Products

- Boxboard and cardboard (food-soiled)
- Facial tissue, napkins, paper towels
- Flour and sugar bags
- Kraft paper (e.g. meat wrap)
- Microwavable popcorn bags
- Muffin paper
- Newspaper (food-soiled)
- Paper cups and paper plates (food-soiled)
- Polycoat containers (e.g. paper ice cream container)
- Shredded paper (small amounts)

Animal Waste

- Bird seed
- Cat litter
- Feathers/fur
- Pet bedding
- Pet food
- Pet waste


Personal Hygiene Products

- Diapers
- Hair
- Incontinence products
- Nail clippings
- Sanitary products
- Toothpicks

Other Acceptable Items Include:

- Houseplants including soil and flowers
- Sawdust from wood (not pressure treated, melamine, composite wood or particle board)
- Wooden craft sticks (uncoated)
- Wooden stir sticks

Still don't know where it goes?
Try the Bindicator – York Region's online, easy-to-use waste directory york.ca/bindicator



Why Waste?

Green Bin Implementation Decisions

Choices: Aerobic Composting or Anaerobic Digestion (Biogas)








Why Waste?

#2 London's Action on Plastics

Act
Inform
Innovate
Collaborate
Commit
(Be) Visible

1. Reduce
2. Reuse
3. Recycle
4. Recover
5. Policies & Directions



Why Waste?

Reduce / Reuse



Why Waste?

London CLEAN & Green

The London Free Press | NEWS | BUSINESS | LOCAL NEWS | FEATURED: FACE IT | VIDEOS | PHOTOS | SUBMIT A LETTER | SUBSCRIBE

London Clean and Green advocates 'refusables' to cut a source of litter

The City of London wants you to add a new word to your vocabulary: "Refusables."

JONATHAN JUHA Updated: April 16, 2019






ZERO WASTE WORKSHOPS AND TALKS



Why Waste?

Recycle



Why Waste?

Plastics End Markets

London's HDPE, Mixed plastics and plastic film EFS in Listowel, Ontario (backup - Green Line Polymers, USA)



About 1,200 tonnes from London

A PRIME REPLACEMENT

- PP, PE, LDPE and HDPE repro for:
 - injection molding
 - extrusion
 - blow molding



Why Waste?

Plastics End Markets

PET - Ice River, Shelburne, Ontario (backup Plastrec, Joliette, Quebec)

About 2,100 tonnes from London



Support closed-loop recycling

Why Waste?

Plastics End Markets

Not used by London at this time

Inbound Plastic

- Pre-Picked 1-7 Mixed Plastic Bales
- Tubs and Lid Bales
- Post-Consumer PE Bales
- Post-Consumer PP Bales



REVital POLYMERS

PYROWAVE™
CLOSING THE LOOP

INEOS STYROLUTION

London & S&B

Why Waste?

Recovery




Why Waste? **Hefty® EnergyBag™ Pilot**

Purpose: Divert more plastics from landfill

1. Reduce the amount of plastic being mismanaged (tossed on the ground)



Materials to Collect: non-recycled and hard to recycle plastic items:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • juice and food pouches • chip and snack bags • meat and cheese bags • cereal and cake box pouches • tooth paste tubes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • candy wrappers • plastic dinnerware and utensils • frozen fruit/vegetable bags • pet food bags • straws and stirrers
---	--



Why Waste? **20,000 HH will be Invited**



- 13,000 curbside
- 1,000 units (8 to 10 buildings)
- 6,000 access to EnviroDepot



Why Waste? **End Markets to be Examined**

- composite plastic products
- energy
- fuels
- oils
- waxes
- feedstocks for making new plastics





Why Waste?

London Waste to Resources INNOVATION CENTRE

1. Research & Investigation
2. Training, Testing & Auditing
3. Resource & Waste Management Knowledge Exchange (MoUs)
4. Technology Demonstrations (MoUs)
5. Outreach & Engagement



RESOURCE RECOVERY PARTNERSHIP
Advancing Resource Recovery In Canada

CONTACT US 905.941.2174

EVENTS REBO-RRES PARTNERS ABOUT US CONTACT-US



RESOURCE RECOVERY PARTNERSHIP
A 21st century approach to driving a sustainable economy. Continuing the conversation.

