

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

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

- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning, on behalf of York Developments – commenting on the meeting that they had with the residents and she would say that the meeting, even though the opinions were quite divergent, it was a respectful meeting and she appreciates that the residents came willing to listen and she would also say that York wanted to hear from the residents; noting that sometimes these meetings can deteriorate into a shouting match and she believes that they were all working at their hardest to make sure that there was a respectful conversation, but as Mr. Tomazincic said, at the end of the day, she thinks that the sticking point was the height of the building, with the residents really wanting to see something in the four to six-storey range and the developer saying that that simply was not feasible on this site; pointing out that, if you look on the site plan map, you can see where those townhouses are located and they are setback 20 metres (66 feet) from the pipeline and that represents about a third of the property, so the challenge with this site, notwithstanding that it is designated medium density, is that a third of the site cannot be built on anyway as there is a setback for that pipeline; reiterating that one third of that site is compromised; indicating that the density that would otherwise be available on a site that did not have that restriction, could be accommodated on the entire property; advising that, in essence, what is now required is that the density that the land area would otherwise provide has to be accommodated on the back two-thirds of the site and essentially what has happened is, in addition to the bonusing, that density has all been transferred to that northerly half and as staff have said, there has been a very concerted effort on behalf of York Developments to provide a transitioning of that height so that the building that is closest to Sunningdale Road will have that three storey that steps up to eight, then it goes up to nine and then up to ten; advising that we are not talking about an apartment building that is ten stories in its entirety; indicating that the furthest area, which is approximately fifty-eight metres to the property line, probably closer to sixty metres, to the actual residences; advising that they are talking about almost 200 feet setback from that ten storey building; requesting that the Committee take into account that if you look at this intersection and you say, what is the appropriate form of development for an intersection of two major arterial roads, Richmond Street and Sunningdale Road; indicating that if you look at all four quadrants, on the southeast corner, there is an existing development and they need to be respectful of that and they need to recognize that that existing low density residential neighbourhood has been there for quite some time and we want to make sure that there is minimal impact on that neighbourhood; indicating that, if you look to the west, the southwest corner, that site is designated as a Community Commercial Node; indicating that, if you look at the northwest quadrant, that site is designated as Community Commercial Node, so when those to remaining vacant quadrants are going to get developed, there is going to be a much higher level of development at this intersection than this development is going to create; indicating that the impact from this development, in her opinion, is going to be far less significant than the commercial development that is proposed and is approved in the existing Official Plan so we need to look at it in context, even though those sites are vacant today, the intent is that this intersection is going to develop for a significant amount of commercial development over time; taking that in to account, it is important that you have those densities in close proximity to support that commercial development so we need to look at all of those planning principles that are espoused in your own Official Plan; advising that this development falls within that policy framework; requesting that the Committee take that into account in your deliberations and ask yourself if this is an appropriate form of development at this location; taking into account what is anticipated to develop on the other two corners of that intersection; summarizing that they are in support of the staff recommendations; indicating that it is unfortunate that the two sides could not come to an agreement at the end, but, from a planning perspective, it is her opinion that this is an appropriate development, that the developer has made a number of changes to that

