

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

23. Property located at 545 Fanshawe Park Road West (OZ-8286)

- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning Urban Design and Landscape Architecture, on behalf of the applicant – indicating that when they first met with staff and proposed a high density residential development on this site and indicated that there would be a request for density bonusing, they were told very clearly, that in order to do that, staff were going to be looking for an exceptional level of design on this site and the proposal in front of the Committee tonight does raise the bar in terms of architectural design in the city and certainly will bring a very high level of design to North London; advising that the development is adjacent to a very active and thriving commercial node at the intersection of Wonderland Road North and Fanshawe Park Road and it is surrounded by a variety of uses, such as the Amica Retirement Residence immediately to the East, the existing stormwater management pond for the larger subdivision to the North; indicating that the photograph is approximately one year out of date; however, you can see a cul-de-sac to the Northeast and there are a combination of mid-rise townhomes on the opposite side of Fanshawe Park Road; reiterating that there are a variety of land uses in the immediate area of this site; indicating that there will be two point towers with a very strong podium base, there will be ground floor and second floor amenity space for the residents, there will be rooftop patios, a great deal of attention was paid to the roof top to provide a very unique architectural element to the building; indicating that all of the resident parking is underground; noting that there is a very limited amount of at-grade parking and that is to serve visitors accessing the buildings; advising that there are two street accesses onto Fanshawe Park Road; massing of the building is oriented towards Fanshawe Park Road to ensure that the entire open space area to the North of this site will remain undisturbed in its existing condition; indicating that they wanted to achieve a very strong, appealing street edge along Fanshawe Park Road; noting that Fanshawe Park Road is a very busy arterial that does not have a lot of pedestrian activity and the point of this, with the podium and with the townhouses; pointing out that there are a number of entry doors into the townhouses to create a much more appealing street edge along Fanshawe Park Road to provide and enhance the visual qualities of the streetscape by creating this positive pedestrian activity; indicating that there is an existing shopping centre immediately to the West; advising that they want to use that closeness to ensure pedestrian activity between the site development and the commercial; advising that this development is also supportive of transit and the Official Plan encourages high density development along transit routes; advising that they wanted to provide a building design through the combination of massing, building orientation, architectural elements and detailing would improve that pedestrian experience along Fanshawe Park Road; indicating that they have developed a landscape plan that would also visually integrate that building with the surrounding properties; advising that all of the recommendations that were requested at the urban design peer review panel have all been incorporated into the more current concept plans and they intend to have some further discussions with staff, on a go forward basis to make sure that all of the items that have been raised are fully addressed through a site plan review process; indicating that she is willing to provide the shadow studies; noting that shadow studies are not normally prepared during the winter months because the light levels are so low that you do not get an effective representation on the shadows; advising that she met with Mr. Brown, General Manager, Amica, and tried to resolve his concerns; advising that she also met with the developers and the architect to see how the buildings can be moved closer to Fanshawe Park Road without having them on the street line; and, noting that the buildings were moved closer to Fanshawe Park Road to open up the view into the ravine. (See attached presentation).
- Jim Brown, General Manager, Amica Retirement Community, on behalf of the Amica Retirement Community and Amica residents – expressing surprise about reading about the development in The London Free Press; noting that it was the first time that they heard of this; indicating that they have not had a lot of time to deal with this matter; expressing concern with the fact that the proposed development is outside of OCB guidelines and reduces the amount of sunlight available to their community; expressing concern about resident safety; noting that this has been a huge forum for their community, resident and neighbourhood

