

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

12. Property located at 161 Windermere Road (39CD-14501/Z-8167)

- Don deJong, Tridon Group of Companies – indicating that it has been a long process; reflecting on some of the time that they have taken to go through the process has been challenging, but he understands the need to be careful here and he says that carefully to the Committee because the staff have been very clear and detailed in the process; expressing appreciation to staff for helping them be clear as well because there have been a number of steps and details to be careful on in this project and they are trying to, and looking to, respect the recommendations of staff and to have regard for them all the way through; taking a couple of steps back for a minute, when they first looked at this project, they did not expect the red line to be going up as far as it does, they have been educated and they have gone through that and it is a little painful to accept for where they wanted to be; indicating that they would have chosen not to be down to the blue line or a little bit more, but they have respected what has been detailed and they look to have regard for it; indicating that, when Mr. Menard came around one time to say hello, they listened quite attentively to his insight into the home; indicating that they felt a similar feeling for the significance of the home and they worked very hard to try to have that home be recognized as the beautiful building that it is and the beautiful home that it will be to a family in the years to come, for many years; speaking on that for a minute; advising that he has no disagreement with the recommendation of heritage designation, but, it is unfortunate a bit of the scope of it, where, for some of the process here, we have been trying to be with the idea of working a little more with some ideas that were put to them in the beginning, through staff, with we can improve this house and we can have some regard to what they are trying to do with the rest of the development; helping them with the improvement, because the improvement on the house has not been easy, it has been quite extensive and it has been a lot of work and there is a lot of work there still and there is a lot of effort that is needed for this home; having said that, there is still some conversation that they need to have with that; appreciating that there has been a change in some of the staff in that zone and, with Mr. Menards' help, he knows that they can have further dialogue; confirming their respect and regard to the significance of the Medway Valley; looking at the public and having some of the phone calls in the past while and having some of the interest put to them, there has been a misunderstanding for, he thinks, some of this project; noting that he is not really sure where it comes from exactly, but he will suggest that there has not been as much understanding as he would like to see; indicating that they do not look to go into the Environmentally Significant Area and deal with it in a negative way; noting that they look to respect it and enhance it; advising that they do not look to tear down the house and unfortunately, the subtlety of words have been skewed and spun several times in this process and they have no, and never did have, any intention of tearing down the house; advising that he thinks that that is important to state clearly; noting that maybe it has not been understood as readily; advising that they are looking for the Planning and Environment Committee's support tonight and they feel that they have taken the extra steps to be very detailed in how this can be supported by Committee as evidenced by staff's support; letting Mr. Hinde speak to a little more of the detail but he appreciates the Planning and Environment Committee's time here and the Committee's support in this process; clarifying a couple of comments that he heard, as well; advising that they do have respect and regard for the stormwater management detail, they do not have water flowing onto the neighbouring lands to the east of them, they have to have their post development conditions equal, or be better than, the predevelopment conditions; advising that they have looked at extensive detail on this matter; indicating that, with the land titles suggestion, he is a little confused on what he heard tonight, but what they had done a time ago they have addressed recently; reiterating that they have heard the residents' concerns and they said that they will not object to that concern and they gave that detail to them and he is not sure, but he believes that their lawyer could share that they have received additional concerns; reiterating that they look to have regard and respect for their neighbours, but it seems that they said that they understand their concerns on the land titles, they gave them that there is no debate here, but now there seems to be something else coming to them; advising that the does not believe, unfortunately, that there is going to be a way that they have full agreement, but in the end, when this development is done the right way, with proper architectural control, through proper homes being built the right way, the neighbours will see that it is a respectful development and he knows that comes down the road and not today, but this

development, this group of housing can be very harmonious with what is there and be very respectful in the long term.