Upcoming Events:
September 19: Conference, Toronto, ON



Why Waste?

Building Local Capacity (Community & Business)

London Environmental Network

Learn About our Members

Green Economy London

You want a sustainable future for your business and your community. We want that too.

Find out how you can join

Green Economy London

About Us | Program Details | News & Events | Get Involved | [Join Us!](#) | Member Login

Why Waste?

News Release

Ontario Announces Next Steps to Improve Recycling and Tackle Plastic Waste

Improving the Blue Box Program Will Save Taxpayers Money and Help Divert More Waste from Landfills

August 15, 2019 10:10 A.M. | [Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks](#)

Government of Canada taking action to reduce plastic pollution


June 10, 2019
Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Quebec

London
ON CANADA

 **Canadian Plastics Industry Association**

CPIA establishes:

- 100% of plastics packaging being recyclable or recoverable by 2030
- 100% target for reuse, recycling & recovery of plastics packaging by 2040



 **Council's NEW Direction on Plastics**

b) Civic Administration **BE DIRECTED** to develop a more comprehensive plan to reducing and managing plastics in the residential sector including:

- i) addressing upcoming Federal and Provincial legislation, regulation, policies and scientific studies;
- ii) how senior government direction with producer responsibility will support local policies with respect to reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of plastics; and
- iii) report back by early 2021



Why Waste? In summary. . . the “new”
Top 7 “actions” for plastics
Act in London are:

Inform **Embrace**
Innovate **and**
Collaborate **implement**
Commit **EPR**
(Be) Visible




Why Waste? **#3** Resource Recovery Strategy
& London Waste to
Resources Innovation Centre



Why Waste? **Resource Recovery Strategy**

Achievable with Tomorrow's Technologies?


Residential Component PLUS other Sources	Diversion Rate Recovery Rate
Existing + Upcoming Diversion	45 - 60%
Mixed Waste Processing (MWP) and/or Mechanical/Biological Treatment (MBT) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> material and energy recovery anaerobic digestion Waste conversion technologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> gasification, pyrolysis, other 	15% to 30%
Total	75% to 90%





Institute for Chemicals and Fuels from Alternative Resources
Western University



i cfar



Western

Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering (Faculty of Engineering)

- 25,000 square feet of laboratory
- Small and large scale pilot plants
- Advanced analytical facilities
- Prototypes



Why Waste? **1. Research & Development**

- Hefty® EnergyBag™ pilot project
- Over 30 student research projects
- 2 PhD projects – food waste avoidance and landfill technology
- 1 PostDoc – resource recovery/WCT/disposal
- FCM Green Municipal Fund project




Why Waste? **Industrial Research Chair in Thermochemical Conversion of Biomass and Waste to Bioindustrial Resources**

- NSERC funded, 5 years, June 30, 2023
- Current value = +\$3.5 million
- Research Chair – Dr. Franco Berruti
- **Members:**

A&L Laboratories	Global Warming Prevention Technologies
Bella Biochar	Grain Farmers of Ontario
Canadian Plastics Industry Association	Ontario Federation of Agriculture
CHAR Technologies	Ontario Greenhouse Vegetable Growers
City of London	Titan Clean Energy Projects
Domtar Inc	Try Recycling



Why Waste?

2. Training, Testing & Auditing

- Products through the MRF
- Landfill operations
- Waste audits
- MRF training room



Mixed Waste Processing and Mechanical/Biological Treatment (MBT)




Why Waste?

3. Resource & Waste Management Knowledge Exchange (MoU - 1)

4. Technology Demonstrations (MoU - 2)

ICFAR/Western University	Feedstocks, waste conversion, products (biochars, bio-oils, fuel)
Canadian Plastics Industry Association	Feedstocks, products, resource recovery, conversion technologies
Try Recycling	Pre-processing, mixed waste, organic mixes
Green Shields Energy	Gas-phase Chemical (Hydrogen) Reduction
RediCan BioEnergy	Gasification
Tucker Engineering (inactive in London; however re-emerging)	Pyrolysis (demonstration)
Bio-Techfar (inactive in London)	Pyrolysis (demonstration)



Why Waste?