proposal to ensure that the existing residents on the south side of Sunningdale Road will have minimal impact; pointing out that, with the removal of those trees, staff have asked that the developer provide, not just small caliber trees, but these would be large, mature trees that would have to be spaded in so that there would be some immediate visual street trees along Sunningdale Road frontage; requesting that the Committee take all of this into consideration in your deliberations; indicating that there were quite a number of comments that were made and she is going to try and focus on some of the key issues; indicating that a recurring theme from all of the delegations was their reliance on the Area Plan; thinking that it bears repeating that she knows everyone knows this, but that Area Plan was done in 2002 and it has not been updated; pointing out that the Official Plan gets updated every five years and the Province mandates that so that planning policies can be updated and stay current with changes in land use; advising that, at the time that the Uplands North Area Plan was developed, there were no Area Plans for the lands to the west, it was agricultural; indicating that the context for when that Area Plan was developed has changed considerably; reiterating that we need to take that into account; indicating that we all know that Area Plans do get amended and Official Plans get amended; advising that, to suggest that, in this particular case, in this particular situation, an Area Plan should not be amended is really not recognizing that this is something that happens throughout the City; pointing out that another comment that was made is that this development is not compatible with low density or single family housing, but there are numerous examples throughout this City where there are high density, medium high density residential development directly across from low density and there has been a concerted effort made by the developer to transition that height in the most appropriate manner to respect that existing low density residential; relating to the Imperial Oil pipeline, the letter that they just received indicated that mature trees could not be planted on the easement; noting that the easement is approximately three metres along the frontage so it is a very narrow strip of land directly along Sunningdale Road; indicating that the Plan did show some of those trees, probably encroaching in that easement; advising that what that means is that those trees would simply be shifted back; pointing out that there is still a considerable distance between the front façade of the townhouses and the actual easement itself but there is an ample area for planting mature trees; reiterating that the comments from Imperial Oil will not prevent or hinder the planting of those high trees; relating to the concerns about cut-through traffic, she suggests that the removal of the access to Sunningdale Road would certainly go a long way to alleviating that; indicating that she is not anticipating, and does not want to get into this in any detail because she is not a traffic engineer, but she cannot imagine that people going to this development, with the access off of Richmond Street, would have any need to cut through this neighbourhood; indicating that, on the other hand, we all need to be aware that as development in this area continues to occur on the north side of Sunningdale Road and to the west, there is going to be an increase in traffic along Richmond Street and along Sunningdale Road, so there will be an indirect impact for the existing residents in that neighbourhood regardless of what happens on this particular property; noting that the City is growing up around them and there is going to be an impact regardless of what happens; ensuring that all of this is taken into context; relating to the comments about the bonus zoning and the mix of height and densities and the reference to the policies in the Official Plan that talks about high density designations that should be greater than three hectares in size; pointing out that what that policy means, and she knows this because she specifically dealt with this at an Ontario Municipal Board hearing and, what it says is that where you have a high density designation of three hectares or greater there needs to be a variety of height within that three hectares; indicating that it does not mean that you cannot have a mixing of height and density in areas that are smaller than three hectares so, what it really says, is that if you have a large area of three hectares or more, the policy encourages a mixing of height and density; reiterating that any amendment to the Official Plan or an Area Plan comes under scrutiny and it comes under evaluation and those changes that are being requested are thoroughly evaluated by professional staff and you have professional staff that you rely on to make that evaluation; and, pointing out that not every amendment gets approved but, for it to be considered, there has to be careful consideration and your staff have done that, they have undertaken a thorough evaluation, they have looked at

the traffic, they have looked at the land use and your professional staff feel that this is appropriate, that it is a good development and that those amendments are appropriate.

