

1ST REPORT OF THE
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting held on December 10, 2013, commencing at 4:05 PM, in the Council Chambers, Second Floor, London City Hall.

PRESENT: Councillor J.L. Baechler and Councillors D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill and S.E. White and H. Lysynski (Secretary).

ABSENT: Councillor P. Hubert.

ALSO PRESENT: Mayor J.F. Fontana, Councillor B. Armstrong and G. Barrett, M. Elmahoon, J.M. Fleming, T. Grawey, B. Henry, G. Kotsifas, M. Johnson, B. Krichker, A. MacLean, L. Maitland, D. Menard, N. Musicco, C. Parker, A. Riley, C. Saunders, R. Sharpe, M. Tomazincic, J. Yanchula and P. Yeoman.

I. CALL TO ORDER

1. That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.
2. Election of Vice-Chair for the term ending November 30, 2014

Recommendation: That Councillor B. Polhill BE ELECTED Vice-Chair of the Planning and Environment Committee for the term ending November 30, 2014.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

II. CONSENT ITEMS

3. 10th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Recommendation: That the 10th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on November 6, 2013, BE RECEIVED.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

4. 11th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That the 11th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on November 21, 2013, BE RECEIVED.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

5. Woodhull Subdivision (39T-03511)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a subdivision agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Farhi Holdings Corporation, for the subdivision of land over Part of Lot C, Gore Concession, (Geographic Township of Delaware), City of London, County of Middlesex, situated on the east side of Woodhull Road, north of Gideon Drive, municipally known as 1820 Woodhull Road:

- a) the Special Provisions, appended as Schedule "C" to the associated staff report dated December 10, 2013, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Farhi Holdings Corporation for the Woodhull Subdivision, (39T-03511) BE APPROVED;
- b) the financing for this project BE APPROVED in accordance with the "Related Costs and Revenues" appended as Schedule "B" to the associated staff report, dated December 10, 2013; and,
- c) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions. (2013-D12)

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

III. SCHEDULED ITEMS

- 6. Property located at 1103 Adelaide Street North (Z-8284)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, relating to the application by the City of London, for the property located at 1103 Adelaide Street North, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated December 10, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 17, 2013, to add a new regulation to the existing Holding Neighbourhood Shopping Area Special Provision (h-5*h-11*h-64*h-95*NSA1(8)) Zone which indicates that: "The lot line which abuts an arterial street shall be interpreted as the front lot line regardless of whether or not it is the longer lot line.";

it being pointed out that there were no oral submissions made at the public participation meeting associated with this matter. (2013-D14A)

Voting Record:

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

- 7. Non-Industrial Uses in Industrial Areas (OZ-8219)

Recommendation: That, the application of the City of London, relating to a Zoning By-law and an Official Plan Amendment to introduce non-industrial uses in industrial areas, BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration to incorporate the properties located at 457 Southdale Road West, 1920 and 1930 Blue Heron Drive and to report back at a future meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Carol Weibe, MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture, on behalf of the Muslim Association of Canada, relating to the property located at 457 Southdale Road West – indicating that she has been working with her client on this matter for just over one year; advising that her client purchased this land for two reasons; advising that one of the reasons is to develop the land for a community recreation centre; indicating that the other reason is to develop a mosque that would be connected to the community recreation centre; indicating that this site is currently zoned Commercial Recreation (CR-1); reiterating staff's comments relating to the purpose of the by-law amendment, as it deals with commercial recreation uses and assembly halls in Industrial areas and any potential conflicts that may occur when you have non-Industrial uses or sensitive land uses in close proximity to Industrial lands; indicating that what has inadvertently happened, specifically relating to this property, is that by changing the definition of "assembly hall" to remove religious activities, it has now prevented her client from proceeding to construct the mosque on that site; indicating that the timing is somewhat ironic and coincidental in that her client has just completed the materials required for their pre-consultation for their site plan; advising that because the property is zoned, they met with Development Services staff in May, 2013, to get confirmation on the list of permitted uses, as they have received confirmation that a mosque would fall under the definition of "assembly hall" because it does allow religious activity; indicating that, on that basis, her clients engaged the services of an architect and they have been working over the last number of months to refine the architectural plans and have also engaged the services of an engineer; advising that her clients are making a submission this week; indicating that she became aware of these changes, and they are of great concern to her clients because they have permissions, today, that would allow them to proceed with the mosque; noting that the commercial recreation centre is not an issue; advising that she has two recommendations to present to the Planning and Environment Committee; advising that the first recommendation is for consideration for a site specific exemption; (see attached proposed by-law wording); noting that they have recently found out about the proposed by-law change and have had to work quickly; advising that what she is requesting is that, notwithstanding the changes to the definition to remove religious uses from an assembly hall, a site specific exemption be permitted for the property located at 457 Southdale Road West; indicating that they may be able to work with staff to refine the proposed by-law wording between tonight's meeting and Council; failing that, the second recommendation would be to possibly defer this matter and refer it back to staff as this may not be the only property that may get caught inadvertently in some of these changes; noting that there may be other churches or places of worship that are now going to find out that their legal status has now changed to legal non-conforming; indicating that, on this property, right now, with the current zoning, her clients did receive confirmation that they could proceed; advising that they are literally ready to submit an application; and, advising that time is critical for them at this point.
- Mike Inglis, 147 West River Trace Walk – indicating that he and his wife have owned and operated Gymworld Gymnastics for the last 12 years in northwest London; advising that Gymworld Inc. currently has a completed and accepted application for the rezoning of the properties located at 1920 and 1930 Blue Heron Drive to add Commercial Recreation to the permitted uses in the Hyde Park Industrial subdivision; noting that the Planning and Environment Committee will be receiving an application relating to these properties shortly; advising that their vision of putting together a multi-sport training centre began many years ago when they purchased the property and they have been waiting for servicing in the area; noting that servicing is to begin next year; indicating that, prior to the introduction of this application, they had their pre-consultation meeting with the Planning Department, about their application, in the summer; indicating that because their application is being reviewed using current by-laws, they do not have a vested interest in the outcome of this application expressing a desire to convey their opinion on how it will be more difficult, in the future, for organizations, such as themselves, clubs, community organizations and places of worship, to locate a business in London for commercial recreational purposes; expressing support for the

