

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 22. Property located at 447 Old Wonderland Road (Z-8228)

- Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – expressing support for the staff recommendations; requesting the Planning and Environment Committee approve the recommendations; advising that there is a revised concept drawing; advising that the amendment is to the design of the building, not to the application; noting that the amendment is based on the Urban Design Peer Review Panel comments; indicating that the application has not been amended since it was submitted last August; noting that they have always proposed the full range of uses; advising that they are satisfied with the limitations on the uses that staff has put forward at this time; indicating that they are required to prepare their own reports, staff has reviewed the reports with their own specialized departments and have signed off on them through discussions with their experts; noting that the various studies included a tree analysis, the subject lands status report and a traffic report; reiterating that staff have reviewed the reports and they are satisfied with the information that we provided with the uses that they are proposing; and, indicating that there is an overlap in uses and they can confirm that the number of parking spaces that are proposed is sufficient to accommodate the uses that have been presented before the Planning and Environment Committee.
- William Bower, 33 – 499 Teeple Terrace – advising that they just moved to London in the Fall; noting that part of their reason for choosing this location was the woodlot on Wonderland Road; indicating that it is obvious from the number of people that have shown up to the meeting, the number of submissions provided and the almost 4,000 signatures on a petition that this application has produced a great deal of interest, unhappiness and outrage over what has taken place; indicating that the applicant submitted the original proposal in August; noting that when he started to get involved in this matter, an amendment was supplied for that application; advising that he looked at the original application and the amendment and having recently moved here, he was a little puzzled by the content; advising that they started out with what the Planning and Environment Committee heard a presentation on tonight as the first proposal; noting that the first proposal was for a medical/dental office, a pharmacy and offices, which doctors and dentists have to have; indicating that after five months there is an amendment that has recreational facilities, banking facilities and personal service facilities and looking at the size of the building, there is not room for everything; advising that the functions of the building are being expanded yet the same amendment wants to reduce the number of parking spaces; expressing confusion over how this amendment came along five months after the original application; indicating that, at a meeting held on February 5, staff told them that it had been overlooked or that someone forgot to put it in; suggesting that a well-run office would not let a major omission like this go out, and no one, including the applicant, discover the mistake until January; wondering if someone would ask, after the massive objections to the original application, how this was missed; indicating that, and a meeting was scheduled to be held with the applicant on January 5; however, on December 27, the theoretically endangered trees and the lot itself was bulldozed; advising that this seemed premature and showed a lack of disrespect for the procedures and the rules that were applied in this case after considerable negotiation between the Planning Division and the applicant and with a meeting set to get further information about the environmental implications; raising this matter as he felt it was disrespectful; indicating that he finds it difficult to accept when the rules and regulations of City Council are simply ignored; realizing that there is no reason or ability to penalize the applicant; noting that it does seem a bit odd after having been treated like this, that the applicant is rewarded by accepting the application; indicating that all of the studies for the site, as far as he could gather and from what they were told on the February 5 meeting, the work was done by experts who were hired by the applicant; wondering, if you buying a house and you want it inspected, and the vendor says that their inspector is very good and has a report prepared on the condition of the house, would you accept that; noting that he does not think any of us would agree to that; indicating that he is not suggesting that anyone is not a perfectly competent professional and honest, but it just seems to him that with city staff able to do this, why simply accept reports from consultants hired by the applicant; noting that it is a matter of principle; indicating that all of these things