Technology Site Visits



Gasification – Enkernem



Pyrolysis – Tucker Engineering (MoU)



Gasification – Blue Concord (MoU)



Gasification – Aries Clean Energy




Mechanical-Biological Treatment – OES

Why Waste? **5. Outreach & Engagement**

- Ontario Mixed Waste Processing Working Group
- 2 workshops (Canada-wide participation)
- 4 conferences (Resource Recovery Conference)
- Resource Recovery Partnership officially formed
- Canada-wide RRP webinars (2018-2019)
- September 19, 2019 6th annual Resource Recovery Partnership Conference (Toronto)




Why Waste? **#4 Environmental Assessment (EA) Process for the Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill**



Two Phases:

1. Develop ToR
2. EA Technical Studies & Report

Why Waste?

Proposed Amended ToR


- City submitted Proposed ToR on October 12, 2018
- Submitted Proposed Amended ToR Feb 7, 2019
- **APPROVED** . . . July 30, 2019
- Update report to CWC, September 24, 2019


February 2019


Volume I


Proposed Amended Terms of Reference

Environmental Assessment of the Proposed W12A Landfill Expansion, City of London






 **#5 - London's Community Energy Action Plan (CEAP)**




Moving from 2014 – 2018 (CEAP) to 2019 – 2023 (next CEAP being developed with the broader community, project to start in late Fall 2019)







Some Key Reports in 2019

Date	Title
April 2	2014-2018 Community Energy Action Plan (CEAP) – Final Update
April 2	Development of the Next 2019-2023 CEAP
April 16	Environmental Programs Annual Overview Update
April 23	Council – 2019-2023 Strategic Plan
April 23	Council – Declaration of Climate Emergency
<i>Oct/Nov</i>	<i>2018 Community Energy & GHG Inventory</i>
<i>Oct/Nov</i>	<i>2019-2023 Corporate Energy Conservation and Demand Management (CDM) Plan</i>
<i>Oct/Nov</i>	<i>Update and Immediate Next Steps – Climate Emergency Declaration (including next CEAP steps)</i>





 CEAP - Next Steps	
Major Activity	Timeframe
Complete community engagement process, background documents and finalize internal discussions	Nov – Dec 2019
Launch a broader community engagement plan (<i>Tentative – Dianne Saxe, Nov 19</i>)	Nov 2019 – June 2020
Discussions with London’s key energy stakeholders and community leaders	Dec 2019 – March 2020
Develop Draft 2019-2023 CEAP	June – July 2020
Submit Draft 2019-2023 CEAP to Civic Works Committee	Aug 2020

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT - 2019 WORK PLAN

(updated September 23, 2019)

Project / Initiative & Background	Lead/ Responsible	Proposed Timeline	Proposed Budget	Actual Expenditure	Link to Strategic Plan	Status
<p><u>Waste</u></p> <p>Managing organic waste</p> <p>1. Review & prioritize leading edge waste management systems that focus on waste as a resource technology (biogas, anaerobic digester, landfill gas recovery – e.g. Edmonton Waste Management Centre of Excellence)</p> <p>2. Follow the progress of City regarding development of a Resource Recovery Centre for London (invite staff members speak to ACE)</p> <p>3. Continue research into organic waste diversion. Examine other cities’ highly successful green bin programs (i.e. Toronto, Halton, Markham)</p> <p>Resource Recovery</p> <p>4. Monitor & review on-going resource recovery initiatives.</p> <p>Landfill Expansion</p> <p>5. Monitor & review on-going landfill expansion, including plan to get to 60% diversion.</p>	<p>Waste sub-committee</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>\$0</p>		<p>Building a Sustainable City 1-Robust Infrastructure D-Increase efforts resource recovery/ long-term disposal capacity/ reducing community impacts (p. 11 #1D)</p> <p>Building a Sustainable City 3-Strong and Healthy Environment D-Support resident/community driven initiatives... (p.12 #3D)</p> <p>Growing Our Economy 3-Local, Regional and Global Innovation B-Lead development of new ways to resource/energy recovery... (p. 17B)</p> <p>Leading in Public Service 3-Proactive Financial Management A – Well planned finances/limit burden on current and future rate payers. (p.21 #3A)</p>	<p>Received an excellent presentation and participated in an interactive discussion from Barry Orr, Sewer Outreach and Control Inspector – March 7, 2018</p> <p>Subsequent motion regarding the “Toilets Are Not Garbage Cans” stickers made at June 6, 2018 meeting.</p> <p>Received a presentation from Claudia Marsales, Senior Manager, Waste Management Services, City of Markham regarding Waste Management Options on June 6, 2018.</p> <p>Sub-committee members have attended the City Waste Management Work Group meetings on Landfill expansion discussions.</p> <p>The committee submitted a report to the Civic Works Committee regarding residential waste management issues July 4, 2018.</p> <p>Be mindful of the City’s declaration of a climate emergency in all approaches to waste reduction and diversion.</p>