argument stated in the staff report relating to non-Industrial or sensitive uses and their placement away from general and heavy Industrial uses; expressing disagreement with the staff report relating to the restrictions on secondary uses, and their locations, having to do with Light Industrial areas; understanding that, by definition, a Light Industrial location has few off-site impacts and it should not be necessary to restrict the placement of secondary uses within a Light Industrial area; indicating that the transportation movements and the efficiency issues that have been referenced in the staff report are more relevant in the heavier general industrial or heavy industry areas; noting that LI-3, LI-4 and LI-5 uses may have location issues locating if they are trying to locate on primary collectors or arterial roads within Light Industrial areas; advising that the staff report references compliance with Provincial Policy Statements; noting that the Provincial Policy Statements also reference healthy communities; indicating that, when dealing with commercial recreation activities, there are not a lot of areas in the City zoned for commercial recreation; advising that, activities such as running a gymnastics gym, running a karate studio or a dance studio, you are basically destined for a Light Industrial area somewhere in a quiet little area where it is affordable to offer affordable programming to the citizens of London; and, indicating that, in his understanding of the staff report and moving forward for the next generation, to have to put a facility out on an arterial road somewhere is not feasible.

- Derek McBurney, 4-466 South Street – expressing appreciation to the staff for their well-thought out report; expressing concern with the previous definition of churches and places of worship and the secondary uses that are in areas that are really inappropriate; expressing disagreement with the previous speaker; advising that there are a lot of places in the city for recreational uses; indicating that you have to do business in the reality of today; and, indicating a desire to see the proposed revised by-law for the mosque. (2013-D14A)

Voting Record:

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to refer clause 7 back to the Civic Administration for further consideration.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

8. Property Located at 2320 Auto Mall Avenue (OZ-8276)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of the City of London, relating to amendments to the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law, for the property located at 2320 Auto Mall Avenue:

- a) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated December 10, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 17, 2013 to amend Schedule C, "Transportation Corridors", of the Official Plan to remove a "Proposed Secondary Collector" road in this location that was added to Schedule C, "Transportation Corridors", of the

Official Plan, and to amend "Proposed Secondary Collector" road to "Secondary Collector" road for Driver Lane from Dundas Street to Auto Mall Avenue to implement the accepted Veterans Memorial Parkway Environmental Study Report (ESR); and,

- b) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated December 10, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 17, 2013, to amend Section 4.21 (Road Allowance Requirements – Specific Roads) of Zoning By-law Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan, as amended in part a), above), to delete and amend various streets in Section 4.21 "Road Allowance Requirements – Specific Roads" of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law;

it being pointed out that there were no oral submissions made at the public participation meeting associated with this matter. (2013-D14A)

Voting Record:

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

9. Properties located at 860-874 Southdale Road West (39T-13503/OZ-8223)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Planning the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Norquay Developments, relating to the properties located from 860 to 874 Southdale Road West:

- a) the Approval Authority BE REQUESTED to approve the draft plan of residential subdivision, as submitted by Norquay Developments, (File No. 39T-13503), prepared by Robert D. Sterling O.L.S., (Drawing No. DP1, dated July 3, 2013), which shows 55 single detached dwelling lots, 11 single detached dwelling part lots, the extension of Cranbrook Road, the extension of Thornley Street, and a westerly extension of Collins Drive, SUBJECT TO the conditions contained in Appendix "39T-13503", as appended to the staff report dated December 10, 2013;
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that there were no issues raised at the public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee with respect to the application for draft plan of subdivision of Norquay Developments relating to the property located at 860 to 874 Southdale Road West;
- c) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated December 10, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on December 17, 2013, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to:
 - i) change the zoning of the subject property from an Urban Reserve (UR1) Zone TO a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h.R1-6(4)) Zone and a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h.h-108.R1-6(4)) Zone, to permit the development of single detached dwellings on lots with a minimum lot frontage of 15 metres and a minimum lot area of 450m² and to allow for 1.2 metre side yard setbacks for two story single detached dwellings; and,