leave a slight shadow over the process; advising that the brief that the Old Wonderland Association provided last summer had three pages with measurements of the traffic configuration; noting that the brief is three pages, about 10 paragraphs, and is a professional, conscientious job; indicating that the recommendation that you have from staff tonight has one short paragraph on traffic; noting that this is not adequate; advising that he is not sure that anybody looked at that corner; advising that, at the February 5 meeting, they asked if anyone from the Transportation Department had looked at the traffic problems that would arise from this project if it were accepted; noting that they were told that Transportation Department representatives had looked at the report from the applicant and approved it; reiterating that he does not know whether they even looked at the corner but the references are fairly easy, you have the brief prepared by the Community Association; recommending that, before you do anything, he would suggest very strongly that you look at those pages; noting that he thinks it is pages 5 to 7 of the original brief; reiterating that there were about 10 paragraphs outlining exactly why this would not work and it would not work even more so with the building being flush on the sidewalk both on Wonderland Road and Teeple Terrace; indicating that there are three lanes there now, the one on the north side is the right turn lane, the one in the middle is the straight lane or left turn lane, and the one on the southerly side of the street is a fairly narrow one because it was narrowed to provide for the left turn lane; noting that around that corner comes transit buses, school buses, vans, trucks, and from the north side, cars coming from the south end of Wonderland shooting across the intersection in order to get into Teeple Terrace before the light turns red; advising that just down the street there is an entrance to a plaza and what is being proposed here is another entrance to 85 parking places behind the building being proposed; indicating that right across from there, the only thing mentioned in the staff report to you was that they would have a turn lane; advising that there is no place for a turn lane; indicating that there is one lane going west, which, as he said, goes north on Wonderland, there is the middle one that goes left or straight across Wonderland and there is the narrow one on the south side which takes all that traffic; advising that when buses come around that corner in the winter, there is hardly any room at all; expressing amazement that cars are not plowed into regularly while waiting at the red light while the buses make that right turn; indicating that the report/recommendation of the Planning Division does not deal with this; noting that they simply state that there should be a turn lane; reiterating that there is nowhere for a turn lane, there is hardly enough room now to avoid catastrophe; indicating that any configuration of an extra turn into the building off of Teeple Terrace to the left is going to cause a backup into Wonderland Road on a very short green light; stating that it is going to create chaos at the intersection and he has a vision of children, elderly people or bicyclists at that intersection being caught in the chaos that this is going to create; advising that there is not room there for another 85 vehicles to turn left just as they come off Wonderland Road; and, advising that there could be a serious accident there if that intersection is not dealt with properly.

- Maureen Tucker, 410 Old Wonderland Road – indicating that the proposed medical/dental building is unnecessary as, within three kilometers of where the woodlot used to stand, there are already 31 doctors' offices, 17 dentists offices, 14 pharmacies, five optometrists offices, five medical centres and three walk-in clinics; advising that this unnecessary building will literally have to be shoe-horned into this narrow, precariously located sliver of land; indicating that the applicant proposes to put two storeys and a number of parking spots at this location; enquiring where the green space that they are required to put in, the lighting, garbage, recycling, is going to be located; indicating that she finds it hard to believe that anyone ever looked at that woodlot as it used to be and said you know what we need here is a tooth whitening place; advising that, there is only one reason, in her mind, for this to happen where it is happening, and that is profit; realizing that profit that makes the world go round but now you are in my neighbourhood; advising that she wants to be happy and does not care if these people can make money in her community; indicating that this development is overwhelmingly unwelcome; noting that she knows this because she talks to her neighbours and there are 3,700 signatures, at the last count, on a petition; indicating that she has yet to meet anyone who supports this application; advising that their end of Wonderland Road is a lovely old street with 20 single family homes; noting that they are all proud homeowners, taxpayers and some families have been here three generations; stating that the reason they picked the neighbourhood that they picked is because it is treed and beautiful and quiet;

