

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 29. Property located at 2118 Richmond Street (OZ-7890)

- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning – expressing support for the application; addressing the accommodations that have been made to this application, in response to the comments from the public, in response to comments from the review agencies and taking into account the direction from Council and the resolution from almost two years ago; advising that, it is our opinion that staff have interpreted the Council direction accurately because it very clearly says that the proposed apartment building is to be reduced by two floors; noting that there was an acknowledgement by Council that there was going to be a form of an apartment building on this site and rather than the 12 storeys that was proposed; however, it was to be reduced to 10 storeys; so that is very clear, there is no grey in that area; it also says that the proposed townhouses are to be built first or simultaneously with the apartment building; and, as you will recall, the original application, the precursor to this one, the townhouses were separate, they were not integrated as part of the apartment building and the concern was that the developer would only build the apartment and would not build the townhouses; reiterating that this part of the Council resolution was very clear as well, to make sure that those townhouse units were an integral part of the apartments so that the façade facing Sunningdale would have that mid-rise townhouse form of development and it would have that integral and that there was some certainty that it would be constructed; believing that the application before you does address that, and, in terms of the balance of the resolution that says to come back with a proposal that may be more acceptable to the residents; noting that some of the concerns that were raised were related to concerns of the loss of privacy, the lack of screening and the amount of traffic going in and out of the site; advising that what the developer has done in this time frame has dramatically changed the design of the building; noting that it has been a complete redesign, there has been extensive landscaping incorporated into the site, the large amount of surface parking has been put into the underground, there was a parking court in front of all of those townhouse units that has been entirely eliminated and that whole area is going to be landscaped with mature trees and public amenity space, the street orientation is set back a considerable distance from the low density residential homes on the south side of Sunningdale Road; expressing agreement with staff's interpretation that, putting this in the context of the Area Plan, that medium density is oriented along Sunningdale Road, the high density is oriented along Richmond Street and that is exactly what this development incorporates is that principle, of medium density along Sunningdale Road and high density along Richmond Street; indicating that, if we put this into context, within the Area Plan, on the opposite side of Sunningdale Road, you have a very large community commercial area that is going to be developed and on the southwest corner, you also have commercial development and so to have this mid and higher density development within walking distance of commercial uses is totally in conformity with your Official Plan policies and, in fact, this development meets all of the locational criteria for high density so I appreciate that the Area Plan and direction from Council was to work within the context of the Area Plan; indicating that the Area Plan is 11 years old; indicating that she was part of the consulting firm that was involved in developing the Area Plan so she understands the context of that; advising that they worked with the City in preparing the Area Plan; advising that there was a specific request by Mr. Drewlo and his company to have a large concentration of high density in the lands that they owned and so that request was made; recollecting that there was not a deliberate intent not to have high density at the intersection because that, in many cases, is where you want your high density, right at the intersection, but rather, there was a request by a developer, who specializes in high density, to concentrate a fair number of high density to the north; advising that, if you look at the Official Plan, which is the guiding document that we ultimately have to have regard for, this site does meet the locational criteria for high density; and we have agreed with staff not to change the Official Plan from medium to high, but to keep it in the medium density and allow for that bonusing provision but