- Catherine Munn, 2090 Richmond Street – indicating that her residence is located on the southeast corner of Richmond Street and Sunningdale Road, immediately south of the picture shown on the screen during the meeting; advising that her role, as part of the community presentation, is to review for you the past submissions that they have made and to update those for you over the long lifetime of this application; indicating that the Committee will then hear from Tom Slade, providing a perspective of being a long-time resident; Claudio DeVincenzo, who is going to talk about bonusing, Tracy Quinton who will talk about procedural and other concerns and Phil Wiebe who will bring a conclusion to our presentation; indicating that each of them will respect the Committee's time and Agenda by condensing their comments to as short a time as possible, in the area of five minutes or less each, but we do invite your questions; indicating that they do not feel any less strongly than they did when they came here in response to the initial application of 15 stories in the original version of this application; reiterating that they do not want to take too long in explaining that to the Committee; expressing appreciation to the Planning staff, in addition to arranging the meeting in August, another meeting was arranged as recently as last week and it is referred to in the report of September 18 so they have been making an effort to try to answer the concerns of the residents, the people in the neighbourhood; moving quickly through what you have heard from us before, in summary form; indicating that, first of all the Plan, this is the London North Area Plan; noting that this was a project of the 1990's, immediately after annexation for quite a few years; indicating that their former Councillor, now the Mayor, was involved in that with its development in that time and certainly, Councillor Swan also was actively involved with the development of that Community Plan; indicating that landowners who bought after that certainly had the information that the plan was in place and it is their view, as members of this neighbourhood, that a subsequent purchaser of 10.7 hectare parcel of land should not be able to kick out all the work of the community over all those years in developing that Community Plan; indicating that the idea of the plan was to have a gradual increasing of densities so the existing 50 plus years subdivision along the south side of Sunningdale Road was single family, on the north side of Sunningdale was to be medium density and to the north of that, moving in the direction towards Arva, was to be where the high density then became applicable; advising that one of their concerns is that if you were to accept this application and put a higher density, high rise building at the corner of Richmond Street and Sunningdale Road, that then creates a template for the whole row of development across to the north of our homes on Sunningdale Road; noting that then one of their concerns is then becomes the whole row of high rises exactly what the Plan was trying to address that that would not happen, that it would be their single family homes and then immediately across the road, a high rise development, that was specifically not part of the Plan; touching on some of the other matters, the Sunningdale Road widening has been referred to; indicating that, if you look at page 54 of the staff report in your Agenda, there is a picture that shows the road widening drawings and, if you look along the south side of the road, there are a lot of trees in the road allowance when you look at that picture of where the road is going to be widened along the south side of the road and it is our submission to you that those trees, while they are not necessarily gone because the final decision, we understand, of exactly the road design is not decided so there may be some possibility of change; advising that some of them, most likely all of them will be gone and probably many of the ones that are inside our property lines will also be gone because of the effect of the road work on those existing trees, so effectively, we will end up with probably very few, if any, of the mature trees along the south side of Sunningdale Road; advising that, that as a visual and auditory screen is gone; advising that the trees, on the north side of the road, there was mention of putting mature trees by Mrs. Wiebe and in the proposal she noticed that there was mention, specifically, of nine trees that would specifically be committed to; noting that, in the addendum to tonight's Agenda, there is a letter from Imperial Oil which refers to the fact that trees are not to be planted on the pipeline easement, which is on the north side of Sunningdale Road, which means that she does not know the effect, she has not had a chance to look at it, but chances are, looking at this picture, that those trees that are drawn along the south side of this building are in

the pipeline easement and, to the extent that they are, they would not be permitted according to Imperial Oil; discussing the traffic, cut through traffic, so high speed traffic moving quickly through the Uplands neighbourhood has been a concern for a long time; noting that it is winding streets, no sidewalks and no streetlights in that area; advising that this has been an issue that they have addressed on many occasions at these meetings as well as in letters and e-mails in the past; expressing surprise at learning, at the meeting last Thursday, that, according to the two representatives of the Transportation Planning staff that they were not aware of the concerns of the neighbourhood; hoping that the fact that there has not apparently been specifically a complaint actually registered can be a hurdle that we can clear and get addressing the safety issues with some traffic calming concerns, which are concerns now, not waiting until this gets built; reiterating that their concern, of course, is that more people come to the area, anybody exiting this property and planning to go east onto Richmond Street with the new design and travel east on Sunningdale Road, in all likelihood, just exacerbating the traffic issues in that neighbourhood so this continues to be an issue that needs to be addressed; indicating that there has been a great deal made about the stepped back and the design of townhouse like structures along the south side of the building; taking, as an example, the building that immediately faces our homes across Richmond Street, the Tricar building, which is, by her count, twelve stories; noting that, when she looked at it from the front, she could count the twelve stories and certainly, from the north side, the Sunningdale Road side, it is still twelve stories and it has the top two stories stepped back as well; indicating that she does not think that that changes the view for them looking at the street level from this ten storey building right across the road from them; indicating that the other aspect of the design is that it really does not matter to them what by-law or special holding provision is applied in order to build this high rise building, it is still a high rise building right across the street from their single family homes; and, advising that her submission to the Committee is that you not accept this application and that you make the choice of sticking to the Community Plan and reject the application.