enquiring as to what it is going to be like now that the applicant is dumping an ugly, generic two storey medical/dental box with all the parking and all the problems that will go with it; advising that it is unwelcome on their street; enquiring as to what will happen if the developers put in a paid parking lot; pointing out the medical/dental building on Springbank Drive has paid parking and now the poor residents of Trowbridge Avenue are like a free parking spot for these people; stating that she does not want Old Wonderland Road to become the next free parking spot; advising that the last reason that they object to this development can be best termed the spirit of the thing and by that she means the disrespectful way that these developers have approached the process; in her opinion, the removal of some protected butternuts or hybrid butternuts that could have derailed their application mysteriously removed by a little midnight landscaping a little while ago; advising that the Old Wonderland Area and Community Association asked a tree expert to come out and give them an opinion, just before he is about to come he says that he has been warned to stay out of this because he has to protect his livelihood; referring to this as the now infamous December 27 butchering of the woodlot that, as she understands it, was under an order of protection and was cowardly done when City Hall was closed; enquiring that if it was so important to get those trees out of there, why did they not take them all down that day; noting that you cannot argue about trees that are gone; stating that she also finds it disrespectful to leave a huge, ugly crater all winter long with saggy, trashy orange snow fencing and backhoes for them all to enjoy; stating that she suspects that they hope that it will demoralize them just a little bit more every day as they drive by and it does; indicating that all this adds up to a blatant disregard for the residents of the area; advising that, for other developers, who she believes play fair, it should also leave a bad taste in the mouth of City Council and the Planning Committee; stating that she is proud that the Old Wonderland Area and Community Association has approached this from a place of respect for the process; advising that they are a volunteer group, they do not have planners and they literally hit the ground running when all of this started six months ago; advising that they have had to meander their way through a seemingly endless multi-governmental, multi-departmental maze of new information, by-laws and red tape; reiterating that they have always played by the rules and have always had respect for the process that the Municipal Council is in charge of; stating that it is frustrating beyond words to think that others who may have not operated in the same spirit will be taken seriously, perhaps go unquestioned and might actually have applications granted without question; stating that how these particular developers, in her opinion, have approached and participated in the process does not work for her, does not work for us and it should not work for you; indicating that this is not the respectful, professional way that a matter this important should be handled; noting that it is not even close; enquiring as to whether or not they look like good neighbours to you; enquiring as to whether or not these are the type of people that you hope pick your neighbourhood next to be "improved"; stating that she does not want them, you can have them; wondering, when all of this gets going and she assumes that something is going to happen, will they address the concerns of residents from construction to completion; wondering if they are going to take care of the property or, by that time, will they simply have moved on to the next neighbourhood that needs "improving"; wondering if they will they work with all of the Departments at the City, honestly, openly and effectively; wondering if, when the first major traffic thing comes up and we know that it will, what will they do and say; wondering if anyone will be able to reach them and make them take this seriously or when people call their office with problems will it be like the Friday after Christmas and everything is closed; indicating that she does not look ahead and see a mutually respectful and cooperative relationship between the people who start the process in such a questionable way and the residents in the area and the City; advising that she is not a developer hater, she does not have a problem with development if it is necessary and beneficial, if it is welcomed by the community and completed in a manner that is respectful of the process, with the community and everyone involved; outlining that this is not what she is seeing here; indicating that there is progress and then there is greed and sometimes these two terms are very interchangeable; believing that if this plan is approved, it says very loudly to us and to the people of the City that money is king in London, that money talks; indicating that if it is true that money talks, and she does not have as much money as some people, her money is going to whisper, not talk, but it is going to say no thanks; advising that she is going to boycott every service that goes into that plaza and ask all of her friends and neighbours to do the same

thing; stating that the Planning and Environment Committee can still stop this; reiterating that this is unnecessary, it is unwelcome and she thinks that these are people that really couldn't care less; stating that you can say no, you can say not here, not now; stating that the Council calls the shots, not the people with the backhoes and the money; requesting that the Committee does not reward these people with carte blanche to capitalize and degrade their lovely neighbourhood because maybe yours is next; and, stating that if you do deny this application and tell them that they cannot do whatever they feel like, however they feel like, it would certainly restore her faith that all of us are important and the people who love their communities, build them up and live in them are just as important as the people who want to use communities to make profit.