there are performance criteria that have to be satisfied in order for that high density to be achieved and those performance criteria speak directly to the issues that were raised by the public; indicating that it reinforces the direction from Council to work within the context of the community plan and bring back a proposal that would, in some ways, make the residents happier; expressing appreciation that, for those residents that are not happy with any form of high density, this is not going to achieve that goal; however, she would submit to you that the proposal before you does accurately implement the direction of Council; advising that there are several other high density developments within close proximity to this site, the existing Tricar development further south on Richmond Street, which is much higher than this, directly across from low density residential and there is the recently approved Tricar development, further to the west, on Sunningdale, and again, both of those sites were previously designated medium density and those Area Plans were changed to high density; reminding the Committee that she was here, on behalf of another York development, at 545 Fanshawe Park Road several months ago and that site was almost identical to this in terms of the Official Plan policy context; noting that it was in close proximity to two major arterial roads and an intersection, designated medium density, within walking distance of a community shopping area, with low density on the opposite side of Fanshawe Park Road and adjacent to high density; noting that, in that case, the Committee and Council unanimously approved that and said that this is the type of quality development that we want to see in the city of London; indicating that this application, in policy context, from a planning perspective, is no different; requesting that the Committee accept the recommendations before you this evening; advising that she does not see anything in the resolution that talks about a density of 75 units per hectare so she is not sure where that reference is coming from; advising that, through the bonusing, you can go above 75 units per hectare; reiterating her very first comment that the resolution was very clear in that Council directed that the staff meet with the applicant to request that the application be revised in order that the proposed apartment building be reduced by two floors; reiterating that there was an acknowledgement that there would be an apartment building but it had to be reduced by two floors; reiterating that the Official Plan allows for bonusing provisions, what staff have done, is that they have taken the medium density residential policies and they have maintained that designation on this site and they have used the bonusing provisions that are set out in the Official Plan to allow for that additional density through the performance criteria; advising that, if the developer does not meet those performance criteria they are not able to achieve the density bonusing and so they have done that in the context of the medium density; noting that, if the high density residential had been maintained, the high density would have been achieved without any of these performance criteria so that is the main difference between what is before you this evening and what was before you two years ago; reiterating that it is tied to specific performance criteria that, in their interpretation, are intended to make the residents happier, which is how they have interpreted it, so that these performance criteria speak directly to the issues that were raised directly by the public; indicating that there has not been any public consultation; noting that the direction from Council was that the Civic Administration be asked to meet with the applicant and to report back on the results of these meetings; reiterating that there was not any clear direction that she can see anywhere in the resolution to meet with the residents; advising that she has heard from the people that have spoken that they are not against development but they do not want to see any changes made to either the Official Plan or the Area Plan; reiterating that there is a process, within this city and most other municipalities in the Province, that allow for amendments to be made; relating to the Official Plan, there are very specific criteria, in your Official Plan, which this Council approved, that says that amendments can be permitted and these are the criteria that have to be evaluated and this application met those criteria; indicating that, if we never accepted applications on the basis that they were different from what was previously approved, you would never have any applications before you for amendments because you could only build what was in an approved Area Plan or what was in an approved Official Plan and the only changes that could happen is when the City does their comprehensive five year review; reiterating that there is a process that allows for these amendments and this application falls within that process; indicating that, part of the challenge with the Area Plans is that

they do not undergo a five year update; advising that the Uplands Area Plan was prepared in 2003 and it has not been changed; indicating that it pre-dated the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and it predates the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement so she would argue that the Area Plan was appropriate in 2003, but it has not been updated and your Official Plan has been updated; reiterating that the Official Plan identifies the criteria that needs to be satisfied for this form of development; reiterating that this site meets those criteria, the amendments are appropriate and that the process follows that and that there is public consultation; reiterating that there were previous meetings, as Mr. Soufan indicated, on the earlier applications; noting that this is the opportunity for the public, you have heard from them and there will be further public meetings as part of the site plan process; believing that there was some misunderstanding in terms of the Council resolution; reiterating that there will be public participation for site plan, that is not automatic, the *Planning Act* does not require a public participation meeting for site plan, but in this case, Council said that they want a public participation meeting when this application comes back for site plan and that will be adhered to; indicating that there has not been any shirking of that responsibility by the applicant, it is just that they are not at that stage; and, indicating that, in terms of the traffic, this is a major arterial road and this is exactly the type of development that the Committee wants to see at a major arterial road, within walking distance of shopping.