- Tom Slade, 37 Uplands Drive – advising that his family has lived on Sunningdale Road for 30 years and they have always known that the farmland to the north side would one day be developed but they felt secure in knowing that sound planning for this whole area had been cooperatively developed and approved by the City; indicating that York Developments is now determined to challenge and change the result of this cooperative zoning process to suit their own needs; advising that they do not feel that they have the same influence at City Hall as the developer, but as one of 69 plus families living in the Sunningdale area, we collectively have the right to have our objections to this ill-conceived development, given consideration by the City Planning Board; outlining that, while it is not an issue under discussion at the moment, the planned widening of Sunningdale Road will have a direct impact on the ultimate result of the corner development; indicating that the general consensus at the recent Planning Department meeting, which included the City's Arborist, is that a large number of trees in front of our homes on Sunningdale Road may fall victims to this construction, therefore eliminating the natural screening that we now enjoy; indicating that, although York Development has promised the planting of mature trees on their property along Sunningdale Road, there is no possibility the protection of 50 year old trees; representing and speaking for a majority of the home owners in the Sunningdale area; noting that he has the support of nearly 70 families in their area that are behind them in their objections to this development; indicating that they are determined to use all of the resources available to them, as citizens, to receive fair consideration in solving this matter that seems to have absorbed a large amount of time, money and six years of energy on all of their parts; asking the Committee to view this five storey building, that has 40 rental units, (*Secretary's Note: a photograph of a building located on Fanshawe Park Road was shown on the screen during the meeting*), York Developments site could probably have at least two and maybe more, which would allow him to have at least 80 to 100 units; noting that this type of building, medium to low density, is exactly what we would like to have and would feel proud to have something like this in our community; and, asking the Committee to seriously consider rejecting this proposal.

- Claudio DeVincenzo, 10 Redford Road - thanking the Committee for the privilege to once again speak to them about this issue; advising that he is not going to bore the Committee with the history as they all know the history and have sat through many presentations in the past on this specific issue; speaking on the issue of bonusing, until the last meeting that was held a few weeks ago, bonusing did not ever come up as an issue and now it has become one of the main paths to increase the allotted density while, at the same time, allowing the applicant to present an application, which in a sense, calls itself medium density with bonusing, but at the end of the day is still a high density apartment; indicating that, at the time, he believes it was the 0.75 hectare property could be bonused up to 123 units per hectare, which he believes, at this point in time is doing 107 units per hectare; looking at the section with regards to bonusing in the Plan and it talks about the objectives of the bonusing zoning; noting that he is not going to read them all, but he wants to do a checklist; indicating that the Official Plan talks about bonus zoning and how it will be used to support the City's Urban Design principles as contained in Chapter 11 and other policies of the Plan; reading section 19.4.4.(ii); may include one or more of the following objectives: a) to support the provision of the development of affordable housing as provided for by 12.2.2. ; indicating that this development does not; b) to support the provision of common open space that is functional for active or passive recreational use; indicating that this development does not; c) to support the provision of underground parking; indicating that this development meets this requirement; d) to encourage aesthetically attractive residential developments through the enhanced provision of landscaped open space; giving half marks for this one; e) to support the provision of, and improved access to, public open space, supplementary to any parkland dedication requirements; indicating that this development does not; f) to support the provision of employment-related day care facilities; indicating that this development does not; g) to support the preservation of structures and/or districts identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest by the City of London, in consideration for their designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*; indicating that this development does not; to support innovative and environmentally sensitive development which incorporates notable design features, promotes energy conservation, waste and water recycling and use of public transit; indicating that this development does not; h) to support the preservation of natural areas and/or features; indicating that this development does not; i) to support the provision of design features that provide for universal accessibility in new construction and/or redevelopment; indicating that he will leave this decision to the Committee; believing that the bonusing is a bit generous in this particular case; indicating that, to have the staff continually refer to it as medium density with bonusing, he thinks, is an affront to anybody who can figure out that that is still a high density property; indicating that the bonusing, in this particular case, is although there were three items mentioned as to why, he thinks that there was too much credibility given to underground parking but we have already talked about that; advising that in Section 3.4.3 of the City of London's Official Plan, it states that "Outside of the Downtown and Central London areas it is Council's intention that a mixing of housing types, building heights and densities shall be required in large designated Multi-Family, High Density Residential areas. Such areas, which will normally exceed 3 hectares (7.4 acres) in size,..."; noting that this is a very small portion of land and it does not allow for that type of density to be put on that for the reason of the low density across the street; indicating that he does not believe that it meets the spirit or the intent of the Sections; advising that the community has agreed, as was mentioned earlier, to allow bonusing for up to six floors, it does not seem to be enough, which begs the question of how much is enough; indicating that it seems as though at Central Avenue and Waterloo Street, six storeys is enough and we think that, at Sunningdale Road and Richmond Street, six storeys should be enough as well; reminding members of the Committee that we all, the City, the developers, the homeowners, played by the rules a few years ago when we developed the Official Plan; indicating that the question you need to ask yourself is why must we now reverse all the good work done by so many people for one single persons application; going to read one final thing to the Committee and he is sure that they have heard it a few times already; referring back to S.J. Stephanko's comment at the last disposition, "the existing land use designations at the intersection of Richmond and Sunningdale are the result of years of involvement by many individuals. I am not prepared to undo that which has been achieved by extensive public involvement, thoughtful municipal planning and by prudent decision making on the part of the municipally elected officials. To do otherwise would be to effectively subvert a planning process which has transpired over a considerable period of time. In my view, Council's decision in this matter was correct."; indicating that it still is correct and for that reason we need to leave it the way it is or at least reduce the bonusing; indicating that, on a personal note, the residents in the Uplands area, have spent a lot of time, as Mr. Slade mentioned and we will not give up, they have invested a lot of time and energy; and, advising that, if this proposal is approved, at the Committee meeting and the Council