- Mary Read, 440 Old Wonderland Road, Old Wonderland Area and Community Association – stating that when this process began, she thought she would be here tonight making an appeal to the Planning and Environment Committee to help save a treasured woodlands, a treasured neighbourhood woods; advising that, instead she is here speaking for a community that is still struggling to accept the loss of those woods and to ask for some badly needed leadership to right this wrong; indicating that if you have driven down Wonderland Road lately, you know that instead of a woodland in our midst, we have a bomb crater; advising that this acre and a half of woods may have been seen exclusively as an obstacle to this developers fast track to profit but, to the people who live here, it was a part of our communities history and identity; advising that these woods served as a buffer from Wonderland Road and as a gateway to the residential neighbourhood that surrounds it; indicating that it also provided habitat for many species of birds and animals and contained endangered species; indicating that, to travelers on Wonderland Road, it served as a hopeful reminder that London is still the Forest City even though we face mounting evidence that it is not; stating that this new clear cut ravine serves as a daily reminder that the residents of this City, the voters of this City, have not been able to rely on the democratic process to ensure that their concerns were heard and dealt with respectfully and fairly; wondering how City leaders are going to claim to represent community interests if they do not have the political courage to condemn the unethical conduct of this developer; indicating that, in a December 11 memo to the developers, Parks Planning stated that the patch should be considered an ecologically significant woodland and, as such, the City could not support the rezoning of these lands from OS-1; advising that, two weeks after receiving the memo, instead of waiting to respond to the City's assertions at a meeting scheduled in the new year, this developer leveled the woods; outlining that this was not the act of a landowner doing with his property what he is legally entitled to do, but an applicant panicked by the prospect of lost investment dollars, fueled by a sense of entitlement and a demonstrated assumption that circumventing City process would not result in any penalty; indicating that the report goes on to state that, upon a review of the developers November letter, Planning Division staff was persuaded that the property was not, in fact, part of a significant woodland; advising that this swift reversal of opinion did not take place until the trees were destroyed and all physical evidence was literally shredded; noting that it is interesting that the developers arguments became convincing only after the woods were wiped out; assuming that this change of heart followed a round of meetings and an intensive review of legal, political and departmental options; indicating that the staff report suggests that the change of opinion, instead, rests on two key criteria; indicating that they are not convinced that that is the case; indicating that the staff report states that the endangered species criterion was dismissed because the developers representatives "viewed the location of the neighbours butternut trees and confirmed to us that they were not present"; indicating that this is a dazzling feat and they are fascinated to learn how the consultant made a scientific determination on a snowy December day from a distance of between 9 to 16 feet of three deciduous trees that, by Ministry of Natural Resources standards, can only be identified in full leaf and after close physical inspection of their seeds and bark and the extent of which they have been hybridized can be confirmed only by DNA testing; indicating that, clearly this developers consultant's biologist has super human deductive powers, a Sherlock Holmes of the woodland; requesting that it not be assumed that the underfunded and overworked Ministry of Natural Resource offices, recently subjected to staffing reductions and funding cutbacks, engaged in a thorough review of the developers documents; noting that anything that stays on the Ministry of Natural Resource's desk for more than 30 days is automatically deemed approved; further noting that the report had already been in the Ministry of Natural Resource's office for six months when this

neighbourhood was finally informed of the rezoning application; indicating that this was administrative sign off serving as a replacement for peer review of supposedly scientific data; indicating, that, at an October 31 meeting that the Community Association attended with City staff, they were advised that a hold was being placed on the trees of the neighbouring property until the Spring, which was the appropriate time that they could be assessed; indicating that they thought that they had until April to perform that process and it was clearly removed from them before that; advising that, at the meeting, City staff agreed to exclude the presence of skunk cabbage as an indicator of surface groundwater and seeps when the developer argued that its presence was related to a previously undocumented storm drainage system; indicating that this is an area well known for its underground springs and water sources as anyone in the area can attest; noting that it is called Springbank Drive for a reason; advising that the City had to bear major cost overruns in 2001 during installation of a sewer system along Old Wonderland Road when engineers struggled to contain underground streams that they found only a few steps away from these woods; advising that, as a lifetime resident of this neighbourhood, she can tell you that a large pond with extensive marshes filled with skunkweed and black soil was located on this property until road construction interrupted its ecosystem; advising that the pond is a historical fact and that a storm drain was in place at all suggests that the City had to install the system to manage water sources on the property; advising that the skunk weed growing on this land is a clear indicator that the springs which fed that pond are still active; indicating that this drainage system was not the source of seepage but a means by which to contain it; noting that, in its opinion reversal, the City makes no comment about the developers refusal to provide a revised SLR that would provide adjacent City land and treed areas along the length of Old Wonderland Road; reiterating that this refusal was despite the fact that it would span property lines and, by any standards, should have been evaluated as a complete and functioning entity exclusive of manmade boundaries; advising that since the trees and vegetation extended onto City-owned property, the City was therefore a co-owner of that woodland; indicating that by clear cutting their land, the developers completely changed the nature, value and character of neighbouring property, including City-owned parkland; indicating that these developers appear to believe that their property rights trump everyone else's and, even succeed the City's right to manage and make decisions about its own properties; noting that it seems to them that the City Planning Department says that that is fine with them and that it is that fine with City Council; indicating that the reversal of the Parks Planning decision does not mention the 18% slope, with erodible soils, which is also listed as a designation criteria met by this woodland that may be because after these trees were felled, the developer moved in equipment and regarded the property to a much gentler incline; advising that she called the Planner for the file she called city planner the moment she learned that graders had been moved onto the property and almost as if he had been waiting for her call, he informed her that there were no restrictions on the developer that would prohibit him from making site alterations; indicating that while the optics of this are profoundly unsettling to say the least, essentially, this community was told that the owner could do whatever he liked to the property and the City could not or would not stop him and worse, in hindsight, it appears that they provided these developers with a comprehensive list of specific property features that would prohibit the lands being rezoned and then stood back to watch while everyone of those features was stripped from the land; indicating that the City's astonishingly soft response to this series of events begs the question of what is the point of a planning process if it can be circumvented in this way to guarantee the financial interests of applicants; wondering when did we agree that we are all going to simply go through the motions while developers received the zoning changes and Official Plan Amendments that they wanted just by paying the fee and showing up for pre-consultations; enquiring how this acre and a half of wooded property, clearly visible on maps and familiar to anyone who has ever driven on Wonderland Road, was excluded from City schedules in the first place; indicating that if this was an oversight, it was a big one and defies explanation; advising that their Association sees no compelling information provided by the developers that supports their exfacto exertions that this woodland was not environmentally significant; indicating that it is safe to say that members of this community believe that staff felt compelled to determine that the site was not a significant woodland because the woodland was gone rather than because hard evidence convinced them otherwise; noting that in the absence of this evidence, in the absence of a woodland, what other choice would they have; indicating that there is a choice; indicating that rezoning was recently denied to a

