

From: AnnaMaria Valastro
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 11:04 PM
To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] incorrect letter attached to PEC agenda

Please note that the letter placed under my name on the PEC agenda is incorrect. I would appreciate if the letter below be placed on the Council agenda. I would appreciate if the letter that is currently on the PEC agenda credited to me be removed. The correct letter is below.

RE: Item 3.8 323 Oxford St. and West 92 and 825 Proudfoot Lane

Thank You

AnnaMaria Valastro

Subject:correction 1/2 please add to Agenda Item 3.8
Date:2024-06-10 06:46
From: AnnaMaria Valastro
To:pec@london.ca

Please add to the public agenda re: Agenda Item: 3.8 <https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=3b5cdb10-ddd6-44b5-879c-982ef8197ef6&Agenda=Agenda&lang=English>

There is one staff email to be added to this letter which will be sent individually.

Thank You

AnnaMaria Valastro

This current planning and environment committee routinely approves all development applications that come before them often with added amendments. These amendments tend to be the same amendments over and over again despite legitimate concerns expressed by members of the public and/or variances between development proposals.

Councillor Shawn Lewis routinely supports these amendments which are routinely brought forward by Councillor Franke even though he acknowledges that rarely do the amendments come to fruition in a site plan approval. Please see attached staff email re: site approvals.

The request is that this committee cease from making amendments to development proposals that everyone ignores, and everyone understands to be ineffective.

This ESAM development has resulted in people losing their homes through expropriation to reconstruct Mudd Creek into a stormwater drain for the purpose of removing the floodplain specifically for this subdivision. In doing so, the construction of a stormwater drain has

disturbed nesting activities of migratory birds, and fish spawning habitat as the drain no longer meanders or functions as a natural creek. The creek is now straightened, deeper, steeper and performs as a canal to move more water and faster. The clearcutting of trees has disrupted bat habitat which are currently listed at risk, and instead stormwater staff - who are not biologists - are offering bat 'boxes' as compensation for removing their natural habitat. This development has ousted white tailed deer, squeezing them out of a natural wildlife corridor - the creek - without offering alternative corridors to move safely within the city. The slopes of the drain are too steep to function as fish spawning habitat or easily traversed by shoreline mammals including goslings.

Stormwater management is destructive and made worse by city staff that have no skill set in environmental and/or biological science. 'Forward' municipalities adopt Low Impact Development to avoid their reliance on costly stormwater infrastructure.

We need people on the planning and environment committee that understand these issues not only because of the environmental harm this sort of infrastructure causes but because of the sheer costs associated with it. For example, approximately 50% of my water bill is dedicated to stormwater infrastructure. It makes me angry that I am forced to pay for infrastructure that causes so much environmental harm when there are other options.

If you are going to approve this development, which you always do, then please do not add amendments that are routinely ignored. Please ask that this application be approved only with a thorough and independent and **public** environmental impact study looking at the well being of local wildlife including the bat population, fish spawning, amphibian breeding habitat and nesting activities **AFTER the installation of the stormwater drain, including the fate and movement of white-tailed deer.**

City staff mention that monitoring will occur but there is no public information that describes the monitoring itself i.e. framework, how often, criteria and so on, and I am not aware of any other such monitoring at other stormwater projects. These concerns were raised many times over by internal reviews. **Please direct staff to report back annually with a monitoring report.**

It is important to understand the long lasting impacts of such infrastructure on the natural environment.

Please note: MUDD Creek, even though it has had reconstruction in the past in some areas, it still functioned as a creek and had floodplains which are now removed. An artificially constructed wetland will not replace the natural seasonal ebbs and flows of a free flowing creek. The culvert that restricted water flow is not an excuse to rip up the creek itself as the culvert could have been easily repaired. Mudd Creek is being reconstructed for this development and no other reason.

Please enact a LIGHTS OUT PROGRAM during the spring and fall migration periods to prevent bird collisions with tall buildings, and write a letter to Premier Doug Ford endorsing a current 'push' to change the Ontario Building Code requiring all new windows be 'bird friendly'. Do something constructive, a true effort to make things better, because currently no one is listening.

Thank You

----- Original Message -----

Subject:RE: [EXTERNAL] bird friendly windows
Date:2024-06-06 11:36
From:"Pease, Michael" <mpease@london.ca>
To: AnnaMaria Valastro

To be honest, I can't think of any that advanced far enough to Site Plan Approval.



Michael Pease, MCIP RPP
Manager, Housing Renewal and Development
Municipal Housing Development
City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue, PO Box 5035, London, ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.CITY (2489) x 7601
mpease@london.ca | www.london.ca

From: AnnaMaria Valastro
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 11:33 AM
To: Pease, Michael <mpease@london.ca>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] bird friendly windows

Hi Micheal,

One last question. How successful were those discussion? i.e. were bird friendly windows installed?

On 2024-06-05 10:55, Pease, Michael wrote:

Hi AnnaMaria,
No, it is not automatic. Generally, it is only discussed where directed by Council or in situations where it is noted as a requirement in any of the previously approved Bonus Zone (although it is quite limited).

As a note, I have moved on from Planning. Any future site plan questions can be directed towards Mike Corby.

Take care!

Michael



Michael Pease, MCIP RPP

Manager, Housing Renewal and Development

Municipal Housing Development

City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue, PO Box 5035, London, ON N6A 4L9

P: 519.661.CITY (2489) x 7601

mpease@london.ca | www.london.ca

From: AnnaMaria Valastro

Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:37 AM

To: Pease, Michael <mpease@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] bird friendly windows

Hello Mr. Pease,

Does site plan automatically require bird friendly windows on all new development and/or highrises with or without a direction from Committee or Council?

Thank You

AnnaMaria