meeting, in its current state, rest assured that it will not be the last time that we come back to Council. (See attached photographs.)

- Tracy Quinton, 29 Sunningdale Road East – indicating that her residence is directly across from the proposed building; advising that she is going to speak to things that do not make sense to her; indicating that, when she thinks about all that has transpired over the years with York Developments, the applicant and the property at 2118 Richmond Street, the words corrupt course of action keep coming to mind and continue to do so because there are a lot of things that just simply do not make sense; indicating that it all starts with an off-the-cuff remark by an ex-Mayor, who likely had a lot of things on his mind at the time, who, briefly, while in Council, looked up from his phone; (*Secretary's Note: Councillor Hubert recommended that it is important that we stay to the planning rationale's and not to characterizations of people, to be fair to everyone.*); (*Secretary's Note: Councillor Polhill reiterated that this is a planning application and requested that the public stick to the planning merits.*); indicating that the road widening, as was discussed, is a proposal that has not yet been confirmed and many of the details are not sorted out and yet, we are standing here today, looking at a proposal for a building on a property that could potentially impact the road widening; noting that the timing and order do not make any sense; indicating that the Planning Department, the Transportation Department and the developer have done a lot of talking about the Imperial Oil pipeline, and as of August, 2014, according to Imperial Oil, they had not yet received proper documentation from the City of London; realizing now that there is a letter; reiterating that this does not make any sense to her; advising that the Tree Preservation report required, and it was mentioned in the Ontario Municipal Board 2009 report, that has not yet been done and that does not make sense to her because trees are important as you have heard over and over; indicating that the trees and the view shed pictured in your report, they are a misrepresentation because the road widening, as discussed, will remove the current, very mature trees, so there will be no barrier, so the representation of the trees, in your report, does not make sense; indicating that on page 52 of your report, it states that privacy issues are mitigated by the interruption of views by the mature trees located along both sides of Sunningdale Road and the foliage of heavily planted properties south of the road allowance; indicating that, to suggest that the trees are their barrier, that makes no sense because they all will be removed and then, to pose that nine new trees will be planted, of such small size and scale, to even suggest that they would be a barrier or mature, really, truly, based on the size in the report makes no sense; indicating that the City Planners were instructed to put together a meeting with the applicant and the community for a conversation to negotiate, for a dialogue; indicating that, as mentioned, they did this on August 13, 2014, and they, as a community, did their homework and put together a number of very reasonable proposals; indicating that, she felt that the intent was good, she felt that the Planner's intent was good, she thought that Mr. Tomazincic did a great job putting things together and having a great flow; however, when she specifically asked for comment from the applicant, he declined; reiterating that it was supposed to be a dialogue; indicating that, in fact, the applicant came to that meeting and, in the end, commented, and she quotes "I really haven't given it much thought", is what he said; advising that that means that he came into the meeting with absolutely no intention of negotiating or compromising; indicating that it was a façade, a complete waste of their time and energy and that is not the proper way to engage community involvement and that, to her, makes no sense; indicating that the report states, on page 23 maximum height of ten stories, maximum density of 123 units per hectare in excess of the generally accepted height that medium density residential and the maximum bonusable density of 100 units per hectare, all of this for a small developer with a small piece of property; reiterating that this does not make any sense; advising that the bonus zoning states that the height and density bonus received should not result in a scale of development that is incompatible with adjacent uses or exceeds the capacity of available municipal services; indicating that this is completely incompatible and this proposal makes no sense; advising that it is stated that special policy would allow for the site specific increases to be on a permitted scale of the development in return for a matter which provides public benefit and her friends have already mentioned this, this is not public benefit, which is why we keep coming back over and over again opposing; indicating that the base maximum is four

