

From: A. JOHNSON

Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 5:19 AM

To: Council Agenda <councilagenda@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] addition to the agenda of the next council meeting

Please add this letter to the agenda. It relates to item 3.2 as listed below and as on PEC meeting agenda (Jan.7)

You have my permission to publish the letter on the public agenda

To: The London city council members

Thank you for this opportunity to share my ideas

430 First St.

‘The applicant is proposing a bakery, caterers’ establishment, restaurant, and artisan workshop as additional permitted uses within the existing 1-storey commercial building.’

On the face of it this is likeable project that could support a walkable, sustainable community. It could mean some in-town jobs and small businesses. Jobs may well be short or no-commute jobs in an area of this density. Workers could live at ‘and walk here to work. It could help reduce commute miles, or the household driving we endure when there is a lack of handy businesses nearby.

Unfortunately, this project is located in a high transportation emission area and adjacent to the very highest emission area of the city. These high emission levels are caused by diesel vehicles not car commute traffic. From a global warming point of view diesel emissions are much worse than gas emissions. While they produce about the same amount of CO₂, diesel also produces large amounts of particulate matter (miniscule invisible carbon matter) which we now realize is as bad at heat retention as CO₂ and also large amounts of nitrous dioxide, another potent GHG emission.

When projects are being considered for these areas, their impact in terms of diesel emissions should be factored in. How much diesel emissions will be produced in construction? (Cement trucks running constantly burn a lot of diesel.) After completion will the business be using diesel supply vehicles? Will suppliers servicing the businesses use diesel vehicles?

But the highest levels of emission in this area, (mainly in Ward 4) are not produced by diesel cars, buses, transport trucks, or cement trucks, they are produced by diesel locomotives operating in the CN and CP railyards. Their operations are largely responsible for the worry about diesel emissions in the first place. In a sense, they are creating the diesel emissions problem that development is being forced to deal with.

(See in the Rainham emissions map attached ..with the author's permission)

Both CN and CP have already indicated some intention to adopt non GHG technologies. And the city needs to make serious public enquiries into the progress of rail companies in fulfilling their obligation to reduce emissions, and the timeline for the reductions. The city should also be doing research into legal processes that could be applied to ultimately legislate a ban of the burning of diesel fuel, like bans employed by other cities.

(At the C40 meeting of urban leaders in Mexico, four mayors (Paris, Mexico City, Madrid and Athens) declared that they would ban all diesel vehicles by 2025 and "commit to doing everything in their power to incentivise the use of electric, hydrogen and hybrid vehicles". Taking a different approach, London, England has had considerable success in reducing diesel emissions by instituting charges for diesel vehicles entering the city under a ULEG program (Ultra-Low Emission Zone) charging daily amounts of 12.5 £ for cars and 100 £ for trucks.(1.)”

430 First St. is a small project. The diesel emissions that it will be responsible for, if there are any will probably be minor. What about larger planned projects in the area, like '1472 Dundas'? Doesn't it make sense to try and stop emissions already being produced here by railway operations before having to deal with the diesel emissions of new projects?

Basically, CN and CP need a global warming wake-up call. If council doesn't send them the alarm clock who will?

Angus Johnson, Greenspace Alliance

Rainham/Dalhousie Emissions Map
Of London by Ward