- ii) amend Section 4.21 of "Road Allowance Requirements – Specific Roads" of the Z.-1 By-law to add Street "A" (Cranbrook Road) as a Secondary Collector Road; and,
- d) the financing for this project BE APPROVED in accordance with the "Related Costs and Revenues" appended as Schedule "B" to the associated staff report, dated December 10, 2013;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individual made an oral submission in connection therewith:

- Craig Linton, Norquay Developments – expressing appreciation for the promptness that the application was dealt with; advising of potential concerns that may be raised by the public during construction; indicating that the concerns are related to Condition 60, relating to construction access and Condition 62, relating to construction access for new subdivisions; indicating that they will have to block off and barricade Thornley Avenue in two locations, with another barricade on Collins Drive; understanding that there are concerns about construction traffic while house construction is going on through other areas; noting that there could also be concerns raised by local residents during the approximately two year period of construction, about the area residents not having enough mobility through the area; and, indicating that it is at the Engineers discretion and hoping that that discretion is used when the time comes. (2013-D14A)

Voting Record:

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

10. Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District Background Study

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions regarding the draft Blackfriars/Petersville Background Study BE TAKEN:

- a) the proposed Heritage Conservation District boundary, as appended to the staff report dated December 10, 2013 as Figure 2, BE ENDORSED and that a Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines be prepared for the area;
- b) the draft Background Study BE RECEIVED, and circulated to the public, landowners, agencies, the Blackfriars/Petersville HCD Steering Committee and the London Advisory Committee on Heritage for review and comment; and,
- c) prior to final approval of the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District Plan, a public information meeting BE HELD with the community to solicit input on the draft Plan and Conservation Guidelines;

it being noted that a review of the current Residential R2 zone variation applied to properties within the study area is underway to address issues related to intensification within areas that are susceptible to flood events;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Paul Warden, 199 Lorraine Avenue – see attached presentation.
- John Clement, Chair, Steering Committee – advising that there was an incursion of proposed development in the “pink” area as per the area map on display at the meeting; advising that a group of local residents expressed their concern and developed the Steering Committee; noting that the Steering Committee invited members to join; advising that they did not put together the map that was provided at the meeting; indicating that they have not told the Consultants how to make their decisions; expressing support on behalf of the Association Steering Committee of the current division; indicating that they did not intend to exclude communities; encouraging people to form their own Community Association; expressing appreciation to the members of the Planning and Environment Committee and the Municipal Council for finding a way to maintain and honour the history of the Blackfriars area as we build together towards our future; expressing support for the work prepared by the Heritage Consultants; expressing hope that the Planning and Environment Committee and the Municipal Council will endorse this project as well; indicating that they feel strongly that their neighbourhoods role in the history of the development and growth of London needs to be evident and clear in the appearance of our community on the ground and in our streets as we in the community continue to develop and grow in the future in a way that is harmonious for local community and future growth.
- Angela Goulet, 13 Lesley Street – advising that they purchased their house because they were interested in living Downtown and near the Thames River; expressing support for the staff recommendation; expressing appreciation to the staff for making the Blackfriars area a priority for heritage designations; indicating that what started as a strategy to protect Blackfriars from inappropriate development has grown into a real celebration of the history of our city; indicating that a tremendous amount of work went into the draft Report on the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District Study; advising that designating the Blackfriars/Petersville area as a Heritage Conservation District allows for a process of change management within the area and is proof of the community’s commitment to care for and enhance the area; indicating that they are seeing examples of this in their neighbourhood all the time; providing the example that 12 Lesley Street, which was one of the houses slated to be demolished, is now owned by someone who is taking great care to repair the house; indicating that the correlation has not been lost, this has historically been a working neighbourhood; advising that Blackfriars is becoming a place for first-time homeowners, young families and people who work Downtown and want to own property at a reasonable price; indicating that the pride and love for this area will only increase with the designation; indicating that there are a lot of children growing up in an urban pedestrian style area; advising that their participation in municipal activities and their involvement with the activities going on in the core is what breeds an interest in the city and a connection to the city; advising that she understands that the Planners are dealing with infill situations as opposed to urban sprawl; advising that it is critical to maintain urban niche neighbourhoods like Blackfriars; and, noting that if a city loses those character rich areas, which often tend to be the historical areas, it loses a lot of its personality and a lot of that appeal.
- Susan Spindler, 81 Wilson Avenue – expressing appreciation for all of the work that has been completed on the draft Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District Study; advising that she does not believe that infill intensification and urban sprawl are mutually exclusive; indicating that they do not want enormous intensification in their neighbourhood which would change the structure of what they consider to be a fairly small community; and, reiterating that the Steering Committee was not responsible for the division of the potential designation of the heritage conservation district.
- Wes Kinghorn, Chair, London Advisory Committee on Heritage – expressing support for the draft Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District Study. (2013-R01)