developer who owns property within a significant woodland on Elviage Drive; noting that some trees had been removed despite the designation; indicating that the only difference here is that the Elviage Drive woods had been properly assessed and designated; advising that, for this application, these were destroyed before that process could be completed; asking the Planning and Environment Committee to refuse this application, not only because this developer had the cunning to clear cut the trees before the truth about the land could be established one way or the other, but because the proposal is flawed on so many levels and for so many reasons, many of which you will hear about this evening; indicating that there are reasons in the report of concerns that they submitted months back; advising that some of the concerns are the insufficient parking and the likelihood of spillover onto Old Wonderland Road, unsafe access to the property from Teeple Terrace and other traffic concerns and the u-turn lane there; advising that all it will take is one city bus and an SUV and that turning lane is blocked, it will serve no purpose; indicating that as traffic exits off one of the most heavily travelled arteries in this City, they are going to bump right up against the traffic that is stalled there, waiting to make a turn; expressing concern with the loss of privacy and quality of life for the immediate neighbours, the increase in noise pollution, which we have already experienced because the trees are gone and the introduction of light pollution from the parking lot flood lights; expressing concern with the interference with the root systems and moisture regime of neighbouring trees and inadequate allowances for retaining walls and privacy fences at its eastern boundary; indicating that this community continues to be troubled by many questions; wondering if this is what the future looks like for London's tree canopy; enquiring as to whether or not scrawny samplings plunked in the middle of baking asphalt parking lots are really meant to serve as a replacement for shade trees that have taken our life time to mature; wondering where the communities say in all of this is; wondering where our representatives are when we turn to them asking them to show leadership in charting our cities future course; wondering if our democratically elected Councilors are so beholden to London's developers that they no longer understand that city residents rely on them to be their public voice; enquiring in what ethical twilight zone is behavior like this developers rewarded; advising that London voters are all getting very tired of this whole mess; presenting to members of this Committee a petition that was started in September, 2013 following public notification of this rezoning application; advising that, since then, over 3,700 people who object to the rezoning and who oppose the removal of these trees, have signed it; advising that the 56 pages of comments that accompany these signatures speak volumes to the importance that London residents place on their natural heritage; requesting that the Committee pay these respondents the courtesy of reading their heartfelt remarks; indicating that they do not believe, for a moment, that the wide spread public opposition to this rezoning, represented by this petition, will be altered by the fact that the developer destroyed the woods in question; and, stating that, they believe that opposition to rezone this land is even stronger now given the public distaste for the applicants behaviour.

