

Good afternoon Jody and Robin,

Thank you for your comments.

These comments have been added to the file and form part of the public record. Staff appreciate your comments and are taking them into consideration. Please be advised that your comments, including your name, will also be included in a future staff report published on the City's website for consideration by the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC).

No bus rapid transit stop is currently planned for this area, but the Oxford-Richmond intersection already supports several existing stops that connect the City together. Additionally, while the name of "Transit Village" represents the Place Type Designation, the policies go beyond transit too. Policy planning must be forward thinking, which includes addressing many of the matters you touched on. So, this effort is one part of many efforts that the City is pursuing.

Although there are no developments directly associated with this proposal, London has been leading Ontario in growth and is projected to grow by hundreds of thousands over the ensuing decades. Furthermore, these amendments would allow for more ground-level commercial uses that could stimulate the local economy. Given this area's close proximity to focal points within London, the City has every expectation that this area will continue being a vital part of London.

The proposed policy changes would support more intensification at this area, especially south of Oxford Street, but the developments would still be subject to review. In contrast to the mid-century push for slab towers or a tower-of-a-park morphology, London's contemporary policy framework emphasizes transitional forms. For wind, sunlight, and street engagement, policies support more tapered high-rise buildings buffered by medium density. For the transition away from high-rise buildings, London's policies also encourage more missing middle housing (e.g., townhouses, low-rise flats – typified by Montreal, Québec City, and many European cities).

Currently though, developers must seek a Zoning By-law Amendment and sometimes, Official Plan Amendments, to pursue developments in this area. Council has typically approved these amendments and done so with enough regularity that Staff have identified more generalized regulations and special provisions. Large developments are typically subject to Noise/Vibration Impact Assessments and Shadow Studies. Heritage is among the biggest policy priorities for this area. In practice, a small parcel of land or an especially sensitive parcel may not be appropriate for larger scale developments. Site Plan Control would also ensure consideration for more nuanced considerations, such as form, urban design, landscaping, accessibility, amenities, and more. For amenity/landscaping, the City differentiates between public amenities (parks), private outdoor amenities (gazebos, community gardens), indoor amenities (apartment gyms, pools), and landscaping (trees) – further formalizing these distinctions and requirements is beyond the scope of this project but is being considered by staff (for more information, please see: [getinvolved.london.ca/rethink-zoning](http://getinvolved.london.ca/rethink-zoning)). London prides itself on being the Forest City, so *The London Plan* and Site Plan Control By-law ensure that larger developments screen abutting smaller residential uses with trees.

For further information, please see the Get Involved page:

[getinvolved.london.ca/transit-villages](http://getinvolved.london.ca/transit-villages)

You may find mapping of the zones here:

<https://london.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=20327d3bcfb34bb488a7c3f74c05d2d3>

Should you have any further questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,



Stuart Filson, MCIP, RPP (he/him)

Planner, Planning Policy (Research)

Planning & Economic Development

City of London

[300 Dufferin Ave](#), PO Box 5035, London, ON N6A 4L9

P: 519.661.CITY(2489) x 4847

[sfilson@london.ca](mailto:sfilson@london.ca) | [www.london.ca](http://www.london.ca)

The City of London is situated on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak and Attawandaron. We honour and respect the history, languages and culture of the diverse Indigenous people who call this territory home. The City of London is currently home to many **First Nations, Métis and Inuit today. As representatives of the people of the City of London, we are grateful to have the opportunity to work and live in this territory.**

**From:** Jody U

**Sent:** Thursday, September 5, 2024 8:43 AM

**To:** Filson, Stuart <[sfilson@london.ca](mailto:sfilson@london.ca)>

**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] Amended Notice of the Planning Application, OZ-9726

Mr. Filson,

Thank you for the very detailed and informative email you sent in response to our previous submission to your office.

We are not city planners, and have neither training nor experience in the field. What we do have is an outside view of what is being presented, along with a sense that there is often more to a plan than what one's initial perception offers up.

It's that sense which has us realizing that, no matter how things are coloured, no matter how many considerations might be introduced, no matter how many checks and balances might be brought to bear, and no matter the amount of justification that might be applied, there is one unshakable, underlying fact to be recognized here. And that is, as the proposal

in question stands, it would be within the rights of a developer to erect one or more 30-storey towers in the area in question.

That's precisely what forms the basis of our objection to the proposed plan. As an example, it would be possible for a party to erect a 30-storey tower, where CIBC and Independent Grocer currently exist on the northeast corner of Richmond and Oxford, that would brush up against the 2-storey dwellings just across the narrow lane to the north. We are opposed to that.

We would love to see the European model adopted here, restricting upward development to perhaps five or six storeys. Adding to the population of the area in that manner would provide ample opportunity for small business development that would increase the appeal of the area. But emulating that model is not what is being proposed. Rather, there is specific reference to increasing the allowable height of buildings beyond the existing cap of 22 storeys. There would be no need to propose that increase if the intent were to regulate building height and mirror the European model. There is purpose behind the proposed change. It is not being advanced in the hope that no party ever takes advantage of it. After that door is opened, it's going to be used.

Where you explained that the proposed policy changes would support more intensification in this area, but that the developments would still be subject to review, it's hard to imagine the developments not passing scrutiny, assuming they adhered to the policy granting permission to go as high as 30 storeys. You speak about London's policies encouraging a transition away from high-rise buildings, but that is the exact opposite of what is contained in the proposed plan. And that is the point we are trying to make.

Therefore, we urge the City to rework the proposal to bring it into line with some of the information you provided in your email to us. Focus on middle housing. Apply standards to ensure a gradual transition from high to low. Implement changes to allow for more ground-level commercial use, if you believe changes to be required to spur such development. Most important, ensure that there is some sort of transitional buffer zone that makes sense for all the adjacent neighbourhoods. It is the community's interests that should take precedence regarding decisions that affect its future.

Jody and Robin.