- Ali Soufan, York Developments, applicant – advising that Mrs. Wiebe has only been involved in this aspect of the application; during the original 2012 submission for the 15 storey high density proposal, we had numerous public consultation meetings at the YMCA on Sunningdale Road and Adelaide Street North; recalling that their group held two public consultation meetings on the high density proposal; indicating that City staff was there at one point in time; indicating that the direction back, the way that they understood it, was that they would implement mitigating measures to try to enhance the features and he believes that Mrs. B. Debbert, Senior Planner, had consultation with the community; and, advising that they have met with Mrs. B. Debbert to try to apply some of that mitigating criteria and Mrs. Debbert subsequently met with the community as the liaison between; *Secretary's Note: Mrs. Debbert indicated that City staff sent out the revised notices with the new information, collected feedback and incorporated that into consideration of the application*); apologizing as he had understood that there was consultation between City staff and the community.
- Tony Cottle, 2058 Richmond Street – indicating that there was a reference made to several other buildings in the area that are similar in structure and requesting that the Committee repeat what Mrs. Wiebe said, please; advising that he does not see these buildings as similar because the Tricar, the building on Sunningdale Road, the one that has just gone up, has an area of over three hectares that they are building the site on; and, reiterating that he does not see how that is similar to a development that has 0.86 hectares.
- Tracy Quinton, 29 Sunningdale Road East, on behalf of the Uplands Community Neighbourhood – pointing out that they are well represented this evening and for the sake of the Committee's agenda and time, they will limit to four presentations which will be short and concise; speaking to the Ontario Municipal Board ruling of October, 2009; however, Mayor Baechler did a fantastic job reading most of her presentation without ever seeing it; advising that she lives directly across from the subject property; realizing that some people would say that her being here all of the time, over and over again, may seem personal and that would be true, but it is more than that, it is based on principle; indicating that the principle is that there is an Official Plan; noting that she drew that document, that she looked it up and went through it with due diligence before buying her house; advising that, this evening, we see a picture and based on multi-family medium density, my interpretation would be what the front of the building looks like on the lower level; reiterating that this would be her interpretation; reiterating that it would not be the high rise building and the look of it; indicating that Mr. Stevanko, of the Ontario Municipal Board ruling, was very clear about sticking to the Official Plan and she finds it disappointing that they have to keep coming back over and over again to address the same; realizing that it is two floors less but by the same token, it is still a high rise and does not fit with their neighbourhood; reiterating that it does not fit with what they saw as the Official Plan and what they agreed to; advising that four storeys would be

acceptable, but not 10 storeys regardless of the nice drawing and the efforts that have been made, but it does not fit with them.

- Claudio De Vincenzo, 10 Redford Road – indicating that, on one of the drawings of the view point, you can see his house; reiterating that only four people are going to speak, but they had lineups of 34 people that wanted to speak; expressing appreciation for the opportunity to address the Committee; indicating that this is their third or fourth time coming to the Committee to speak on this particular property; indicating that it is a very important point for their community; advising that this is not a “Not in My Backyard” situation for them, the opposition to the proposal, actually, it is quite the opposite, the main reason being is that we were all mostly involved with the original planning documentation after we were annexed in 1993; indicating that as you have read and heard before, from residents, they all agreed on a process; advising that they did not agree with the medium density originally; noting that they wanted low density; indicating that they came to a compromise and that compromise said medium density and they can live with that and that is all that they have asked for ever since; speaking to the Municipal Council resolution dated March 21, 2012; noting that, in that letter, Mrs. C. Saunders, City Clerk, issued the letter to all parties, and as the Mayor mentioned earlier it referred to clause 19 being referred back to the Committee for further discussions with the developer; noting that these discussions obviously took place; further noting that he does not disagree with that point; indicating that another point was to come to an amicable solution that the residents might be happier; advising that this has not been done as no one contacted the residents as was just clarified a few moments ago, other than through the Notice; advising that, based on the number of letters sent to the City, none of the residents are happy; advising that, in the context of the letter, it specifically states that the medium density policies and regulations and in the context of the community plan; reiterating that this has obviously not been done; indicating that, with all due respect to Mrs. C. Wiebe, who constantly referred to the letter where Council said to reduce the building by two floors; noting that it is a very long letter and it does not just talk about reducing two floors, there are other aspects of the letter that have been failed to be mentioned; indicating that one section of the letter talks about clause 19, paragraph b, i) to v), there are five items listed in that letter, one of which dealt directly with the area residents; finding it interesting that all of the other items seem to have been addressed, in the recent offering, except what he believes to be the single most important point, not only for the City, but also for the residents and the taxpayers who live in the area, which is b) v), which is the holding of a public site meeting, which, he does not believe has happened; advising that he has lived in Uplands since 1988, predating annexation; indicating that the residents in Uplands are very good people who love the city, now that they are a part of it and they contribute to it every day; treating them dismissively by not having a public meeting, which this letter clearly states should happen, he thinks, is disrespectful to the residents; and, indicating that his final point with regards to the proposal is the issue of bonusing; indicating that, nowhere, in any previous discussions or letters from the Municipal Council in 2012 was the term “bonusing” mentioned nor did it raise much of an eyebrow at the time, until now; identifying there have been discussions about 75 units versus 107 units; indicating that we are discussing a property that is approximately 0.75 of a hectare; noting that it is not even a hectare; believing that approximately 52 units, based on the medium density, would be allowed, but with the bonusing allowed and allotted in this plan, of 123 units and he did some quick math, that is 136 percent larger than is allowed under the medium density plan; indicating that he thinks that someone won the lottery here to get a bonusing of 136 percent over and above what you could put on a 0.75 hectare; advising that the most interesting point of this is that the developer was only asking for 107 so that is an area that I really do not understand; suggesting that bonusing on a medium density building, which the previous speaker mentioned would be four levels, would be in the ten percent range, five or six apartments on top of 52; indicating that that is something that, to him, would be reasonable amount, but 123 on a 0.75 hectare is totally unreasonable; requesting that the Committee reject the recommendation; advising that they are not disrespecting the Planning staff as they obviously put a lot of work into this; advising that we need to stick to the medium density plan as everyone agreed to; requesting that they are not to be dragged into another one of these meetings in two