- David Hall, 439 Old Wonderland Road – indicating that his residence abuts the subject property; advising that the woodland has been there for at least 80 years and probably much longer; indicating that he moved his family to Old Wonderland Road 22 years ago; reiterating that some neighbours have been there much longer; stating that they have enjoyed the beautiful woods daily since moving in; noting that it has not only provided a screen and a buffer from the noise and busyness from Wonderland Road, it has also provided beauty to our neighbors, our property and our neighbourhood; indicating that it is a beauty that changes seasonally and has provided a dwelling for wildlife of various kinds; indicating that the photographs on the petition are of his backyard; indicating that it provides before and after photographs; advising that the property had been family owned for many decades and they realized that change would happen some day; reiterating that that change came on December 27 when the new owner, having only been there one year, came in and totally devastated the property thus changing the character of his property, his neighbours property and that of the whole neighbourhood; advising that his property is now completely exposed to Wonderland Road and they can now see and hear every car, transport truck, flatbed and emergency vehicle that passes by; indicating that anyone travelling down Wonderland Road can now see into his backyard and his family room; indicating that his property is now open to every pedestrian to cut through into his backyard; advising that they have lost considerable summer

shade and are now subject to light pollution, air pollution and noise pollution; expressing concern about the future of the mature trees near his property line; further expressing concern about the land and how it will further impact their properties; indicating that, although they knew that change would someday happen, it was the way it happened that bothered them; stating that it should give everyone concern; advising that their neighbourhood was approached by a different developer for another property being considered for development; advising that this developer had the courtesy to inform the neighbourhood of the situation and held community meetings to get feedback for their plans concerning that property; indicating that the neighbourhood was very willing to work with this developer to work out plans that would be agreeable to all parties; indicating that that is the kind of responsible developer that is a good corporate citizen; noting that that can hardly be said about this developer and his underhanded methods; advising that what is galling is that there are apparently no consequences; indicating that their neighbourhood worked within the process, the applicant did not and his actions demonstrate that; expressing concern for the process and they worry that the City will just roll over and say oh well to this whole thing; further expressing concern about the integrity of the City Council, the by-laws and the whole process; also expressing concern that the outcome may encourage further inconsiderate behavior on the part of all developers; advising that, right from the beginning, the application was full of what he will call inaccuracies, such as measurements, the description of the woodlot, the size of the lot, labelling, the incorrect street names; expressing shock that the Ministry of Natural Resources and the City's Planning and Transportation Divisions looked at the reports prepared by the developers hired consultants and gave the ok without really questioning the data; pointing out that instead we get phrases like the issues have been resolved to our satisfaction; questioning what that is supposed to mean; enquiring as to where the information and data to support that is; wondering how we can rely on their information about traffic and trees when they cannot even get the most basic things correct in a report; outlining the community concerns that they have an application for rezoning, a developer for whom they do not have much confidence in, a Planning Department that apparently tries to represent all sides but, ultimately, has let things slip by thus enabling the developer, a City with by-laws that apparently protect the developers but not residents and an outraged electorate; wondering if they have a Council that is willing to reward the system with an ok to this application for rezoning; hoping that this is not the case; advising that he is watching for the answers, he knows that his neighbours are watching, all of London is watching and you can be sure that the developers are watching and learning to see what else they can get away with; urging the Committee to do the right thing and not accept this application for rezoning; and, requesting that the City consider enacting new by-laws that restrict what a property owner can do to the property without consultation and restricting drastic changes, such as woodland destruction, that affect the whole community.

- David Winner, 497 Old Wonderland Road – indicating that he has lived there for 22 years and by an ironic twist of fate, he bought his house the same day that David Hall bought his house; noting that he wanted to buy David Hall's house but Mr. Hall signed his deal two hours before he could the same day; further noting that had he been more successful, he would have been in David Hall's position today, which is not one that anyone should envy; indicating that this is his neighbourhood and he does not want anyone to be fooled with the idea that this is not a single family neighbourhood; noting that there are condominiums on the northwest corner of Old Wonderland Road and Teeple Terrace, there are five of them; indicating that all of the doors that he has knocked on many times, are single family homes; advising that many of these homes have been there for decades and they are all unique in some way; indicating that the homes are all sited on land that is well treed; noting that this is what attracted him to David Hall's home in the first place; indicating that Mr. Hall's property has a lot of trees whereas his end of the street does not have as many; indicating that he walks past the former woodlot and now, quite frankly, as the other speakers have said, it is a blight on the landscape; advising that it all happened overnight; advising that the developers are here today and they have heard what other speakers have had to say; indicating that the Chair of the Planning and Environment Committee talked about a court of law; advising that, if someone had destroyed evidence in a court of law, they would probably be charged with obstruction of justice; noting that is not the case here; expressing appreciation to the very capable, articulate and passionate spokespeople from the Community