- Paul Hinde, Manager, Land Development, Tridon Group of Companies – acting as agent on the application tonight; requesting that the Planning and Environment Committee support the staff recommendations; expressing appreciation to the staff for their efforts and attention on this file and in helping them work through this rather difficult process because of the sensitivity of the property; indicating that, as Mr. deJong alluded to in his presentation, this application goes back quite some time; advising that the very first thing that had to be determined was where the development limit is; indicating that the red line on the display shown at the meeting really is the delineation of what is referred to as the environmentally significant area line; noting that anything north of the red line has been demonstrated, through a myriad of studies, that those are development opportunity lands, anything to the south, between that and the Medway Valley, is do not touch area in layman's terms; indicating that, in order to determine where that line ultimately fell, there was an abundance of studies that were undertaken; advising that, first of all, the had to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine if there were any heritage archaeological significant considerations on the property; indicating that, secondly, and probably most importantly, is the Environmental Impact Study; advising that Tridon Group retained the services of a very reputable consulting firm that has done extensive work, not only within the City of London, but throughout all of Ontario, both employed by the private sector and the City of London themselves; noting that AECOM prepared the Environmental Impact Study, referred to as an EIS, to determine where, in fact, that red line is established; further noting that this document has been accepted by both Parks Planning of the City of London staff as well as the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority; indicating that there were a number of comments, questions, concerns and additional issues raised as a result of that; noting that this is the final report; further noting that it went through a number of amendments, addendums and supporting information as additional questions were raised; indicating that one such issue was raised by the Ministry of Natural Resources, which was referred to and responded to promptly by AECOM; reiterating that they have the answers back to the Ministry of Natural Resources and they are to assume that they must be satisfied because they have not come back with any further dialogue or questions being raised; advising that, in terms of whether or not the five lots can be developed, in order to determine the develop ability of those parcels, there was a stormwater management study that was done; advising that there was also a water balance assessment because they had to make sure that the water coming from the development site was not going to adversely affect the water balance of the entire area; recognizing the importance of the seeps, the water balance assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that there will be no harm with the development proceeding outside the limits of the Environmentally Significant Area; advising that there was also a hydrogeological study done to support the water balance study to make sure that the issues being raised by the City, as appropriately so, were adequately addressed to demonstrate the develop ability of the property; advising that there was also a geotechnical study done to determine where, in fact, the erosion line is going to be; reiterating that all of these studies culminate in the effort to determine where the red line is to be located, along with slope stability study and the supporting recommendations, with some draft plan conditions and suggestions coming from the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority; expressing support for the staff recommendations that are being presented to Planning and Environment Committee tonight; encouraging the Planning and Environment Committee to make a recommendation to Council for the acceptance of this report and the Zoning by-law; indicating that there is still the site plan stage, there are still the holding provisions that have to be removed, but what they need from the Planning and Environment Committee tonight, and ultimately Council, is - is this piece of property at 161 Windermere Road suitable and appropriate to be redesignated from an R1-9 single family, one dwelling, property to what would allow for a five unit Vacant Land Condo to be developed and is the zoning appropriate to unequivocally identify, on a site-specific basis, where, in fact, the real environmentally significant area should be; notwithstanding that there is a parallel study being undertaken, at the same time, by Dillon that Mr. Smith alluded to; noting that was sort of a fly-by overview of here is where we think it is on the entire Medway Valley Study area, not the site specific land study area that AECOM has undertaken the study to be; reiterating that the matters before the Planning and Environment Committee tonight are - is the zoning appropriate, is the development line appropriate based on the various studies that have been undertaken and is it appropriate to allow for the form of development that is being proposed, the five unit Vacant Land Condo; directing the Planning and Environment Committee's attention, not that he is going to be reading through, but Mr. Smith is very detailed in his report and outlined why this development is suitable and compatible and how it conforms to the Provincial Policy Statement, how it conforms to the policies of the City of London's in

