

**From:** Jan Lubell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 27, 2023 8:54 AM  
**To:** [Council@london.ca](mailto:Council@london.ca)  
**Cc:** Barb Gmail [REDACTED]; Jan Lubell [REDACTED]; Jen Bibbings [REDACTED]; Rahman, Corrine <[crahman@london.ca](mailto:crahman@london.ca)>; Richard Lubell [REDACTED]; Sebastian Russo [REDACTED]; Sophie Lordon [REDACTED]; Sterling Karamar London Office [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] October 6 meeting..comments and letter

Richard lubell would like to be placed on the agenda to make comments about the Fanshawe park road HUB selection.

The points will be made regarding three areas:

1. Process..as a directly neighbouring business our plaza at 655-685 Fanshawe park road did not receive any notice about the decision to be made until the Wednesday afternoon prior to the Monday meeting. Further, the meeting was scheduled for Yom Kippur, the holiest day in the Jewish calendar precluding our attendance.

Furthermore, There is a lack of transparency to the entire input process. Holding a community meeting during the summer does not constitute receiving sufficient feedback from affected community members.

In its initial deliberations Council stipulated that any new Hub :

A. Would not be located near schools or child centred establishments...IT IS ( Thames valley children's centre, potential day care centre in new apartment under construction, directly abutting busy toy and children's activity shoppe)

B would not require re zoning IT DOES. Further, other businesses are waiting for many months, even years for rezoning and building permits. In the normal process in the City, this site would not be available so quickly in the times frames stated.

2. Location choice.

It is on a transit route but is relatively isolated from activities of daily living such as grocery stores, general stores like wal-mart, libraries, community recreation centres, coffee shoppes, etc

The women who would use this site have special and complex needs. But..Does this site provide best access for regular solutions/activities to meet their needs..seemingly not.

Clustering a larger number of special needs clients together, even with trained and caring staff, does create a vulnerability to undesirable community behaviours even as simple as proper needle disposal, garbage and food disposal, etc. we have seen too much of this with just the motel operating and don't want more of it with a complex population.

Costs: granted there would be rooms available and a common kitchen but the total costs for running this for a relatively short period for the number of clients served seem high.

In our professional lives my wife and I spent many years in the community services and primary health sectors. We are well aware of the critical need for the City to act quickly and wisely for the benefit of a vulnerable population . We know this is a complicated process and requires complex solutions. However, the Fanshawe solution does not seem the best choice to meet the needs of this population. This is not NIMBY but suggests real concerns that we must start with the actual needs of the clients not political ones.

Op0Requirements of our business: If this is a done deal, we will insist on the City's assistance with putting up a barrier fence ( not chain link!) between the property in question and the toy shoppe on our plaza, extra lighting in the rear part of our property for safety and security concerns, regular cleanups of needles, garbage etc to the rear of the property and enforcement of NO Parking on the plaza lots, particularly at the rear, for visitors to the HUB site.

Thank you. PLEASE ADD THIS AS AN ATTACHMENT TO THE AGENDA..