Association; indicating that it is his curbs that the spillover cars will be parked at; noting that it may not be a problem some of the time but it will be a problem if people on his street want to have guests staying at their homes or when the snow plows come down the street in the winter; indicating that it creates a lot of curbside traffic when the developer is asking to reduce the number of parking spaces from the 90's to the 80's; expressing concern that there is no setback, it is a zero setback; indicating that this property was a woodlot and now it is going to be replaced by a massive building compared to the adjacent architecture, that is going to reach right up to the lot lines; enquiring about the landscaping; wondering if it will be landscaping with concrete because there will not be much room in the parking area for islands with vegetation on them; indicating that there is very little to replace what the adjacent neighbours have enjoyed over the years; concurring with the comments about the traffic; noting that when he goes down the street, turns left onto Teeple Terrace and waits for the light to change, which seems like waiting forever, there is always a lineup of cars waiting for the same thing; wondering why you would augment that problem by bringing in a host of new cars particularly when we have those kinds of medical/dental services in the area; advising that, not so long ago, the Council approved the large medical building on Springbank Drive, near Berkshire Drive, which is only a few hundred yards away; reiterating that they are well serviced by medical buildings; indicating that they do not need to bring in people from across the city who have viable alternatives; advising that he brought this issue to the Council when he was a Councillor in 2000 or 2001; advising that they had some very needed infrastructure work done on Old Wonderland and we went through months and months of flooding; advising that the developer came back twice for more budget to complete that work because there was virtually a river running underground that no one had counted on; indicating that his basement, his neighbours basement and the home across the street were all flooded; noting that it cost tens of thousands of dollars in insurance money to repair the damage from the flooding; enquiring as to whether or not the proper hydrological studies have been completed for a building of this size; requesting that consideration be given for proper drainage; requesting that the Committee deny the development based on its scale, parking, traffic problems, the lack of landscaping amenities and the misconduct along the way; advising that he has only seen anything like this once and that was a number of years ago where a lot was clear cut in the middle of an application; and, indicating that it is just not right, it offends democratic sensibility and it flies in the face of all that is meaningful to the people in the Old Wonderland Community.

- Gary Brown – indicating that he used to cycle by this property to and from work for about eight years on what is probably the most dangerous bicycle lane he has ever seen in his life; advising that you cannot use the bicycle lane on Wonderland Road, you have to bicycle on the road; indicating that, at this intersection, if there is no car blocking the lane, which is less than half the time, you generally cut out onto the bike path because that is the safe route; guaranteeing that there are drainage problems here because the difference between being on a bike and in a car is that he sees the water coming out of the ground and running across the bike lane every time it rains so we know that happens and there is no denying it; indicating that the Transportation Department has signed off on this intersection as being safe for bicycles; stating that, based on every other intersection in London where there is a bike lane or a bike route, we have no concept of what a safe intersection for a bicycle is; advising that he brought this matter forward to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) when they were discussing the rezoning application; noting that not a single person on the TAC even knew that there was a bicycle lane here; advising that this was part of the reason that he really pushed for a Cycling Advisory Committee; stating that the City does not have the expertise to sign off on an intersection as being safe for cycling; expressing congratulations to the community as this is one of the biggest turnouts he has ever seen; indicating that he has expressed support for infill projects, whether it is to his political benefit or not if it is a good project; advising that this is not a good project; noting the belligerence shown by the developer and the disrespect shown to the Forest City; understanding staff's recommendations; noting that they have to make their recommendations based on the strict letter of our planning applications; advising that Councillors have a little more purview from that because you do not have to allow the rezoning of open space land; indicating that you can advise the applicant that the land was zoned open space when you bought it, the land is going to remain open space and we hope that you become good stewards of this



land; suggesting that we may need to think about protecting all of our trees in the Forest City; realizing that a lot of homeowners do not like the fact that you are going to tell them that they cannot cut down a tree in their own backyard but the law has to apply to everybody; indicating that if we are all going to have to give up that little bit of freedom to chop down our trees in our backyards so that we can say to a developer that you cannot cut down your trees either, they serve the public benefit; advising that every one of those trees took carbon dioxide out of our air, which is something that he has been told that our city is actually trying to reduce; advising that this option has been taken away from them; asking the Committee to not allow the rezoning of this land, leave it zoned OS1, do not allow traffic onto what is already an extremely dangerous route for cyclists; and, hoping that the Councillors do the right thing here for us.