Voting Record:

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (4)

NAYS: D.G. Henderson (1)

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

11. Urban Growth Boundary Inclusion Requests (O-7938)

Recommendation: That, the urban growth boundary inclusion requests, the following actions be taken:

- a) the questions that were raised at the Public Participation meeting held at the Planning and Environment Committee on December 10, 2013, BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration to answer and to continue discussions with the development community; and,
- b) a Task Force BE ESTABLISHED with a membership similar to the Development Charges Working Group, with L. Townsend as Chair, to review the submissions received at the December 10, 2013 Planning and Environment Committee Public Participation meeting and to report back to the Planning and Environment Committee in three months;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication, dated December 5, 2013, from P.V. Hinde, Manager, Land Development, Tridon Properties Ltd., relating to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- William Hill, 2168 Bradley Avenue, on behalf of the property owners on Bradley Avenue from Innovation Park to the current Urban Growth Boundary – advising that there are 13 landowners; noting that 12 of the landowners formed their own group; indicating that he reviewed a staff report on the November 18, 2013, Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee Agenda which indicated that the City needs more industrial land, in terms of size, location and quantity; indicating that they have potential industrial land in this group of properties along Highway 401; advising that their lands are deemed inappropriate as they cannot be serviced by existing or planned infrastructure; expressing disagreement with this because roads, sewers and water were mentioned as being expensive to build; advising that, a few years ago, the City rebuilt Bradley Avenue and brought water and hydro to Innovation Park; noting that they have always had gas service along Bradley Avenue; advising that when he looks at what has been done and the fact that Innovation Park is at the east portion of the lands and the Summerside residential development is at the west end of the lands, it should be possible to service these lands at a reasonable cost; advising that, for the people he is representing, they are all original owners; noting that he has lived there for 25 years and he is the newest resident; indicating that there are people in the group that he represents that are in their fourth generation of living on the land; indicating that they have no land developers or land bankers; advising that they need some change so that they can do something with the land; noting that these are small lands, originally they

were 50 acres and five acres were removed to accommodate Highway 401; indicating that they are no longer viable as farm land; noting that only one person is still farming and he has a secondary job off the farm; further noting that it is cash crop, the dairy farms that used to be on Bradley Avenue disappeared a long time ago; indicating that they are surrounded by development; pointing out that they have Highway 401 on one side, Innovation Park on another side, residential development along Jackson Road; noting that there are a lot of “change of use” signs along Jackson Road and Commissioners Road and Sifton has just started a development along Hamilton Road, near Commissioners Road; advising that they feel isolated and helpless because they do not have any zoning to allow them to do anything effective with their lands; indicating that, despite everything that he has heard about the fact that lands cannot be added unless lands are taken out, which will not be a popular idea; indicating that the residents of Bradley Avenue are requesting that the lands on the south and north sides of Bradley Avenue be included in the urban growth area; recommending the south side of Bradley Avenue should be industrial; suggesting that the north side of Bradley Avenue should be residential; advising that the land is suitable, as there are approximately 2.5 kilometers of land along the Highway 401 corridor, which is highly visible and reasonably flat; noting that it would not require the amount of grading and excavating that went into Innovation Park, there is great access to the city core; and, further noting that there is no need for a ring road in the area as they have Highway 401, the Veterans Memorial Parkway and two interchanges servicing Bradley Avenue .

- Alan R. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates – see attached communication, dated December 10, 2013, from M. Campbell, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
- Doug Brown, on behalf of the West Talbot Landowners Association – indicating that these lands are located south of Southdale Road, west of Colonel Talbot Road and north of Pack Road; advising that they have been seeking inclusion into the urban growth boundary for over 20 years; advising that they have spoken to the Municipal Council several times outlining some of the problems and challenges that they face as landowners being surrounded on three sides by encroaching development and city growth; noting that these problems include trespassing, land erosion, difficulty in economically farming the lands, inability to procure insurance and other difficulties; advising that they would like to focus on three key areas, those being conceptual design for the development of the lands, compliance with the City criteria and requirements for land development and the economic feasibility to look at developing these parcels of land; advising that they hired IBI Group to explore how the lands could be developed and what the community might look like; noting that there could be a bike path to connect old London with new London, there could be a recreational area which would include a community centre that would provide sports and entertainment and other activities to the area residents and the plan could provide an opportunity for approximately 1,500 single family homes along with multi-family and high density development, community commercial school sites and recreational facilities; also noting that it provides for the extension of Boler Road, which is already planned by the City, linking Southdale Road to Colonel Talbot Road; advising that the West Talbot lands would provide the City with control over one of the largest natural heritage features in southwest London, as the back boundary is Dingman Creek; indicating that in October, 2013, they were provided with an outline of the City’s criteria that they would have to meet to be considered for development of these lands; noting that these included environmental, social, agricultural and economic requirements; advising that from the social standpoint, the inclusion of these lands will allow for the development of the Talbot community to reach its full potential as a vibrant residential and commercial community, it will enhance the entire Talbot community and allow the area to reach its full potential as a sustainable community; advising that the single biggest negative impact on agricultural land is to do nothing; advising that the subject lands are an agricultural island isolated by urban development on three sides and a large natural heritage area on the fourth side; advising that, with the appropriate development buffers and management practices, these lands can be environmentally protected and maintained as sustainable,