Project / Initiative & Background	Lead/ Responsible	Proposed Timeline	Proposed Budget	Actual Expenditure	Link to Strategic Plan	Status
<p><u>Sustainability Commitment</u></p> <p>6. Request updates from Greg Barrett regarding Resiliency Strategic Plan status.</p> <p>7. Support further actions in regards to sustainability & resiliency.</p>	Sustainability & Resiliency sub-committee	Remainder of 2019	\$0		Building a Sustainable City 3-Strong and Healthy Environment	
<p><u>Community Education</u></p> <p>8.Support community events directly and indirectly, as possible to increase awareness of environmental issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner with London Public Library & London Environmental Network to organize a second series of “Green in the City” talks 	ACE	November 2019	\$500		Strengthening Our Community Building a Sustainable City Growing Our Economy Leading in Public Service	
<p><u>Renewable Energy</u></p> <p>9. Explore possibilities for hydro-electric along Thames River</p> <p>10. Explore solar energy on municipally-owned buildings</p> <p>11. Ensure that co-generation/local electricity generation initiatives do not negatively impact the City of London carbon-dioxide emissions targets and carbon footprint or compromise local air quality</p>	Energy sub-committee	Remainder of 2019	\$0		Building a Sustainable City -Robust Infrastructure... Page 11, item 1B -Strong & healthy environment...Page 12, item 3A thru F, 5B	
<p><u>Community Energy Action Plan</u></p> <p>12. Provide input on 2019 review.</p>	Energy Sub-Committee	Fall 2019	\$0		Building a Sustainable City -Robust Infrastructure... Page 11, item 1B -Strong & healthy environment...Page 12, item 3A thru F, 5B	

Project / Initiative & Background	Lead/ Responsible	Proposed Timeline	Proposed Budget	Actual Expenditure	Link to Strategic Plan	Status
<p><u>Built Environment</u></p> <p>13. Develop a draft green roof by-law</p>	Energy sub-committee		\$0		Building a Sustainable City -Robust Infrastructure... Page 11, item 1B -Strong & healthy environment...Page 12, item 3A thru F, 5B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find out if City staff are already working on this by-law
<p><u>City Budget</u></p> <p>14. Review and provide feedback on budget.</p>	ACE	November/December 2019	\$0		Leading in Public Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget consultations take place in December
<p><u>Committee Member Education & Development</u></p> <p>22. Assist ACE members with registration fees for conferences pertaining to ACE mandate</p>		October to December 2019	Maximum of \$1000		ALL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members who attend conferences with financial help from ACE will provide a written report about their findings to go on the next ACE agenda, and give a verbal report at the meeting.

London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Report

The 10th Meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage
October 9, 2019
Committee Rooms #1 and #2

Attendance PRESENT: D. Dudek (Chair), M. Bloxam, J. Dent, S. Gibson, T. Jenkins, S. Jory, J. Manness, E. Rath, M. Rice and K. Waud and J. Bunn (Secretary)

ABSENT: S. Bergman, L. Fischer, J. Monk and M. Whalley

ALSO PRESENT: L. Dent, K. Gonyou and M. Greguol

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

L. Jones discloses a pecuniary interest in Item 3.4 of the 10th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, having to do with a Notice of Planning Application - Revised Application - Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment for the properties located at 2555-2591 Bradley Avenue, by indicating that her employer is involved in this matter.

