

From: Jason Stern [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:58 PM
To: Rahman, Corrine <crahman@london.ca>
Cc: Rafuna, Liridona <lrafuna@london.ca>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] 1364-1408 Hyde Park Rd - meeting tonight

Ms. Rahman and City Staff,

As a resident of South Carriage Rd I appreciate the ability to submit comments, and yes, you have my permission to have these included in the agenda and for open discussion. I would like to first provide some background information about myself so that members understand the lens through which I'm looking at this overall project.

I co-founded a property management company in 2004 that currently has 3,000+ doors under management. I also personally own investment properties and have done so since 2002 which also include multi-unit buildings in London and surrounding area. I would just like to present comments/concerns I see with the existing presentation of the subject property based on my "in-the-field" experience.

In a broader context, there's no debating the need for more affordable housing. However, my focus here is on specific issues I've observed with the way this project is being introduced and expedited. I currently have tenants that would be considered on the affordable housing spectrum based on income qualification and rents being within the definition of affordable by CMHC standards. So I will discuss what I see in my own experience with the tenants I personally deal with daily and those we manage as a 3rd party management company.

My overall concern is that the City is treating this as a prescriptive project that has some boxes to check in order to reach a housing goal, so the more units, the better. I just don't see tenant profiles, building location, transit accessibility etc being considered here. See further explanation below:

Overall Project - Comments/Questions

1. What is the tenant profile being targeted? Social Services required? Level of employed tenants that won't require a vehicle due to the restrictive parking being requested (0.3/unit). Even at 92 spaces, almost half of all tenants won't have or be able to have a vehicle.
2. Multiple applications and information packages show between 59-132 parking spaces being requested (initial application 40 underground + 92 surface). Then why the request for 0.3 spaces/unit? This would place the parking at approx 59.
3. There is a large pool of tenants that work, drive a vehicle, and require attainable or affordable housing. With limited parking, the City will be essentially denying these tenants housing.
4. What other sample properties has the City used as a baseline for comparison, even from other municipalities? If a property is built near the City boundary (approx 200 metres from growth boundary) with limited public transportation, what has been their experience? Has anyone visited these properties? Performed a tenant profile? Interviewed the onsite staff and a few tenants? This could be a wealth of information. How many successful housing projects have a similar profile as the subject property? What would that municipality have done differently?

5. Design related: Where are the snow lanes and the expectation of snow accumulation from plowing? As an example, we manage a 24 unit building with 27 parking spaces. Each winter we lose 3-4 spaces due to plowing and the lack of a snow lane. With a building of this size, the expectation could be upwards of 10 total parking spaces lost, unless dump trucks are brought in at a substantial expense. I didn't see a dedicated snow lane on the plans.

6. Tenant profile related: If there is a profile of elderly, mobility-restricted, or Ontario Works/Disability tenants, how much parking is being allocated to PSW workers, VON nursing staff, other social services? They can't be expected to park on the street (not possible on Hyde Park) or park on South Carriage Rd and walk?

7. Design related: Townhouses, in my opinion, appeal to families with kids. If both parents work, they would only be able to have 1 vehicle, thereby again limiting the tenant profile. This wouldn't be an issue if there were appropriate transportation options.

Concerns/Comments

- Based on limited availability of bus services employment opportunities will be limited as there is only 1 bus line running on Hyde Park Rd that runs every 30min (londontransit.ca) How long would it take to get to South or East London? Has a study been completed?
- Library and other services are available at Sherwood Forest Mall. No bus service on Gainsborough (londontransit.ca)
- Food Basics (low cost groceries) in Sherwood Forest Mall again has no bus service.
- Access to Aquatic Centre & other municipal amenities. How accessible are these with limited/no bus routes?
- What are the nearest Social Services? I'm personally unaware of any in the neighbourhood or any that are easily accessible or reasonably accessible.
- Utilizing Walkscore data the subject property has a score of 47 (car dependent) vs as an example, 1639 Richmond's score of 79 (very walkable)

Comparable buildings, as an example:

1600/1622 Hyde Park Rd (under construction)

- 1 parking/unit

- located on **1 bus route**

1639 Richmond (R9-7, newly built)

- 0.67 parking/unit

- located on **9 bus routes**

- near substantial amount of amenities & transportation

200 Albert (under application to build)

- 0.57 parking/unit requested
- located near **5 bus routes**
- Application contains **257 bicycle spots (1 per unit)**
- Downtown location

In summary, the City is looking at placing a building with parking requirements similar to a centrally located building in a car-dependent area that requires a higher walkability requirement or an extensive network of public transit (the location meets neither of these). If not done properly, this could encourage a more transient tenant who has difficulty getting to employment or social/City services. This project could meet the needs of a very diverse tenant that requires a level of attainable housing, but an appropriate tenant profile should be investigated more thoroughly.

Outside of subject property discussion - of interest

In my opinion, an example of a prime property meeting most/all of the above requirements exists at Highbury @ Dundas containing 20 acres. Currently owned by "Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada" and is vacant (data from MPAC & assumed to be Federally owned) Why wouldn't the City obtain that land? Also the sale that just happened North of this plot of land in 2019 to Old Oak Properties for \$17M also owned by "Her Majesty" containing an astonishing 144 acres, was surprising that the City didn't attempt to obtain even a portion of this for housing. Prime, centrally located land on major transit routes, close to social services and a prime hub for multiple employment opportunities.

I appreciate your time on this matter,

Jason Stern