effect Official Plan and how it is compatible and suitable with surrounding land uses; indicating that surrounding land uses do not just happen to be south of Windermere, the neighbourhood and the community also extends north; taking a look at this development, in context to a broader area, the lands to the north of Windermere, the lands to the west of the subject lands and the lands to the east of the subject lands, that is what we look at in terms of compatibility, suitability and is this an appropriate infill opportunity that is taking advantage of existing infrastructure, which is in the ground, which has been demonstrated by the various servicing reports, stormwater management reports and environmental reports, etc, that yes, development is appropriate, it could be compatible and is compatible with the adjacent neighborhood; asking that the Planning and Environment Committee support the staff recommendations tonight, with the various holding provisions, recognizing that site plan is still a public process that will be going through and there is still an opportunity for site plan participation and it will be before Planning and Environment Committee once again; reiterating that what we need to establish is whether or not the form of development is appropriate for them to proceed to the next level; indicating that there were an abundance of comments presented tonight; indicating that, although he does not want to go through each one, he believes that they can be summarized into groups of issues; making specific reference to some of the comments and, in particular, reply to them, with sections of the Planning report, it may be of assistance to the Committee; advising that part of the rationale of the Planning report before you tonight is that mitigation measures to address land use conflicts between the development and the adjacent existing development will be addressed through conditions of draft approval and site plan approval; indicating that, with respect to site plan approval, one of the holding provisions is to allow for additional public participation; advising that there was a comment made that there was a concern that if the Zoning goes through tonight, the residents will lose any other opportunity to voice a concern or have any input into the process being carried forward; reiterating that the public will have the opportunity to provide additional input and to present their comments to the Planning and Environment Committee before end of the process is concluded; addressing the comments on stormwater management; advising that, in the report, the supplied stormwater management servicing report designed by EngPlus based on the current lot configuration shown in the Vacant Land Condominium application demonstrates that a stormwater management servicing solution can be implemented; reading from the staff notes; indicating that the seeps are located outside of the development limit, as identified in the AECOM Environmental Impact Study and as accepted by Environment and Parks Planning and the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA); Environment and Parks Planning can support AECOM's buffer recommendations based on the description on how the boundary was arrived at and the supporting text on page 39 of the staff report; noting that it is a large report; reiterating that Environment and Parks Planning is able to support the fact of how the buffers were derived; indicating that, as a condition of site plan approval, an education package will be provided; noting that there are further comments in the staff report on this matter; reading that, through the site plan process, the stormwater locations and features will be fully contained on the site with no net change to the existing stormwater flows; further reading that the UTRCA is satisfied that there is enough information to confirm that there is a development envelope and that development envelope is the lands detailed by the red line; also reading that the UTRCA is satisfied that there is enough information to confirm that there is a development envelope and they therefore have no objection to the approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment at this time; advising that the UTRCA is saying that there has been enough information provided to demonstrate the development; indicating that there is no net change; indicating that, in terms of the erosion, there was a Stable Slope Study, there was a Hydrogeological Study, there was the Geotechnical Study; advising that all of those Studies were undertaken in accordance with the standard science derived to come up with the findings and, although, they, as the applicant, did not really like some of the findings coming out of those reports, they had to live with them; advising that, in terms of the rate of erosion, in terms of if it will be accelerated, if the stormwater management pond will cause further negative impacts, they have all been assessed in the reports and the lines have been determined based on the scientific findings on the opinions of the experts carrying out the various studies; indicating that, in terms of the Queensnake, the entire Environmental Impact Study and the seeps have been studied for two full years; indicating that it is not a matter of having to go out in the Springtime to check and see, it has been checked in the Springtime times two, in the Summertime times two, in the Fall times two and the Winter times two, so going out for one more Springtime, in their respectful opinion, is not going to serve any further information that what already has been contained in the last two years; indicating that, through the abundance of technical studies that have been contained, with the findings of the experts that City Hall has retained on both staff to review the reports, through the request of the outside agencies,

the UTRCA; the Ministry of Natural Resources was provided additional information regarding the Queensnake from Dr. Gary Epp, who is well respected in environmental and ecological science environment and has provided a response to the Ministry of Natural Resources and has refuted a lot of the comments and concerns that were originally raised; indicating that the stormwater management report in itself, has gone through seven different amendments to address various issues over the last two years that continued to be raised that need to be addressed, appropriately so to make sure that all of the various disciplines, the various studies that have been participated in, concluding what the development line will be are all consistent and compatible and meld together to come up with a development line; reiterating that they are asking the Committee to recommend to Council is – is the zoning appropriate based on the myriad of technical studies that have been completed, that have been reviewed by both staff and outside agencies and having reports and recommendations and comments being made, such as the UTRCA being satisfied that there is, in fact, a development line based on their areas of interest and reviewing; indicating that the City of London's Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee providing comments with the first Environmental Impact Statement that was submitted and the addendum was provided to address that and staff and Parks Planning reviewed the addendum and they felt that it was appropriate that they felt that enough information was provided that they were able to support it; asking the Planning and Environment Committee to support those studies in determining the line; indicating that, in terms of compatibility from a land use planning perspective, and whether or not this is an appropriate development, this application was submitted two years ago and the standard, common, accepted principles in the planning practice that you use the documents that are in effect at the time that the planning application is submitted; if one is to say that, all of a sudden, there is a brand new Provincial Policy Statement, he could stand here and say that maybe they should never look at another planning application until, finally, the new London Plan is in effect which might be two or three years down the road; suggesting that this would mean that we would just close the door for anything happening because we know something might come through, we know that the Dillon report might be concluded in two or three years with a finalization, but we cannot stop everything, we have to use the current documents that are in effect, that are applied to based on the application that was submitted and we are having regard and sensitivity to anything that is being brought forward that is new information and we feel that things like the Near Neighbourhood Campus, those types of studies are being having regard to in the report as is how various other various documents have changed over the course of the history of this application; reiterating that, with all of those technical studies, he would again summarize that they are asking the Committee to support the recommendations and the opinions of your professional planners, which have relied on the professional opinions and the input provided through technical responses and Ministries and the agencies that have provided Mr. Smith the opportunity to prepare the planning report that is before you tonight.