ecological features; indicating that the study also indicated that they can meet the necessary infrastructure requirements and intensification and density targets; advising that the West Talbot land represents some of the most economical opportunities in the City of London, an opportunity to bring in one of the largest tracts of land at little additional servicing costs beyond what is already in the planning stages; advising that development studies by IBI Group clearly indicate that the lands can be attracted to service and developed considering the costs involved; noting that actual indications are that these lands could be more economically developed than other areas already included in the urban growth boundary; advising that development of the area could create jobs for local citizens, provide the street expansion to meet traffic needs and reduce present congestion at rush hours; advising that their group has worked very hard to make sure that these areas have not been left out of planning of future infrastructure as the City looks forward as to how the southwest area is to be serviced. (See attached presentation).

- Dave Schmidt, Corlon Properties - (See attached presentation).
- Bob Stratford, RWS Consulting – advising that he participated in three of the requests by landowners for urban growth boundary alterations; indicating that he will be speaking in general terms, not in terms of specific applications, looking at the costs and engineering analysis that appears to have gone into the final suggestions that staff have made as to what should go in and what should stay out of the urban growth boundary; having attended prior meetings on this topic, and Mr. Schmidt talked about some of the older meetings, his understanding was that we wanted to investigate where there were opportunities to bring lands in, where there was little to no added cost burdens on the City of London; advising that he thought that it was fairly straight forward; noting that there is infrastructure in the ground with land near it that you do not have to spend any more money from a development charges perspective; recommending that these lands be capitalized on, bring in the land, earn the development charges revenues and carry on; noting that there are some sites where this could happen; believing that they were going to look at obvious and logical areas; understanding that there are a lot of requests and a lot of land area, but it was their hope that it would be kept simple and you would find the low-hanging fruit and try to take advantage of it, generate some development charge revenues where you already have infrastructure sunk and paid for in the ground and where there is no new added significant costs; advising that when he looks at the staff report and the special consideration lands, he does not see the logic; indicating that, with regard to two of the properties, where there is consideration for inclusion, one of them is for NW-1, on Sunningdale Road, bounded by Fanshawe Park Road and the City limit, staff is suggesting that there is no big impediment to this, but he advises that there are 1,600 metres of sanitary sewer required to get to that piece of land from where the sewer exists today; indicating that the sewer needs to go through private property, an Auburn development; noting that it is going to take 10 to 15 years for that sewer to get there if they go by the rates at which adjacent development has progressed; advising that the point is that that is not something that they need to worry about capitalizing on today; noting that there is another Official Plan review in five years; further noting that you could probably wait until the one after that; indicating that it is the notion that they should be going after the easy kills, if you will; indicating that we know that it needs a stormwater management facility, which is planned in the GMIS for 2016, but when you go north, there is another sewer through private lands, ultimately through plan of subdivision, that need to be brought up to area NW-1, so this piece of property is years and years away; indicating that he did not think that it was something that the Committee was looking towards in terms of advancing development, generating revenues and jobs and getting people active again; advising that the second property, W-1, is something that staff suggests should be considered for inclusion; noting that, again, you need to build a sanitary sewer; advising that the sanitary sewer is approximately 800 metres long to get to an existing sewer; noting that the sewer would have to go through private property and is not going to happen; advising that the W-1 area is within the Tributary C watershed and is outside of the recently completed and approved environmentally significant area study for Tributary C so it is really not

