It is common for the required parking standards applied to similar commercial plazas to vary depending upon the composition of uses. The original site plan with a large patio required 143 spaces resulting in the minor variance application. The current proposal only requires 107 spaces but this could change depending on the mix of future uses. Staff recommend that the 133 spaces previously approved by minor variance be maintained to ensure that the existing number of parking spaces is recognized regardless of the composition of uses.

Other Issues:

Members of the public have raised concerns about a potential gas bar on the subject site. As was already noted the Gas Bar is permitted and approved by the existing zoning implemented on the site. Building permits have already been issued and construction is well underway for the gas bar. A zoning amendment to remove the Gas Bar as a permitted use would not result in the removal of the existing Gas Bar as it would simply result in a legal non-conforming condition. The property line which abuts the residential uses to the south currently has board-on-board fencing separating the backyards from the subject site. The public has raised this as a concern that the current fence does not provide enough privacy nor block out the light that would be generated from cars parking along the fence line. The applicant has already received Site Plan Approval and is required through that process to provide an additional board-on-board fence along the property line. The applicant has confirmed that it will be building the required fence up against the existing fencing. As previously mentioned, the modest increase in additional uses is not anticipated to generate any additional impacts beyond those that may be generated by the current range of uses. The Site Plan Approval process to implement the current range of uses has taken into consideration the potential impact mitigation by requesting the development of a board-on-board fence.

The issue of odours was also a public concern in relation to potential restaurants. The building code will govern the building requirements for restaurants to reduce odours. It should be noted that the existing zoning also permits restaurants. Therefore, the recommended amendment does not introduce this use as part of this application. The other concern about hours of operation falls outside of the scope of the Zoning By-law.

CONCLUSION

The recommended amendment is consistent with the polices of the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and the Auto Oriented Commercial Corridor policies of the City of London Official Plan related to the evaluation of applications requesting an expansion to a commercial corridor designation. The amendment will allow for the site to be used to its fullest potential to serve the travelling public and surrounding community.