

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 2. The London Plan – Second Draft – June 2015

- Gary Smith, 141 Meadowlily Road South – Friends of the Meadowlily Woods Community Association; indicating that this is a unique part of the city and a non-conforming neighbourhood; indicating that the priorities of this neighbourhood are very different from other neighbourhoods; indicating that the neighbourhood is overwhelmingly green, therefore the neighbourhood has a different set of priorities; indicating a desire to keep sidewalks in other areas in the City, and not in Meadowlily; indicating that they like the neighbourhood just the way it is; indicating that their neighbourhood is supported across the City; indicating that there is an important distinction between woodland areas and recreational uses and that these areas should not be confused; indicating that they took a walk a few weeks ago through the area and there was a lot of appreciation for the natural areas; indicating that Meadowlily has been recognized for years by the Ministry of Natural Resources.
- S. Levin – Chair of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) provided the attached presentation.
- B. Singh Dhinsa, 1989 Quarter Road – indicating that he was not consulted when his land was reviewed by staff for redesignation; indicating concern that when the use of someone's property is being proposed to be changed, the change should not occur without consulting the property owner who has invested money in the property; indicating that it is important to protect the neighbourhood; indicating that he is not particularly happy with the notion of the designation of his land being changed; indicating that he does not support the proposed open space designation; Council should work with the people and for the people.
- Judd Menochan – indicating that the planners who worked on the London Plan, on this project are not here today, specifically, Heather McNeely; indicating that they have a property that they plan to develop that will include parkland, soccer fields and baseball diamonds; indicating that the proposed change in designation to their land was done without any consultation whatsoever; indicating that the City wants to take their land from them and if the City wishes to do so, they should do it through an expropriation process; indicating the City is trying to take their land without any consultation is wrong and is not acceptable.
- Harry Juston - owns property in Byron; indicating that direction 2 of the document speaks to connecting London to the surrounding region; indicating that more transportation is not the only answer to connect London to the surrounding region; indicating that there needs to be leadership in order to achieve the connection with surrounding municipalities.
- J. Fitzgerald – 3384 Gore Road on behalf of the Crumlin Sportsmen's Association – presents the content of the attached communication.
- Naomi Brett, 9120 Elviage Drive – indicating that she is wearing two hats as an organic farmer and strongly supporting woodland management; indicating concern with the proposal to change the designation of her property without consultation; indicating that agriculture land is being developed all around her, but she cannot alter the woodlot on her land to allow her access to the portion of her land that can be farmed.
- Rob Brown – 4059 Glanworth Drive; references vegetation patch 11059; indicating that his letter was circulated to Members of Council; indicating that he owns a 33 hectare parcel of land; echoing previous concern with respect to the lack of consultation with landowners; indicating that he was not consulted regarding the proposed redesignation of his land; indicating that agricultural land is dwindling; indicating that the Kettle Creek Conservation Authority (KCCA) is involved in his lands; indicating that this matter needs further review. *(Note: staff reviewed the process and the environmental policy with respect to agricultural land that was part of the annexation process, indicating that landowners were consulted in 2005 and that some of the land will remain agriculturally designated.)*

- Marie Blosch, 43 Mayfair Drive – reviews the attached communication.
- David Schmidt, Development Manager, Corlon Properties Inc. – requesting review of the urban growth boundary – attached presentation – in addition – noting that existing woodlot protection already exists – should not include lands that have not been completely assessed. Apply the science – if you haven't had the opportunity to assess, don't change the significance.
- Jim Kennedy, London Development Institute – reviews the attached communication.
- David Schmidt, Corlon Properties – reviews the attached presentation.
- Craig Linton, Developro Land Services Inc. – review the attached communication.
- Craig Linton, on behalf of himself - asking what impact the Environmental Assessment that is currently being undertaken with respect to rapid transit will impact the London Plan; indicating that the current alignment shown on the London Plan does not fit what is being proposed; indicating that the next version of the London Plan will result in a significant change in the mapping as a result of the Environmental Assessment process; indicating that the London Plan purports to support intensification and supports the use of existing infrastructure; indicating that the London Plan actually ends up discouraging infill and sterilizing land; indicating that the London Plan will discourage such development as townhouses; indicating that there is a need to support a wide range of house that will contribute to a walkable neighbourhood; indicating that the London Plan should be written in plain language.