- Lisa Bilty, 1370 Corley Drive – (see attached presentation).
- S. Levin, 59 Longbow Road - (see attached presentation).
- Hayden Bilty, 1370 Corley Drive - (see attached presentation).
- William Pol, Pol Associates Inc. – assisting the Corley Drive community for the last two years from a land use planning perspective; indicating that he was pleased to participate early on in the process; advising that the residents knew that it was an important issue and they started thinking about the land use planning implications very early on in the process; touching briefly on three specific issues, being erosion, municipal servicing and the land use planning issues; showing a photograph of the bluff erosion on Medway Creek as it exists now; noting that the photographs were provided by a PhD student working on geomorphology and fluvial erosion along the Medway Valley; advising that erosion is caused by three processes, being hillside slope, river process and internal groundwater and seepage processes; advising that the hillside process is concentrated water creating rills and gullies which create instability of the bluffs and create erosion; noting that, in this case, the stormwater outlet will be part of that concentrated surface water; indicating that, with respect to the river processes, the river is constantly eroding the toe of the bluff during floods and creating slumping and failures and that will continue on in this process; indicating that, with respect to seeps, we know there is a groundwater flow through this area and, that, in turn affects the quality of the area, the stability of the slopes and may lead to further erosion; expressing concern that the location of the new development, on an already unstable slope, we know that it is eroding, may increase the risks to property infrastructure and potentially human life; showing an example of the erosion from the Scarborough Bluffs in Toronto; noting that it is the damage located at the top of the bluffs; advising that, with respect to erosion, their feeling is that any development above the bluff is not appropriate but keeping the natural processes of stormwater flow is the appropriate solution; advising that there will be an accelerated erosion caused by loading the soil with houses, landscaping and artificial irrigation;

believing that it is important to recognize that erosion rates are unpredictable, there may be no erosion for years and then suddenly there will be an erosion slope; observing that, on other applications that he has personally brought to the City, there is a six metre easement across the top of the erosion line; noting that it is shown in the plans as part of the condominium recommendations, but there is no way to get there; indicating that, in addition to the condominium conditions, is that there needs to be a six metre access across the Vacant Land Condominium to access the emergency access at the top of the slope; advising that there have been changes made to the Provincial Policy Statement as of April, 2014; indicating that, one of those is that erosion studies need to consider the effects of climate change; noting that we have more intensive storms, more frequent storms and there is no discussion at all with respect to the erosion study or any of the comments on how climate change may or may not affect this site in terms of erosion; discussing municipal servicing, they know that there will be a pumping station required for each of these units; advising that there will be a private water system to access each of the five units; expressing concerns with system failures, whether that is water or sanitary, where will the sewage flow, in case of an emergency, power failure or the pump is not working; everything goes downhill towards the Medway Valley; expressing concern that there must be a municipal responsibility agreements to ensure that, if anything in the future fails, that there is an appropriate solution; reiterating that the policies in the Official Plan discourages private services for land development; speaking to stormwater management, the existing flows are sheet flows; noting that they travel through the site to the Environmentally Significant Area, on vegetated areas, it seeps into the soil and it is across the entire area; indicating that stormwater flows from the existing building north to Windermere, but behind the swimming pool existing development, it flows to the south across to the slope to the Medway Valley; expressing concern that this will outlet into a public Environmentally Significant Area; expressing concern that the riprap and the outlet is going to create a concentrated flow and potentially create a channel across the Environmentally Significant Area lands; identifying that there is an underground storage facility, approximately mid-way on the property and then an above-ground stormwater management pond with an outlet concentrated out to the Medway Valley; advising that the size of the combined underground and surface water capacity is approximately 130 cubic metres; indicating that they have calculated that they need approximately 128 square metres; also expressing concern that there is no leeway for malfunction, if something does not work, if there are maintenance issues in terms of leaves, debris, snow storage, blocking any of these facilities, that there will not be surplus capacity; indicating that there are no water quality controls; according to the Ministry of the Environment, because it is such a small site, it technically does not require stormwater quality control and they are concerned because the applicant is trying to infiltrate into the site that there will be fertilizers, salt from the roads maintenance of the access roads, vehicle fluids, oil, antifreeze, dissolved fluids that will get into the stormwater system; advising that the point raised by staff today that there will need to be a turning circle at the end of the development adds to the paved surface area and all of the calculations and all of the conclusions from the stormwater management process will have to be re-evaluated; enquiring as to how much more water will be required to be accommodated through the stormwater management system; concluding that the stormwater management flows do not achieve the kind of protection of the Environmentally Significant Area that is required; speaking on land use planning; indicating that, in terms of the community land use, the Elsie Perrin Williams Estate owned by the City of London, a significant part of the Medway Valley Heritage Forest is to the west; advising that there is another residential estate to the west, also as potential for redevelopment similar to this site, Corley Drive to the east, large lots, unique architecturally designed homes each with their own public access to a street, part of the public realm, they add to the character of the area; indicating that, to the north, there are smaller lots, more intensive, but also, if you look to the northwest, further west, north of the Elsie Perrin Williams Estate, there are large estate lots; adding that the character of the area is for large lots and unique architecturally designed homes; noting that the properties have extensive landscaping, they are well maintained and they add to the character of the area; advising that when he evaluated the consideration of intensification, it is intended to enhance the character and the amenities of the residential area; indicating that they direct higher intensity uses such as this to locations where they will not adversely affect surrounding uses; advising that, in this case, it is an adverse effect on the environmentally significant area, in particular; advising that compatibility must be clearly demonstrated that it is sensitive to, compatible with and a good fit with the surrounding existing neighbourhood; advising that, in this case, they do not have that good fit; pointing out that when you start to look at the proposed plan, there is a stormwater management pond that is abutting the Environmentally Significant Area, there is no buffer between the units and the Environmentally Significant Area; advising that the setback from Unit 4, at the south, is six metres to the Environmentally Significant