years or three years unless they have first been consulted, in a public site plan meeting, as the letter states in 2012 and that the developers proposals put forth are more in sync with the Official Plan; indicating that staff mentioned earlier, that maybe they do not always get it right, maybe the interpretation was wrong; and, believing that that is exactly what has happened and with all due respect with the work that has been done, perhaps the Planners and the staff may want to rescind the recommendation this evening.

- Tom Slade, 37 Uplands – indicating that the site plan provided at the Planning and Environment Committee meeting is not the site plan that was circulated to them; noting that the new plan has a lot more surface parking and the original plan only had 12 parking spaces; indicating that the footprint areas of the proposed buildings are excessive due to the size of the 0.8 hectare site, there are only ten parking spots, as well as two handicapped parking spots were shown on the plan that they received a few days ago; noting that there has obviously been amendments made in the last two days; commenting that, if this was an adequate number, it obviously is not now that they show more parking spaces; noting that just having the 12 parking spots on the plan was ridiculous; further noting that this means that approximately 160 spots would be underground; indicating that there was no provision for visitors parking; advising that there is no provision shown on the site plan for bulk garbage containers, which takes up a fair area; indicating that it would be a real challenge for a truck to navigate around the winding road and snow removal is going to be a problem; indicating that, to approve the access entry and exit onto Sunningdale Road East, as shown, is poor planning; indicating that the Sunningdale Road widening is to be done in the near future; enquiring as to why not conform to the new proposed new limit widths and at least indicate how it would eventually be altered if constructed as shown; indicating that, if any thought is given to new internal access roads to the east or the north by Drewlo, it will not happen; indicating that it is on record, here at the City, from previous applications and meetings, that the Council would not grant that at all so there is no access now, or in the future, for the north or the east access internally within that property so those two access and entrance ways will stay there; indicating that the setback of the building units facing Richmond Street is too close for comfort, with pollution and traffic noise on busy highways; reiterating that it is not a sound feature for the development; outlining that the Imperial Oil pipeline relocation has been mentioned tonight and it was said that it has been discussed but they have heard nothing on how it is going to be relocated; advising that it is definitely going to be a very expensive cost to the City; stating that, if York Developments had done their due diligence, very early on, when buying this property, he doubts if we would be here tonight for our fourth meeting at City Hall; realizing that it is vital for York Developments to maximize the number of units for this site; however, not at the homeowners expense by trying to radically change the zoning from what was long a established community accepted development solution for the whole area; and, repeating the mantra, “Stay with the plan”.
- Philip Weibe, 73 Sunningdale Road East – expressing appreciation for the opportunity to speak to the Committee with respect to this matter; advising that London’s future, as we know it, relies on a London’s future, as we know it, relies on a very important policy program, a very important process; indicating that Councillor Polhill brought up part of the process that we are talking about is that we are looking at is a zoning issue first and a development issue after; advising that he likes how Councillor Polhill put that because that is exactly what he sees as well; indicating that this issue is about a zoning issue and he does not think that we should lose sight of that; realizing that there have been many groups that have been involved, as he has shown on an illustration that he presented at the meeting, of all the groups of people that have been involved in this process and this has taken place over, from what he understands, greater than a decade of time; indicating that we are now in the process of asking whether or not we are going to rescind this and we are now going to turn this around to something else; believing that that is what is at stake here; indicating that this process recognizing that their neighbourhoods are involved in these decisions, and for you to not come to us and to not ask us was, in our opinion, a major mistake; advising that we are recognized as the strength of our community and we are part of the foundation of London’s future; indicating that this is stated very clearly in the mantra of London and this is what we stand for here, in this room, right now; indicating that the intent of the Uplands North

Community Plan was to use a designation in order to protect communities that were already in existence during this annexation; indicating that they can spin this around however they want, they can say that, oh, well, there is a façade of a townhouse which is supposed to address the fact that this is supposed to be medium density zoning; showing a map of the area that is all supposed to be medium density; indicating that this façade is exactly how they view this, that it is a façade, that it is not actually a medium density with bonusing, this is actually a high density is what it is; indicating that it was stated by Mrs. Wiebe, over and over, that she related this to a high density change in this spot, a high density change in this, then she said that no, this is medium density with zoning, but she stated three times the words “high density”; adding that, with all of this work to be done was apparently landscaping; noting that he heard the word “landscaping” used three times during the explanation of what wonderful work York Developments has done in landscaping; indicating that this is a landscaping redesign; indicating that this process has been built on the hard work done over many years; talking about setting a precedent, you want to talk about high density that happened over here and here, he would like to say that this was rejected by the Council, by Staff, by the Ontario Municipal Board and he would like to use precedent in that regard, as well, because if we want to use precedent one way, we can use precedent another way; advising that this has been rejected three times, this is our fourth time here; advising that policy 3.4 states that “for a site outside of the downtown area, high density residential sites shall exceed 3 hectare in size”; noting that this site is 0.7 hectares in size; advising that residential land use designation states that “Medium density “shall have low rise form and serve as a transition between low density residential development” and to “not exceed four storeys”; advising that, if staff are trying to understand what this is supposed to be and how this is supposed to fit into the context of the form, this has taken quotes straight out of London development guidelines; indicating that the previous grounds for refusal have not changed; enquiring as to what is at stake over this decision; indicating that that is the big question; advising that a decision to support this, to change the Official Plan will be of such magnitude that it will, as the Ontario Municipal Board has stated, it will subvert the community involvement in these processes, it will subvert the process that is at work, in London, in order to be able to move forward; noting that that is what they are all trying to do here; indicating that this will have a domino effect, a devastating effect on development plans, not only for this area, but for all of London; advising that, if he goes and talks to his neighbours in the community and ask them what their feeling is on communities involvement in city planning, he thinks you know what their answers are, but it is very sad to hear; noting that the answers that the community give are “it does not matter” what communities say and what that breeds is apathy, people do not care and depression and that is what is happening; advising that this proposal is not in the context of medium density residential policies and regulations and is not in the context of the community plan; indicating that this community plan, in North London, is the community plan that has held up as a plan of integrity; advising that this was stated by the Ontario Municipal Board that this is a plan of integrity and this is what this stands for; advising that, to go against this is a major setback in what the City of London stands for; indicating that, in his opinion, being here four times is three times too many; and, indicating that medium density means medium density.

- Stan Brown, 75 Pine Ridge Grove, President, Stoneybrook Heights-Uplands Residents Association – indicating that the previous speaker said a lot of the points that he wanted to make; advising that this is getting incredibly frustrating; indicating that every time he comes here, the last four times, is because of a developer wanting to go from medium density to high density and it keeps happening and it is incredibly frustrating; indicating that the Community Plan was developed, as was stated, by many, many people and organizations over many years; indicating that the developer knew this and raised no objections until it is time to build; advising that he was here a few months ago on the application relating to the Garibaldi Avenue situation; indicating that, quoted in this developers justification, as the reason why this should be high density because you did it in the Blackwater/ Garibaldi situation; advising that what you are looking at is medium density all along Sunningdale Road and every developer is going to come in to put a high rise because you keep doing it; advising that medium density is 75 units per hectare, which is four storeys; reiterating that the developer knew this and has known it

all along; enquiring as to why this keeps coming back; indicating that this just needs to be rejected; recommending that the applicant comes back with a medium density application; reiterating that that is what is called for and what the community agreed to; indicating that he has never received a word from the developer or the Planning Department asking his opinion or that of the residents; advising that this proposal, which stated meetings, they never happened; indicating that he does not know about the meetings a few years ago; noting that he was not notified; asking the Committee to do their job; reminding the Committee that they are elected by the community; asking that matters are interpreted the way that they are meant to be; indicating that the developer has one vote, the same as he does; looking at a really frustrating situation at all levels of government, which are becoming more detached from the people and more attached to business; advising that it is the people that are the city, the community; and, requesting that they be listened to or you will have no more community doing any work for you.

- Gloria McGinn-McTeer, Urban League of London – advising that what she is hearing from discussions that went on a decade ago when the Community Plan was put in place, it is easy to lose sight of what went on there; indicating that the current Mayor and she attended almost all of the; in meetings for the planning process for area planning; advising that they were the first community planning group for the first community plan in London; indicating that they paid attention to it and there was immense discussion about ensuring that medium density along Sunningdale Road, all the way along, just as it showed on the map, was paramount and part of the reason for that was out of respect for the Uplands community as well as the single family dwellings that were subsequently built in the other Uplands area; expressing shock to hear that maybe that was not the case, but she can tell you that it was a very detailed process and there is a reason that medium density was placed there; advising that the reason that the medium density includes all of this 0.8 or 0.75 hectares is because that is what it supports, is medium density; indicating that it never supported a high density there as it is a small, little spot; advising that, when she was here the last time, her understanding was that it was going to be a public participation meeting for a plan that was coming forward or had come forward; indicating that, at the meeting, Mr. Soufan said no, he had another one right here; indicating that you cannot have a public participation meeting on a plan that no one has seen yet; noting that the Planning and Environment Committee let this go ahead; advising that the only person who spoke was Mr. Soufan and his representative; indicating that it is unacceptable to drag people down here like this; advising that, when these things happen, and when we talk about civic fatigue, this is what you get; thanking these people for coming out and caring enough to talk about their community and their understanding of what was going to be built surrounding it, but, if you continue to operate in this manner, no one is going to come out; enquiring as to who is going to waste their time; advising that there is no one here who is against development as it is prescribed in the Official Plan; indicating that they had input into that over years; advising that it makes you feel rather useless, that your voice means nothing, in a time when, if London is ever going to get over itself; indicating that what we need to do is engage people and people are willing to be engaged; advising that they are not willing to be engaged four or five or six times for the same thing; indicating that the development site itself speaks volumes, so fine, a developer bought it, but that does not mean that he gets to shoehorn in something that just does not fit, was not even expected and that he continues to come forward at a meeting like the last one and say that he has another plan; seeing that there is a plan to have eight mature trees planted, which is supposed to deal with the tree situation; expressing concern with traffic; recalling when many people from the area spoke to the Committee about their concerns with the increased traffic and the inability of people to get out of their houses along Sunningdale Road; advising that there have been no changes to that road; indicating that she is not sure when the Sunningdale Road widening would occur; however, she believes that it will be in 2019 or 2020, which is quite a few years from now; indicating that it is more important that they stick with medium density along Sunningdale Road and wait for the roads to catch up because that is what happens; expressing concern with walkability; noting that it is fine to say that all of this stuff is here and that you can walk to it but if you are pushing a carriage across five lanes, that does not work very well; expressing concern as there are a lot of elderly people with walkers and they are not going to go across there any faster;

reiterating that the walkability of the city is important; and, indicating that it would be nice if the roads kept up with the development because, for sure, something is going to go into that, but let us make sure that it is what is in the Official Plan right now.

- Madeline Quinton, 29 Sunningdale Road East – indicating that she lives right across from where the proposed development will be; reiterating that this will not make them happier because they are not happy at all; indicating that this is an established community where a lot of people have lived for a lot of years and it continues to grow; advising that they have a breakfast every July 1 and the whole community is involved; enquiring as to why this development is continuing to come back to the Committee after they have fought it numerous times and they continue to come back to the same points and it is still not anything to what they agreed to and there is no minimal support to this; noting that there is no support for this application and they are not happy with what is being done; and, enquiring as to why, when they are coming back with the same points, they are not being heard and why nothing is changing.