going anywhere fast; reiterating that it missed the point that we were looking for solid examples that could happen now; indicating that the two examples that he pointed out are heavily encumbered in terms of their servicing routes and other infrastructure; advising that he is not sure how we can say that those are ready and ripe to go; indicating that, in when we talk about having to go through other property developments, he recalls being in meetings about the GMIS and Committees and Council making strategies that said that they do not want other private developers in between growth, that the Committees and Council did not want to see a leap frog, but you hate to see a developer holding up some other opportunity; reiterating that these are two properties that were recommended to be brought into the urban growth boundary; advising that, in comparison, they could look at two of the requests that were Tier 2 or Tier 3; noting that he did not work for the property owners; advising that he is talking about Corlon Properties at the northwest corner of Wonderland Road North and Sunningdale Road; advising that there is a sanitary sewer and a watermain at Sunningdale Road; noting that the services are right there; advising that the City has most likely already paid the pipe subsidies out of the GMIS; noting that you have already paid the developer to oversize the pipes, so you could bring the land on; noting that it does need a stormwater management facility, so the City would have that extra expense; noting that the facility in the EA that is approved is \$1,700,000, the site generates \$12,000,000 in development charges revenues, which, in his opinion, is easy pickings, which is where he thought we were headed on this project; advising that another one would be out in the Wickerson area, which he did work on for Sifton Properties Limited and the other landowner group out there; advising that they looked at the servicing and costs as a whole of the servicing of the areas outlined in red on the map presented at the meeting; indicating that they also prepared a subset of calculations for the lands located on the east side of Wickerson Road; noting that this land was not considered a Tier 1 or preferred property but there has been heavy infrastructure investment through the development charges out in this area; arguing that the lands on the east side of Wickerson Road and the lands fronting Wickerson Road can be serviced; noting that there are no impediments, there are servicing requirements, but there are no added development charges costs; indicating that, in his opinion, this is the low-hanging fruit that the intention was to go after to recover costs on prior investments; indicating that, on the lands on the east side of Wickerson Road, there is the pond at the south limit of it, that the City of London is currently going out for a tender to build that pond, but they will not bring in the lands, which does not make any sense to him; advising that there are probably other obvious and logical places where we could look to gain an advantage and gain those opportunities that they were looking for; indicating that Riverbend South is one of the lands that were looked at for removal; advising that there are large sewers at the edge of the property, with a \$5,000,000 pumping station in Riverbend that City Operations staff complain does not get enough flow yet as it is not developing quickly enough; noting that it is operating in a manner that was not intended because development is not happening fast enough; reiterating that staff would like to see more flows to that facility; indicating that the Tributary C Environmental Assessment took five years; noting that the Ministry has now approved it; further noting that the Minister rejected a Part 2 Order request; advising that all the works that go to this are scheduled in the GMIS today and, to his understanding, the lots apply to this end of the city, so it would make no great logical sense that this should be an area to be considered for withdrawal from the urban growth area; indicating that the Parker-Jackson lands were suggested could be removed from the urban growth boundary; noting that he does not work for the landowners; enquiring why staff would pick those lands when there are sewers all along Jackson Road; indicating that right beside these lands, there are 44 hectares that there is no planned infrastructure for and there have been no planning applications for these lands; indicating that there are 44 hectares, in the urban growth boundary, with no hope, in the near future, of being developed; indicating that, to him, these areas are pretty obvious to be removed from the urban growth boundary and put the other low-hanging fruit in; providing another example on Clarke Road, near the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, with 37 hectares, with no

hope of being developed, but it is inside the urban growth boundary; advising of another property along Dundas Street that is 45 hectares, that is inside the urban growth boundary; reiterating to take the lands out and put the easy ones in, get the development charges revenue; suggesting that the mechanics of the current analysis bears no resemblance to what was discussed at prior Committee meetings or to what many in the industry expected to occur through this work; and, requesting that the Committee refer this matter back to have staff to simplify the review and figure out where the obvious areas for inclusion and exclusion from the urban growth boundary are located. (See attached maps).

- Phil Masschelin, Vice-President, Neighbourhood Developments, Sifton Properties Limited, representing Sifton Properties Limited, Crown Homes of London, 166142 Ontario Limited, 818255 Ontario Limited, relating to the properties located 2270, 2380 and 2576 Highbury Avenue North, (the Highbury North Landowner group), the properties are located on Highbury Avenue North, south and north of Sunningdale Road, on the east side of Highbury Avenue North; Sifton Properties Limited, property located at 1682 Byron Baseline Road and 2420 Westdel Bourne; the Dirks, property located at 1697 Byron Baseline Road; 2090864 Ontario Incorporated, property located at 2291 Wickerson Road; Kape Developments Limited, property located at 2280 Wickerson Road; the James Wickerson Stanley estate, property located at 2426 Wickerson Road, (the Wickerson Landowner group) and Hans and Sigrid Wagner, property located at 1478 Westdel Bourne – indicating that there has been a lot of discussion at the meeting tonight about Municipal Council resolutions from 2006, staff reports, land needs, the Terms of Reference from 2011 and the recent Municipal Council direction that has stirred the staff report that the Committee has in front of it currently; advising that there are two things that he concludes from this process; indicating that one of those matters is that Vision '96 laid out a growth boundary, at that time, which was almost 18 years ago, and today, we are basically still dealing with the same line; enquiring as to why, in 18 years, that line has not moved for the most part; indicating that, with 18 years of absorption, the line is due for an update; requesting the Committee to look at all the growth that has occurred, especially in the North and the West and the relatively small amount that has occurred in the Southwest; noting that the lack of development in the Southwest is mainly due to the lack of services; advising that it is time for a proper review; advising that we do agree that the current 20 year growth boundary does have more than 20 years of supply in it today; expressing agreement that the land needs determine that we do not need any new land; enquiring as to whether or not all of the land inside the boundary can be serviced by engineers; responding that of course engineers can come up with a solution to service anything; advising that it is a question of cost, timing and how much land to bring in; enquiring as to whether or not we can get the maximum developable land using the Official Plan growth forecasts from Altus, that no one seems to dispute, for the least amount of money; expressing regret that this is not what we have in front of us tonight; advising that this is not what the Municipal Council asked for in the review of events; noting that, in 2006, the Municipal Council asked to review the urban growth boundary looking at cost and benefits and a review of the entire boundary; indicating that the report tonight makes the premise that if you are designated Urban Reserve Community growth that you are presumed to be more costly or at least a longer term; advising that they respectfully submit that this is not correct; indicating that there has been no analysis done on the cost, the revenues for the lands to be removed and for those lands in Riverbend South; advising that, with all due respect, the land use designations themselves are irrelevant; indicating that the most important matter here is whether or not you have access to a sewer, what proximity there is to a sewer, whether or not it is funded or could it be funded; indicating that the Riverbend South final Environmental Assessment has been completed and the sewer will be constructed in 2014; indicating that, at Riverbend South, there will be a sanitary sewer at their doorstep in early 2014; advising that, just last month, a Thames Valley District School Board meeting was held and the School Board identified a need for a school in Riverbend South; noting that the School Board has provided written correspondence to them and identified a future site in their property for a school; indicating