Area; indicating that the setback from Unit 5 to the Environmentally Significant Area is approximately six metres; indicating that there is a conflict in terms of creating flag shaped lots; indicating that, in effect, when you create a Vacant Lot Condominium, you are creating a separate lot and now we have, behind 161 Windermere Road, four independent flag shaped lots; advising that each of the flags happen to use the same access road but they are independent lots; advising that that is what the request is today; indicating that the conflict comes up with Unit 5, the front yard of Unit 5 is into the backyard of Unit 3; reiterating that there is a conflict there; indicating that the setbacks from Unit 5 to the rear, normally you would have rear yard to rear yard; stating that, in his opinion, this is setting a very undesirable precedent for flag shaped lots, to the rear of established development; indicating that it is going to encourage other projects in the community to consider the same type of development; with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment, particularly the boundary of the Environmentally Significant Area, it is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, it has not been demonstrated that there will not be an impact on that environmental feature, we have issues around stormwater management and the climate control, it does not conform to the Official Plan policies with respect to intensification and protection of the Environmentally Significant Area; indicating that the zone boundary needs further study and evaluation; outlining that there are four holding provisions and that is an indication to him that it is premature to consider this; indicating that those holding provisions should be much further along in the process; advising that, if the developer is truly interested in resolving them, and having them before us, the public should have an opportunity to speak to them; clarifying one point that was raised with respect to the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA); indicating that, first of all, the UTRCA continues to have concerns regarding the seeps and the protection of their source; indicating that the UTRCA does believe that there is some development envelope here, but there is still concern in terms of adding conditions that the developer integrate stormwater management hydrology and ecology to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the UTRCA that the seeps will be protected; indicating that there is still a lot of work to do to confirm that that has been accomplished.

