

To the Clerk of the PEC committee

1. Please attach the following letter to the PEC agenda (05-22)
2. I give permission for the letter to be made part of the public record
3. I wish to attend the PEC meeting and speak at the meeting

To the Chair and Members of the PEC Committee:

My thanks for the opportunity to share these ideas

530 Oxford

Mitigating global warming will require unprecedented efforts from industry, agriculture, and cities. The main responsibility of cities is dealing with the GHG emissions of their cars. Many cities are already limiting the number and type of cars being allowed in.

I'm going to talk about the specific implications of this development on the GHG emissions being produced in this city by first looking at the current picture of emissions in London. The only document I know of that shows the pattern of GHG emissions for the city is the Rainham Dalhousie map. (attached) **Used with the permission of D. Rainham, Dalhousie University**

The map is about a year and half old but I think we can assume that there have not been sufficient changes in the factors that cause emissions to impact its accuracy.

What is unique about this map is that it displays emissions by area and it does show considerable variations in the amount of emissions present in the city. For example, there are wards with four differing emission amounts.

London, like other cities in Ontario has a commitment to reduce GHG levels by 2050. If that commitment is lived up to this map should look different.

If the Rainham team was able to return and test again and record results on a new map, we should see the colours overall change "downward," reflecting what should be generally lower levels of emissions in the city.

The problem with the 530 Oxford development, and with all the potential projects for the area (**323 Oxford (ESAM/ Mudcreek) 735 Wonderland, Rand Tract on Oxford, Rona Site**) is the potential increase in GHG emissions they'll cause.

If this building is completed it becomes a base for 646 cars (our count) adding to the daily traffic and the existing complement of emissions in this community, inevitably raising those emissions and in other areas on commute routes, and effectively pushing emission reduction targets farther away.

In Toronto twenty-five story (and higher) buildings, surround subway stations with much less car accommodation. Torontonians car dependency rate is half of London's (.33) and every day a half a million people (London's population) commute to work, or school, or whatever, back and forth, a million trips in total using mass transit.

If London had real "mass transit", cars would be reduced. But building out the Oxford area to imitate Yonge and St. Clair without a subway underneath, is a lunacy that could produce a mass of emission spewing congested traffic.

What the Rainham map also shows because of its detailed look at London is vegetation's reduction effect on emissions. That emission reduction helps to reach targets, effectively shortening the time to get there. Those emissions vegetation removes, are just that much less to be dealt with.

The Rainham map shows London needs to protect vegetation and reduce sources of emissions. Greenspace Alliance has in the past raised concerns about projects we call 1-2 punch efforts that do the opposite of both, that is, remove vegetation and increase emissions. (Our calculation is that currently 38 520 additional cars, a 14% increase is baked in to plans currently approved.)

Admittedly, 530 Oxford built on existing pavement, isn't removing vegetation to create housing, but neither does it create significant vegetation. That should now be a requirement for any development.

While we've been working hard to deliver that dual message, we have not delivered another message that follows from the map, about Londoners who are doing a lot of the heavy lifting in protecting the vegetation of the city, a protection which benefits not just them but everyone else. An example.

My neighbour and I are lucky enough to own houses on large well treed lots, more common, a hundred years ago. The vegetation we own is making a considerable contribution to the reduction of GHG emissions for our whole community, which we pay for with our effort and expense. If I clear the vegetation and transform yard into an apartment complex, putting a few hundred cars a day onto the street. I leave my neighbour and his vegetation with the harder residual job of reducing existing emissions now increased on my dime.

We have not begun to show the public and non-public the importance of protecting vegetation and this means any vegetation you can think of, much private residential, but also parks, cemeteries, playing fields and golf courses. And it doesn't matter if this vegetation contains invasive species or trees that are out of favour with naturalists. It all removes emissions. More needs to be done to recognize and support the contributors and to underline the responsibilities we all should be sharing.

Angus Johnson, Greenspace Alliance

Rainham/Dalhousie Emissions Map  
Of London by Ward