enjoyment and satisfaction, especially during construction, environmental concerns and traffic considerations; advising that the proposed height will block out hours of west setting sunshine; reiterating that this is outside of OCB guidelines; indicating that the shadow studies are incomplete and do not actually speak to the other six months of the year; noting that we have gone through one of the worst winters that London has ever seen and those sparse days in January, when their residents, who rely on sunshine, that would be nice to know where that shadow was cast for the other six months of the year; advising that the proposed height of the building impacts the reason some of their members chose this site, which was for the beauty and amenity space; noting that, they were commenting on the number of deer that were walking by at lunch time; indicating that they would like to be able to preserve that and to also be able to enjoy the space and the sunshine that they moved there for; advising that a building within the guidelines would not interfere with that enjoyment and expectation of their residents; indicating that they are not in favour of the proposed height or density; enquiring as to why the shadow studies were incomplete; advising that they understand that a bonus zone is part of the recommendation to exceed OCB guidelines for additional height; however, that is not a significant storey residence at this time; expanding on residents safety, their inability to access city sidewalks or the retail area during the construction; advising that the residents need unfettered access during construction; indicating that many of the reports that they read talked about when Amica was built; reminding everyone that there is nothing to the east of the Amica building; noting that there is a bridge and Medway Creek; indicating that there are 160 seniors living in Amica and their only way to shop is the neighbourhood retail location; reiterating that it will be difficult for them to access that area if they do not have unfettered access during the construction phase; indicating that many of the residents have mobility issues and will require a clean and safe access on a city sidewalk to access their only retail that is within walking distance; requesting consideration for the start and end times, weekends and off hours, of construction due to noise; indicating that there may be construction infringements and traffic on their property and roadways; enquiring as to whether sewer lines will be affected or will need to be upgraded as sewer lines run east and they reside on the lowest grade; enquiring as to whether or not the city water pressure will affect their building; enquiring whether or not flagmen will be used during construction; enquiring about dust considerations and vehicles idling during construction; indicating that, two years ago, they had the same considerations given when the subdivision was going in behind them and during a storm, they had a massive amount of silt runoff; advising that they received guarantees, at that time, that this would not happen; reiterating that they would like to preserve the stream and the environmental area during construction and that there is no impact to Medway Creek or the surrounding areas; indicating that, with the massive green space behind the property, that it be maintained; enquiring as to what happens in any development if a mistake is made that removes or damages protected areas or wildlife; requesting information on drainage plans to ensure that no adverse effects from the new development would affect all structures or natural areas; reiterating that they are on the east side of this proposal and on a significant drainage grade towards Medway Creek; enquiring as to whether or not the sanitary and drainage reports address possible or forecasted issues to their property; reiterating that they are on the low end of the huge development and during a storm or during large run-off, they do not want their parking garage full of water; pointing out that Fanshawe Park Road is one of the busiest arterial roads in London and, despite the Official Plan review, safety needs to be the first and foremost consideration; enquiring as to whether or not traffic lanes will be closed on Fanshawe Park Road, just west of their exit, during any of the construction; indicating that the closeness of their exit turning lane, turning right (West) on Fanshawe Park Road, to the proposed secondary entrance is of huge concern for residents; indicating that none of the proposed plans seem to meet the safety concerns for their residents; indicating that this will filter a large volume of traffic into the westbound turn lanes causing confusion for drivers turning in and out of their property; indicating that they learned tonight that people will be able to turn east out of the new development; imagining what it will be like to have 60 metres between residents turning opposite directions out of each development onto a busy, four-lane arterial roadway; indicating that this will cause safety concerns and infringements onto their residents; advising that one consideration that they would like is the removal of the secondary entrance of this proposal; and, advising that people use their driveway to turn around in as it is the only spot between Wonderland Road and the next set of lights to do so;

and, indicating that Amica and its residences are not opposed to any development.

- Greg Blondie, Member, Amica Residents Council - advising that they are fully in support of the concerns raised by the General Manager, Amica; indicating that when they moved to Amica, they were looking forward to spending their retirement years in a secure and safe community while being able to enjoy the pleasures of living in surroundings that are environmentally sound; indicating that it is indeed a pleasure to savour their meals as they look on the ten deer that wander through the nearby conservation area; expressing concern with the loss of safety and the loss of sunlight; noting that he prepared a projection of sunlight on December 21 as all the other times are daylight savings times; during standard time, it appears to him, that the people on that side of the building will get the benefit of sunlight from about 12:30 PM to 2:30 PM; requesting a shadow study be done for that time of year; expressing concern with the increase of traffic on an already busy road during construction and afterwards is worrisome; noting that, at the present time, when they exit their driveway, they turn to the west; advising that if they wanted to go to Masonville or even down to City Hall, they would have four circuitous choices; indicating that with this development, another 500 to 800 cars will have to do the same thing; advising that there is a turn lane into the Amica driveway, but no turn lane into either of the proposed developments accesses; noting that they thought the turn lane would have to continue, which is problematic; however, if it does not continue, there would be two lanes of traffic going right to the curb with no turn lane; advising that, if a sidewalk is put in, then it is 18 inches from the road; noting that this is very dangerous for seniors; expressing concern for the residents who like to walk to Sunningdale Village, both at the turns into the two towers and into the plaza itself; requesting the opportunity to study the details of the traffic report and to ask for a holding provision on the development until these questions are satisfactorily answered; and, advising that they are not opposed to developments that will enhance the area but are concerned about ones that will decrease our sunlight, our safety and our mobility.
- Steven Churra, 758 Hickory Ridge Common – expressing support for Mr. Brown and Mr. Blondie's comments; advising that there has been discussion of the tree line at the back of the property that will block the building and will not affect the subdivision in behind; noting that he went onto the property and you can see the model home and his home in the photograph that he took; indicating that he is not sure what the tree line is going to do with a fourteen or fifteen storey building and how it is going to prevent any viewing; advising that the properties in the subdivision range from \$500,000 to \$1,500,000 and he does not believe that anyone would want to own a property when they have someone staring in their backyard; and, suggesting that the height of the buildings be substantially reduced.
- Karen Campbell, 697 Franklin Way Crescent, on behalf of the 10 residents on Franklin Way Crescent – advising that the lots are served by drilled wells and septic beds which raised the concern that there may be damage their wells; reading a portion of their communication on the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda; indicating that they live in a low density residential area and the Official Plan outlines medium density as a transition from low density to high density; believing it to be a huge leap to go from single family detached homes directly to a large building; indicating that the proposed density requested exceeds the density recommended; noting that they understand the issue of bonusing; advising that, at 15 storeys of the proposed towers, that, in fact, the foundation for the new development would be two to three storeys higher than the foundation for Amica; advising that, when Amica was built, one of the issues they raised was that the building should be no higher than the tree line; noting that this was suitable to all parties; and, indicating that they do not have an objection to a development being built at this location.
- Michael Rosehart, 180 Cooper Street – indicating that he was thinking of building in Hickory Heights subdivision, just north of this proposed development; advising that he will not be building there if a 17 storey apartment building is built there; and suggesting an adjustment to the height and the density of the proposed building.