that Sifton also has a property in Northeast London, in the Highbury Avenue North and Sunningdale area; advising that their review shows that Northeast London has the lowest supply of land in the entire City, with an eight year supply of land; indicating that Riverbend is second with a 12 year supply; advising that the largest supply in London is Southwest London with a 50 year supply; noting that this is based on the City's own calculations; advising that proposing to remove land in West London, the second lowest lot supply, with sewers at the doorstep in 2014, does not make any sense to them whatsoever; advising that, if the Municipal Council were to accept this report tonight, this would cause appeals and significant issues on proceeding with this proposal; reiterating that this is not what the Municipal Council intended to do; indicating that they think that there is a better way to proceed; advising that Sifton has lands inside and outside the urban growth boundary; indicating that Sifton and other companies are able to exchange those lands, which is a better way that has the potential to proceed; however, we understand that that does not work for everybody as not everyone has lands that they can swap in and out; suggesting taking it one step further; indicating that it has been seven years since the 2006 direction and we believe that in order for the Municipal Council to obtain the appropriate information and to make a proper decision, it is important to refer this back to staff and a new Municipal Council resolution to be obtained; proposing a Task Force be established with members of this Committee serving on the Task Force as well as possibly members of the development community, the planning community and the engineering community, to investigate the actual line, where the line should be, what lands should be in the boundary, what lands should be out; recommending Lynn Townsend, who was involved with the City on the last Development Charges by-law, who would be an excellent candidate to be chair of the Task Force; anticipating that the review could take 4 to 6 months as it is a significant review of the boundary which is what the Municipal Council, on two occasions, has asked for.

- Carol Weibe, MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture, on behalf of J-Aar Excavating Inc., for the properties located at 1620 to 1640 Fanshawe Park Road East (N-3) and South Winds Development Co., relating to the property located at 1870 Fanshawe Park Road East (N-4) – (see attached communications dated December 10, 2013).
- Sergio Pompili and Ryan Pompili, Sergio E. Pompili & Associates Ltd., on behalf of Louis and Marjorie Flannigan, 2969 Trafalgar Street, Scott McLaren, 3050 Trafalgar Street, Suzanne McLaren & Betty Jean O'Reilly, 3085 Trafalgar Street, Dorothy Loewy, 2735 Trafalgar Street, Doug and Joyce Byers, 2612 Trafalgar Street, Elizabeth Byers, 2700 Trafalgar Street and Peter Drankowsky, 1176 Crumlin Side Road - (See attached presentation).
- 1711794 Ontario Corporation, property located on the southeast corner of Clarke Road and Kilally Road – advising that they were not provided notice of this meeting until the day before the meeting by a member of the public, not by the City; indicating that the staff report recommends that the property located on the southeast corner of Clarke Road and Kilally Road be removed from the urban growth boundary, which they are opposing; recommending that the meeting be adjourned; advising that any discussions which could affect their property should not be allowed to take place this evening as it would constitute a clear abuse of process; and, indicating they trust that the Committee will reschedule this meeting and provide them with proper notice.
- Paul Hinde and Don DeJonge, Tridon Properties Ltd., relating to the Kempinski/Tridon Hyde Park property (NW-2) – (see attached communication).
- Ali Jomaa, on behalf of himself and Randy Clarke (NW-1) – (see attached presentation).
- Murray Jones, on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Vaness, 2031 Commissioners Road East – indicating that this is a farming property; advising that this is not A-1 Agricultural land; indicating that the property is west of Old Victoria Road, south of Commissioners Road; advising that the property to the north is designated future residential, the property to the east is industrial and the property to the west is commercial and residential; advising that they believe that this property would be a great fit to fill in

Commissioners Road; indicating that \$13,000,000 has been earmarked to upgrade Commissioners Road in 2014; and, indicating that he does not foresee this being a problem to add into the urban growth boundary .

