

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 13. Property located at 312 Oxford Street East

- Guy Debock, 1394 Hastings Drive – understanding that there was an appeal to the recommendation; indicating that he would like to hear the results of the appeal; advising that he is not opposed to some of the issues in the appeal; indicating that he has met with the Counsel for 312 Oxford Street; expressing concern with how the result of the appeal might turn out; outlining that it depends on the conditions; reiterating that he has a concern, but at this point, he is ok with the Council recommendation; advising that he is one of the owners of the property located at 310 Oxford Street East; indicating that, the property located at 310 Oxford Street East, their building, is a triplex; expressing concern about sharing the driveway, which is exclusively theirs; indicating that you did see a vehicle parked out front in the photograph, which technically was the boulevard; indicating that that was his vehicle, it was a stop and go thing and that is what they use it for; noting that they sometimes use it for interchanging vehicles from the back where the parking lot is; advising that our primary concern is not so much that there is boulevard parking in front of 312 Oxford Street, their concern is how it gets accessed; hoping that it is not through their section of the roadway because then they would have no control of a vehicle blocking anybody in; indicating that, if parking were to be granted to 312 Oxford Street, we would hope that the access would be separate from theirs, off of Oxford Street; indicating that, then they have no objection; advising that he also thought that the Planning Department had mentioned that it was imperative that vehicles were, in this particular case, parked north-south, that east-west was not permitted; noting that it is a good suggestion, but he does not think that they would allow that; (*Secretary's Note: There was discussion between the Chair of the Planning and Environment Committee and Mr. Debock*); indicating that he just thought he would get his two cents in; advising that that is not what he said, what he said was, that, at that time, he had no issues, and the first issue that he has was only raised after you have given this gentleman some extra time before the motion was made to close the meeting.
- Tom Kelly, Kelly & Hayes, legal counsel for the applicant – indicating that the pictures are just to make it a little more real; outlining the history, that the property is located on Oxford Street, on the north side; advising that, to the right in the picture that was shown at the meeting, is the Shell gas station, that is at the northwest corner of Oxford Street and Waterloo Street; noting that this house is beside it; advising that the house has a 22 foot frontage and is 150 feet deep; indicating that there is no access to the rear yard; pointing out that the driveway shown on the photograph is primarily owned by the neighbours to the west so it has no way to access the rear yard; pointing out that the land to the east of the property is owned by the gas station; advising that, in the Notice of Objection that the Committee members have read in their material, there was an objection filed by the owner to the west; indicating that some of the material in that objection is incorrect; advising that it was stated that the owner of this property sold off a piece of land 40 years ago for \$10,000; pointing out that this is totally incorrect; indicating that he has done a title search and cannot find it; pointing out that there was a house, 312½ east of this house, which was sold to the gas station; indicating that there has never been a right-of-way, as far back in the books as he can go; outlining that, in terms of some of the objections, he thinks that the primary objections are traffic, which suggests that you would have to back out onto Oxford Street; noting that the reality is that the land in front of those houses is City of London land and if the parking spot was granted, you can make a three-point turn twice and go out front wise, you do not need to back out onto Oxford Street; advising that the second objection was from Forestry, in that creating a hard scrubbed parking spot, you would have to damage the roots; indicating that he would suspect that we could work with Forestry to work something out that would not damage the roots; mentioning that there was talk, in the material that you have, of it setting a precedent; outlining that Oxford Street, we all know what it is between Waterloo Street and Richmond Street, it is a lot of mixed housing; showing a photograph with boulevard parking out front; noting that this is a property approximately

four doors to the west; showing a photograph of a property approximately five doors east of the subject property, with boulevard parking; indicating that this is very straight forward, we are not setting a precedent; showing another property that is four doors east; outlining that the rest of the material that the Committee has is just the Notice, which he sees is in the Committee's Agenda; indicating that the next drawing that he is showing the Committee is the original proposal that the owner made; advising that she was told to go through Committee of Adjustment originally; advising that this is zoned for one or two family; noting that two families would require two parking spots; indicating that has changed, in consultation with your staff, to the one that you see, which is the single spot in the front; reiterating that that was changed, the two spots parallel to the street, were changed to that on consultation with your Planning people; outlining that, where we stand today is, we have a house at 312 Oxford Street, it has no parking, it has no possibility of getting parking, the neighbours to the west have been approached, and they adamantly refused to give a right-of-way over that driveway; advising that he had quite a lively meeting with the owner, the chap who is speaking today; advising that he is happy to work with the City; hoping that we can figure out a compromise that would solve the owners' problems and still get some viable parking; noting that it is very difficult in today's world to have a house without any parking; and, indicating that there are all sorts of reasons that they gave in the Notice of Appeal, but you have read all that; advising that he is a real estate lawyer and has been doing this for 36 years, he is not naïve and he is not wet behind the ears; reiterating that the neighbours were approached, they said no, adamantly; further reiterating that it was quite a lively meeting, and you get from that what I mean by that; advising that he is here representing the applicant; commenting on Councillor Henderson's comment; about talking to the neighbours, is not an option; noting that we tried that option and were shut down; and, indicating that, if that was an option we would not be here. (see attached photographs and communication.)