stories and the maximum density is 75 units per hectare, but these special policies in bonusing have allowed an additional six stories and an additional 48 units per hectare; indicating that this is quite a jump, and again, this too does not make sense to her; advising that buyer beware, the developer bought this property and now it seems that they are tending to pay the price for all of the issues associated with the property; advising that, to have an official Community Plan that was developed over years of effort and involvement, along with some of the people who currently sit at the Council table, to see it tossed aside for a small developer, a small piece of land, that is clearly marked multi-family medium density residential with clear criteria makes no sense; and, requesting that the Committee please do the right thing, the thing that makes sense, turn down this proposal that is rifled with hoops and bells and whistles and special policies and excesses of and maximum this and maximum that and instead go with multi-family medium density policies as stated in the Official Plan because that actually does make sense.

- Philip Wiebe, 73 Sunningdale Road East - expressing appreciation for the opportunity to speak to the Committee again; advising that he is a member of the Uplands community and he is speaking on behalf of the Uplands community and he will try to keep his presentation as brief as possible; indicating that everyone received the information that came from the last proposal, which was provided by the applicant and in that proposal, their community had responded to the request to receive feedback, that the Committee was interested in knowing what the community had to say about this and they sent their responses back; showing a map that the Committee has seen before of part of their community which is most directly affected by the proposals application for this area and, interestingly, when you take a look at the number of homeowners in their area that have responded, you will see that the numbers are quite large; advising that there are actually only five homes in the entire area that did not respond and there was a clear majority of homeowners in the area of the community who had responded to the applicant's proposal and have responded and said that they were not in favour of that proposal; indicating that, in order to take a look at what Sunningdale Road looks like, there has been a lot of comment on what our community looks like and this is a nice eastward looking shot here, from Sunningdale Road, looking eastward from Richmond Street; indicating that, if you take a look at the homes, you will see that they have very large trees, they have stated this over and over, but he thinks that it is very important to understand what these homes are like, which are directly on the south side of Sunningdale Road East; pointing out that some of the homes cannot even be seen because they are so overgrown with trees; advising that they are looking at losing all of their trees in this area because of the Sunningdale expansion project; advising that some of the homes are like parks; indicating that they have damaged trees already on their properties from other work that has happened from the City; pointing out that this home, particularly, has been up for sale twice now; noting that it is a beautiful home and nobody is purchasing it; indicating that the point is that the homes in their area have been in this area, this community has been in the area for a very long time and the applicant is attempting to put up a high rise apartment building directly across from single family homes and it is in front of the Committee and you are looking at possibly approving this proposal; indicating that they have said, over and over, to simply stick to the Plan; reiterating that that is all that they are asking for; indicating that they have said, over and over, that they support medium density, and so, when it comes down to a matter like this, where we are looking at specifics regarding this applicants' proposal to put up a high rise, the question that he comes to, over and over, in his mind is what is the most important component here; indicating that, when we take a look at these clauses that have been referred back over and over, they keep saying stick to medium density and, within the context of the Community Plan, and have a discussion with the developer and the community; advising that the community has stated over and over from 2014, again, further conversations between the applicant and the community; pointing out that one of the concerns that Councillor White had, she really wanted them to get together and have a discussion to come to an amicable solution; advising that they attempted to do that; indicating that, even in the Ontario Municipal Board statement it regards the extensive public involvement and certainly one of the reasons why is because public involvement is important; indicating that they are approving this size of a

medium density design; indicating that they are not saying not to do development on the property, they are saying keep it in the context and this is a very reasonable solution that they have been considering as a proposal; indicating that all that they are asking is that when you are looking at this type of a home on the south side of Sunningdale Road, they do not want to see a high rise on the other side of Sunningdale Road; reiterating that they simply want the Committee to stick to the Plan; further reiterating that medium density is what they had requested and the democracy of our country states that the community, the majority of the people, have the ability to be the ones that are heard in this matter, they are the ones that are saying that they want to see medium density, we were involved in this project from the beginning, we were involved with everybody that was on Committee at the time, City staff have done a great job trying to bring us together, and, we are simply trying to find a resolution that is amicable for everybody and that is what our goal is here. (See attached presentation.)

- Gloria McGinn-McTeer, past President, on behalf of Stan Brown, President, Stoneybrook Heights/Uplands Residents Association - eexpressing that she heard a lot of discussion and she supports all the comments that the Uplands Community have made so far, she is representing Stan Brown, who could not attend tonight, he is the president of Stoneybrook Heights Lands Residents Association, and she is the past president of that same organization; further expressing that to go back a little bit, she wanted to make sure that people understand how committed this group has been, and so for example this is the third public participation meeting and the second one that we are able to speak to, because after the OMB decision confirmed the medium density for that location remains, Mr. Stefan came in with his other proposal, but we were there to discuss another proposal that had already been advanced and the public participation meeting was called to discuss that particular concept, instead Mr. Stefan came and said he has another plan and then Chair Polhill allowed him to present that, and the Uplands group had not seen anything to do with this revised plan; indicating that this is contrary to procedural rules, the applicant must address the plan in front of the Committee not a revised plan; noting that they came back for the next time, when there was a revised plan, we spoke then and we are back again today, so there is no lack of consistency or determination that this Community is requesting; indicating that despite the removal of access, she understands that the access is going to be there through Sunningdale until the road widening is done, which will be sometime in 2019 to 2022 from what she heard from various elected officials and Planning staff; indicating that the bonusing that has been provided, in this instance, she would call it a supersized bonusing; expressing that do you want underground parking with that, do you want eight trees of a certain calibre, which would not even begin to replace what will be lost; advising that she thinks it is really important that we recognize that this bonusing seems to be incredibly generous to allow for a medium density custom made solution for this location special provisions; further noting that the bonusing effectively renders that standard medium density definition meaningless, it also renders the Community's acceptance of medium density utterly usurped and has been, let's put it this way, by acting in good faith; further advising that they heard during their discussion with Mr. Stefan and Ms. Wiebe, that really the project isn't profitable unless it is ten stories and then he has been waiting three years; further noting that none of that has been created by the Community, the Community is still requesting exactly what they agreed to years ago with medium density without having any bonusing or supersized bonusing included, notwithstanding the fact that it can go up to certain heights and certain density, it really is pushing the limit, if you are going to push the limit this far, this fast in order to accommodate a development that really doesn't fit that property, that's a mistake and that's poor planning and our community really hopes that you will think twice about that; expressing that all of their presentations spoke to was planning and it shows a different view point, and certainly one that doesn't need to be thrown out with the baby and the bathwater; further expressing that these concerns are legitimate, they are long-standing, the history of this particular parcel of land is documented and upheld by the OMB already once, if you want to go twice, we would rather not bother but there is a serious discrepancy here between what was proposed and what we are dealing with now, what the Community expected and what we are dealing with now; expressing that the fifty year old trees that will be decimated really leaves the community on Sunningdale vulnerable, not just to the

traffic but to the noise, to the dirt, the construction that's going to all come up into their houses after that, also for concern for well water safety, so she knows that there is a provision in there on that, but what she suggest, maybe that all Uplands wells be tested prior to any work being started, and the reason she is suggesting that is that several Uplands homes/wells were unfit for drinking water as Sifton's development to the south proceeded; indicating that at the time when it was brought to the City's and the developers view, they were told then that was anyone that didn't have their well water tested before development started meant that there was no baseline, so with no baseline no one could point to that development as a being a concern, the other concern is about, she just has a question about it, if in fact everything proceeds the way the developer would like it, asking that if the hydrogeological study shows that the underground parking cannot be accommodated, does that mean that there is no deal, we have been told that if all the bonusing requirements have been met the building won't be going to be built, so that is a critical part.