- Joe Plutino, on behalf of Green Valley Estates – (see attached presentation). (*Secretary's Note: The Green Valley Estates Inc. and Green Valley Estates II Inc., Proposed Green Valley Estates Phase I and Phase II Subdivision Development Functional Servicing Report is available on the City of London website*).
- Fernando Desando, 1530 Westdel Bourne – advising that he is not here to discuss his property as he is not sure which criteria it came in at; speaking about the money that has gone into Westdel Bourne; indicating that he heard, tonight, that a decision was made to have some parcels removed; advising that, as taxpayers, they have put in two watermains on either side of the road; indicating there are approximately 10 houses on the east side of the road that are being utilized on the watermain; and, enquiring as to when the money is going to be recouped if development is not allowed along that road.
- Jim Kennedy, London Development Institute – indicating that through the discussion that has occurred at this meeting, one of the underlying faults that has come up is that, unless you have projects to service your lands that are included in the GMIS, you cannot go forward; advising that you cannot bring projects into the GMIS unless the lands are in the growth boundary; indicating that they are currently in the process of updating the 2014 Development Charges and the GMIS; noting that one of the things that is being discussed is putting a couple of stormwater management ponds in as a contingency; and, advising that provisional items in this review and the Development Charges and the GMIS review would assist so we are not doing this again in five years.
- Doug Stanlake, on behalf of Stantec Consulting, and their client, Z Group – objecting to any suggestions that the lands be taken out of the urban growth boundary; advising that the Parker-Jackson lands are part of a larger complex that Z Group brought forward in the 1990's, when both sanitary and trunk services were provided; advising that one stormwater management pond has been built and another one will be built shortly; advising that the second pond is the only service requirement left to build these lands; and, enquiring as to why you would take out Tier 1 lands only to replace it with Tier 1 lands.
- Sandy Levin, 59 Longbow Road – advising that, for over a year, he has been working with the London Development Institute, staff and the London Home Builders Association on the Development Charges study, which becomes an important date because it is August, 2014, when the current by-law expires; advising that everyone agreed that there was no reason for the Official Plan review; noting that there will very likely need to be an expansion of the urban growth boundary in the next Official Plan review; indicating that more supply does not create more demand; cautioning the referral back because four to six months brings you to June; advising that there have been a lot of reports from staff relating to the Development Charge study; and, indicating that it is unclear what will happen if you do not have a Development Charge by-law.
- Steve Polhill, 341 Hale Street – indicating that the boundary and how it is developed is fundamentally flawed as it does not look at certain things that should be looked at; speaking to the lands east of Crumlin Side Road and south of Dundas Street; and, advising that there has been an increase in industrial with no residential to support it.
- Mauro Castrilli, 2156 Highbury Avenue North – requesting to be included in the urban growth boundary; indicating that is municipal water that fronts his property; advising that the Municipal Council has accepted a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment recommendation for the sanitary service works of the Stoney Creek sanitary sewer which runs along Highbury Avenue North.
- Susan Smith, 124 Bruce Street – indicating that none of the presentations included transit supported investment if the city permits roads; and, indicating that she does not like to see Rural Settlement as a secondary appendix. (2013-D09)

Voting Record:

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill (3)

NAYS: J.L. Baechler (1)

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, J.L. Baechler (4)

IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION

12. 9th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That the following actions be taken with respect to the 9th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee from its meeting held on November 27, 2013:

- a) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to explore the opportunity to implement a reserve fund that members of the public could contribute to for the specific purpose of planting trees in the community;

it being noted that the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee (TFAC) reviewed and received a report dated October 29, 2013, and heard a verbal report from J. M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with respect to the Emerald Ash Borer business plan; and,

- b) that clauses 2 to 8, inclusive, BE RECEIVED.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

13. (ADDED) Candidate Approval for the Urban Design Peer Review Panel

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following candidates BE APPROVED for available positions on the Urban Design Peer Review Panel:

- a) Brad Smith – Position of Landscape Architect;
- b) John Nicholson – Position of Architect; and,
- c) Steve Ries – Position of Architect. (2013-C04)

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

14. Property located at 275 Thames Street

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the Fugitive Slave Chapel, located at 275 Thames Street:

- a) \$50,000 BE ALLOCATED for the foundation with a basement from the Capital Budget; and,
- b) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to waive the associated development and building application fees and charges.

Motion Passed

YEAS: J.F. Fontana, D.G. Henderson, B. Polhill, S.E. White, J.L. Baechler (5)

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM