

Members of The planning committee

On April 16 2013, City council voted 11 to 2 to send this plan back to the planning committee

Comments made that night:

- try and find a design that would fit better onto the unique shaped lot
- Smaller building less units
- Address the water issues.
- Would you want this large building sitting behind your home.
- Looks like a industrial building eg. Storage unit
- Something more fitting

The new plan was shown during the public meeting, October 9<sup>th</sup>, still shows a very large building That not only requires a zoning change, it also requires a special provision to permit a minimum 13metre lot frontage where 25 metres is required.

In the scope of planning the document reads:

### 3.2.3.3. Neighbourhood Character Statement and 3.2.3.4. Compatibility of Proposed Residential Intensification Development

As part of a complete application for residential intensification, the applicant shall be required to provide a detailed character statement and compatibility report showing innovative and creative urban design techniques to ensure that the character and compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood are maintained as per section 3.2.3.3 and 3.2.3.4 of the Official Plan. The applicant must clearly demonstrate that the proposed project is sensitive to, compatible with, and a good fit within, the existing surrounding neighbourhood based on, but not limited to, a review of both the existing and proposed built form, massing and architectural treatments as outlined in section 3.7.3.1. Of the plan.

Please take a look at the building design and size.

This building looks like no other houses or design in the area. The unique setting of the lot has this large building dropped in the middle of a residential setting.

Council has since been quoted on another infill project stating:

#### **Bud Polhill**

"It's a large building" "The other buildings around it are half the size or less"... We can't have this kind of stuff happening – these huge buildings being stuck in the middle of a small neighbourhood".

#### **Kelly Pedro sunmedia**

The issue casts a light on the delicate line the city walks as it tries to promote infill projects that don't stretch London's urban growth boundary but don't destroy established neighbourhoods.

One way to do that, suggested Bud Polhill, is for the city to restrict how much of a lot can be built on to stop developers putting large structures on small lots.

April 23<sup>rd</sup> Planning and Environment Committee

#### **Councillor Paul Hubert**

"woken us up a little bit", to the need to ensure appropriate infilling, "that is in keeping with the character of communities"

Judy Bryant

"I totally support infill and this is not the kind of infill we would want to see in any of our neighbourhoods, it is out of proportion with everything around it." Bryant said she wanted to emphasize the issue doesn't apply only to Blackfriars as she has seen it happening "very rapidly" in other parts of the city as well. And the big problem with the kind of development Bryant said is that it goes against the kind of communities people want to move into.

Please give our neighbourhood the same consideration you have given to other neighbourhoods.

This building is just not going to sit in between two other homes. It directly sits in back of 12 single family homes.