2. Scheduled Items

None.

3. Consent

3.1 9th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

That it BE NOTED that the 9th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from the meeting held on September 11, 2019, was received.

3.2 Notice of Planning Application - Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments - 332 Central Avenue/601 Waterloo Street

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application, dated October 2, 2019, from M. Vivian, Planner I, with respect to Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments related to the properties located at 332 Central Avenue and 601 Waterloo Street, was received.

3.3 Public Meeting Notice - Zoning By-law Amendment - 1018-1028 Gainsborough Road

That the following actions be taken with respect to the Public Meeting Notice, dated October 2, 2019, from L. Mottram, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment for the properties located at 1018-1028 Gainsborough Road:

a) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to submit the Heritage Impact Assessment related to the above-noted Notice for the November 2019 meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH); and,

b) the above-noted Notice BE DEFERRED to the November 2019 meeting of the LACH.

- 3.4 Notice of Planning Application - Revised Application - Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment - 2555-2591 Bradley Avenue

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application - Revised Application, dated October 2, 2019, from A. Riley, Senior Planner, with respect to an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment related to the properties located at 2555-2591 Bradley Avenue, was received.

4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

- 4.1 Stewardship Sub-Committee Report

That it BE NOTED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage Stewardship Sub-Committee Report, from its meeting held on September 25, 2019, was received.

5. Items for Discussion

- 5.1 Demolition Request for Dwelling on Heritage Listed Property at 6100 White Oak Road by the Islamic Cemetery of London

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property at 6100 White Oak Road, the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of this dwelling;

it being noted that the Islamic Cemetery of London property at 6100 White Oak Road remains a heritage listed property on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, as are all cemeteries in the City of London;

it being further noted that the attached presentation, from K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, was received with respect to this matter.

- 5.2 Proposed Signage for the Medway Valley Heritage Forest Environmentally Significant Area – Sunningdale Access Kiosk Sign

That the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage supports the proposed wording and design of the signage for the Medway Valley Heritage Forest Environmentally Significant Area - Sunningdale Access Kiosk Sign, as appended to the agenda.

- 5.3 (ADDED) Heritage Planners' Report

That it BE NOTED that the attached submission from K. Gonyou, L. Dent and M. Greguol, Heritage Planners, with respect to various updates and events, was received.

6. Confidential

- 6.1 Personal Matters/Identifiable Individual

The London Advisory Committee on Heritage convened, In Closed Session, from 6:29 PM to 6:33 PM, after having passed a motion to do so, with respect to a personal matter pertaining to identifiable individuals, including municipal employees, with respect to the 2020 Mayor's New Year's Honour List.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:33 PM.



Demolition Request for Dwelling on Heritage Listed Property at 6100 White Oak Road

London Advisory Committee on Heritage
Wednesday October 9, 2019

london.ca



6100 White Oak Road



- 67 acres
- Former Westminster Township, annexed in 1993
- London Islamic Cemetery, established 2005
- Heritage listed property



Dwelling



- 1-3/4 storeys
- Gambrel roof
- Vinyl cladding over painted brick
- May date prior to 1860 (unconfirmed)
- Barns demolished c.1999
- Unoccupied since c.2002











Property Ownership

- 1849: Grant to James B. Strathy
- 1851: Philip Smith (census)
- 1861: Philip Smith, brick house (census)
- 1877: Philip Smith, property for sale
- 1878: Robert F. Smith (*Illustrated Atlas*)
- 1889: Robert F. Smith sold property to Walter W. S. Hunt
- 1897: Walter W. S. Hunt sold property to Charles B. Hunt and John I. G. Hunt
- 1897: Charles B. Hunt and John I. G. Hunt sold property to William H. Learn
- 1965: Learn family sold property to Frederick C. and Ealyn E. Thomas
- 1966: Southern portion of property sold to Middlesex Broadcasters Ltd.
- 1979: F. C. and E. E. Thomas sold property to Peter N. J. and Hubertha A. Ruyter
- 1982: Power of sale to Iqbal M. Hussain, Samina Hussain, Mohammed Sarwar, and Razia Sawar



Census (1861)


PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF CANADA MICROFILMED 1955

PERSONAL CENSUS		Enumeration Station, No.		In the County of	
Name of inhabitant	Place of birth	Age	Sex	Profession, occupation, or trade	Value of real estate
Philip Smith	England	45	M	Farmer	1000
Robert F. Smith	England	35	M	Farmer	1000
Walter W. S. Hunt	England	25	M	Farmer	1000
Charles B. Hunt	England	20	M	Farmer	1000
John I. G. Hunt	England	18	M	Farmer	1000
William H. Learn	England	15	M	Farmer	1000
Frederick C. Thomas	England	12	M	Farmer	1000
Ealyn E. Thomas	England	10	F	Farmer	1000
Peter N. J. Ruyter	England	8	M	Farmer	1000
Hubertha A. Ruyter	England	6	F	Farmer	1000
Iqbal M. Hussain	India	5	M	Farmer	1000
Samina Hussain	India	4	F	Farmer	1000
Mohammed Sarwar	India	3	M	Farmer	1000
Razia Sawar	India	2	F	Farmer	1000


RECENSEMENT - CANADA OUEST 1861 CANADA WEST CENSUS



Tremaine (1863)



Illustrated Historic Atlas (1878)





Aerial Photograph (1960)



Cemeteries

- All cemeteries in London are listed on the Register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act***
- Mather's Cemetery
 - Scottsville Cemetery
 - North Street Cemetery
 - Brick Street Cemetery
 - Forest Lawn Memorial Gardens
 - Siloam Cemetery
 - St. George's Cemetery
 - McCaul Cemetery
 - Bostwick Cemetery
 - Grove Cemetery
 - Fox Hollow of Mount Pleasant
 - McGregor
 - Oakland Cemetery
 - Restmount Cemetery
 - Kilbourne Cemetery
 - Kilworth Cemetery
 - Pond Mills Cemetery
 - Or Shalom
 - Wesleyan Methodist Cemetery
 - Mount Pleasant Cemetery
 - Woodland Cemetery
 - St. Peter's Cemetery
 - Nichols Cemetery
 - Islamic Cemetery of London
 - Woodhull Cemetery
 - McKay Cemetery



Ontario Heritage Act

- Section 27: Register
- Section 27(3): Requiring 60-day written notice of intent to demolish a building or structure on a heritage listed property
- Section 29: enables designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*



Demolition Request

- Received: September 9, 2019
- 60-day Review Period: November 8, 2019



O. Reg. 9/06

- Physical or design value:
 - Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or,
 - Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
- Historical or associative value:
 - Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;
 - Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or,
 - Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
- Contextual value:
 - Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings; or,
 - Is a landmark.



Physical or Design Value

Cultural Heritage Value	Criteria	Evaluation	Meets Criteria?
The property has design value or physical value because it,	Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method	The existing dwelling is not a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method. The existing dwelling has been subject to many alterations in the past, some unsympathetic to its original character. The existing dwelling (or portions thereof) may have been constructed prior to 1860 (as noted in the 1861 Census), however the evidence is circumstantial. The masonry has been subject to previous alterations which has compromised its integrity. Additionally, the gambrel roof is unlikely to be original to the dwelling, as are the concrete window sills, which, along with the vinyl siding and replacement windows, demonstrates the volume of alterations to the dwelling.	
	Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	The existing dwelling does not appear to demonstrate a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	
	Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	The existing dwelling is not believed to demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	



Historical or Associative Value

Cultural Heritage Value	Criteria	Evaluation	Meets Criteria?
The property has historical value or associative value because it,	Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community	Research undertaken did not identify any direct associations of the existing dwelling with matters of historical or associative value, beyond being located on the property of the Islamic Cemetery of London.	✘
	Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	The existing dwelling is not believed to yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or a culture.	✘
	Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	No information was located to associate the existing dwelling with the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist.	✘



Physical or Design Value

Cultural Heritage Value	Criteria	Evaluation	Meets Criteria?
The property has contextual value because it,	Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area	The dwelling is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area. The area has transition away from its historic agricultural uses with farmscapes. The subject property is the Islamic Cemetery of London, and is surrounded by some agricultural lands, telecommunications towers (to the south), and the W12A landfill (to the north). The area has not evolved in manner which supports or maintains its historic agricultural functions.	✘
	Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings	Changes in land uses have isolated the existing dwelling from its surroundings. It is no longer linked to its surroundings in any substantive way.	✘
	Is a landmark	The existing dwelling is not believed to be a landmark.	✘



Consultation

- Mailed notice to property owners within 120m
- *The Londoner*
- City website
- ACO – London Region, London & Middlesex Historical Society, and Urban League



Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning & City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property at 6100 White Oak Road, that the Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of this dwelling.

It being noted that the Islamic Cemetery of London property at 6100 White Oak Road remains a heritage listed property on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, as are all cemeteries in the City of London.



Heritage Planners' Report to LACH: October 9, 2019

1. Heritage Alteration Permits processed under Delegated Authority By-law:
 - a) 145 Wortley Road (WV-OS HCD)
 - b) 111 Elmwood Avenue East (WV-OS HCD)
 - c) 182 Duchess Avenue (WV-OS HCD)
 - d) 184 Duchess Avenue (WV-OS HCD)
 - e) 25 Cathcart Street (WV-OS HCD)
 - f) 95 High Street (Part IV)
 - g) 115 Wilson Avenue (B/P HCD)
2. New Heritage Planner – Michael Greguol
3. Blackfriars Bridge nominated for Peter Stokes Restoration Award (Corporate) – Architectural Conservancy Ontario (Provincial)
4. ReForest London – launch of Westminster Ponds Centre for environment and sustainability at Western Counties Health & Occupational Centre Cultural Heritage Landscape
5. Western University Public History Program – Property Research Presentations to the Stewardship Sub-Committee on Tuesday November 26, 2019 at 6:30pm in Committee Room 4, City Hall (300 Dufferin Avenue)
6. Review of Delegated Authority By-law for Heritage Alteration Permits

Upcoming Heritage Events

- More Mid Mod Movies – Tuesdays, 7pm, Stevenson & Hunt Room A, Central Branch, London Public Library
 - October 15: Bauhaus in America
- Gallery Painting Group – Show & Sale at First St. Andrew's United Church (350 Queens Avenue), October 17-20, 2019, www.gallerypaintinggroup.com (Woodfield area)
- Conservation of Heritage Structures Project Case Studies (three-day workshop in Guelph), October 23-25, 2019
- Do You Dare? Annual Haunted Mansion at Grosvenor Lodge (1017 Western Road). October 25-27, 2019. More information: www.heritagelondonfoundation.ca
- ACO London Region & Heritage London Foundation – 13th Annual London Heritage Awards – Call for Nominations (deadline: November 1, 2019)



**Architectural Conservancy of Ontario - London Region
&
Heritage London Foundation
In partnership with Museum London**

13th Annual London Heritage Awards: Call for Nominations

This awards program seeks to recognize individuals and organizations from either the private or public sector who have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to the preservation of London's built heritage. Nominees may be proposed for their long-term dedication to the cause, for a single outstanding effort that made a notable difference, for strong leadership and vision in educating the public, or for actions that have brought about a positive outcome for built heritage in our City. The awards also seek to honour projects that have actually preserved part of our built heritage. The awards will therefore be given in the following three categories:

1. To volunteers in the fields of education, awareness or advocacy.
2. Projects that have preserved built heritage.
3. Professionals, who were crucial to the success of a project or who have gone above and beyond their professional role.

The number of awards given each year will be at the discretion of the Awards Committee.

How to Nominate:

Any person may make a nomination. To do so, please fill in a nomination form that can be found on the awards website, <http://londonheritageawards.ca>. The list of awards and the evaluation criteria that the Committee will use can be found on the same website.

Alternatively, nominations may be sent by mail to ACO – HLF Awards Committee
Grosvenor Lodge, 1017, Western Road, London, Ontario N6G 1G5
By Fax to 519-645-0981 or by email to awards@acolondon.ca

Deadline for nominations is Friday November 1st, 2019

The awards will be presented at a Gala ceremony to be held Thursday March 5th, 2020 at Museum London. Tickets for the Gala can be purchased on Eventbrite after November 1st.