- Alec Bilty, 1370 Corley Drive - (see attached presentation).
- Dr. Neil Duggal, 1400 Corley Drive – indicating that he recently purchased his home and has now been advised that there could be a water table issue in their backyard; noting that they have owned the house for approximately three months; enquiring as to what the developer has done to check surrounding properties for the potential impact of change in the water table to surrounding properties; advising that a lot of people around here have spent a lot of money on these homes; enquiring as to how you, as a City, going to protect their investment; further enquiring about whether or not the Committee that is suggesting that this plan be put forth has completed any Disclosure or Conflict of Interest forms. (*Secretary's Note: Councillor Polhill indicates that it is the City of London staff that is bringing forward the recommendation.*)
- Dr. Nina Zitani, Assistant Professor, part-time, Department of Biology, Western University and a Biologist – commenting that when she first moved to London, she found it difficult to understand how things happened, what the process was and she had a lot of questions; advising that it is the Committee Chair's job to answer the questions; talking about the biodiversity of the Medway Valley; advising that her home borders the Medway Valley, in a different part of the Medway Valley; indicating that she is also a Biologist; advising that she has been living on the Medway Valley Environmentally Significant Area for approximately six years now and what she likes to do for fun is watch animals and watch wildlife; indicating that there is an incredible amount of biodiversity in the Medway Valley; advising that this is her professional opinion; advising that she teaches a course at Western University on Biodiversity, she teaches a Tropical Ecology course on Tropical Biodiversity; indicating that the estimates by AECOM and by Dillon, you can be sure that those estimates are underestimates; in other words, when we are looking at the total biodiversity that occurs in the Medway Valley in terms of the species diversity and the importance of that habitat, the Committee can assume that it is an underestimate; indicating that the black hatched line is probably more along the lines of it being accurate as compared to the red line so Dillon was not just waving their hands and making a line there; advising that they were doing the best that they could do and she is suggesting that even their estimate is an underestimate of where that boundary should be; recommending to the Committee that you consider, very carefully, the buffers and that you consider that line very carefully and not degrade our jewel, which is the Medway Valley; indicating that the Medway Valley is one of sixteen Environmentally Significant Areas within our beautiful City of London.
- Jack Blocker, 367 Grosvenor Street (Member of the Conservation Action Committee Nature London) – expressing concern for the health of the ESA; indicating two concerns that has been brought forth from other presenters, one is the threat to erosion and to the ability of that slope to remain stable in the face of the outflows that will be taking place, and the second is the concern with monitoring, this was mentioned briefly by Mr. Pol;

advising that there will be no public access to the part of the ESA south of this development and hence there will be no way for anyone to monitor what is happening, in terms of erosion or in terms of unauthorized uses or encroachment; advising he would like to support an easement to be granted if this project goes ahead, so that monitoring can be carried out to ensure these things don't occur; expressing that in general he would like to suggest to the Committee that this application be deferred until we have more information on the effect of the development on the Environmentally Significant Area.

- Sean McConville, 1411 Corley Drive – indicating that he has lived here for eight years, they both feel very strongly that this development is not in keeping developmentally and architecturally with the area; noting that they had a unique experience perhaps, although he is not an engineer and doesn't know a lot about water, he has learned a lot about water over the last couple of years; indicating that they are located at the very south corner of Corley Drive, it all slopes downhill off of Windemere, you look north out of our backyard and you basically look straight out to a bunch of backyards; further noting that about three years ago they started having water issues, and two of the last three years they have had to pump their pool out three times, and that has cost \$2,000 to have it power washed, further noting that they have had to clean up their basement where they had issues before; noting that coincidentally his neighbour two doors over but on the north south, west side of Corely, put a very large garage up, which basically redirected the water, again we talk about water flow and how people created a standard and on a really rainy day when it all comes down Windemere and gets redirected by a street, by pavement, by buildings, it is a flowing mad river; indicating that they have rectified it, \$15,000 later with the retaining wall and the redirection and the drainage, but he doesn't think you can underestimate the power of the water coming off of Windemere; further noting that he is not an engineer but you do redirect it with buildings and street, it really is not something you should underestimate; advising that they have lived through it and it hasn't been fun, noting that they are not mad at their neighbours it is just happened, we didn't take into it all in to account, please do not underestimate what you may be in for when you do put up buildings and roads.
- Siham Barakat, 1388 Corley Drive – indicating that he has been living there for almost five years; advising that he is on his third broken cement basement; noting that it has broken twice this year; advising that the water comes into the back of his lot and there is so much water that he does not know how to deal with it; indicating that he has water in his basement again, both him and his neighbours; advising that it is a big concern for them; advising that his backyard is never dry, that it is always wet at the bottom of the slope, you cannot walk on it in summer or winter; indicating that he is thinking of putting in a retaining wall because they are always doing the same thing.
- Shih-Fen Chen, 1382 Corley Drive – indicating that there has been a lot of discussion about water; looking at the subject property, there are only two ways for the water to go and those are to go to the River or go to the neighbours; indicating that they already have water problems in their backyard; advising that they purchased their property two and a half years ago and did some renovations and opened the basement and they have an underground lake in their basement; asking that the Committee not underestimate the problem with the water; asking that everyone look at page 227 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda, where there is a section addressing the issue of stormwater management; noting that the original stormwater report submitted by the developer is very difficult to read; and, requesting that the development not go ahead because the City is not satisfied with the water and stormwater management issues.