

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

2. The London Plan

- M. Hannay, on behalf of Davies Howe Partners – speaking about the property located at 3030 Singleton Avenue; pointing out that you will see from the graphic on the first page of his presentation that this is a mostly empty site with a three storey seniors facility, which is actually a long-term care facility and two wings; advising that, for the site, there is a Master Plan which would include retirement housing on the rest of the site; advising that there are existing permissions in the Zoning by-law for eight stories and up to one hundred units per hectare across the whole site; indicating that the London Plan refers to this site in Policy 976 “for a portion of the land located on the south side of Southdale Road West, opposite Andover Drive, a maximum building height of eight storeys will be permitted provided the development is designed and occupied for senior citizens’ housing; pointing out that the desire is to be more site specific in that; noting that, in the current Official Plan and the previous Bostwick Secondary Plan, it identified the site by address and was quite specific about the address; preferring to have the address acknowledged in the policy; suggesting wording in their correspondence which would be to the effect: the following applies to approximately 3.9 hectare area located on the south side of Southdale Road opposite Andover Drive known municipally as 3030 Singleton Avenue; a maximum building height of thirty metres (eight storeys) are permitted with a density of up to one hundred units per hectare; advising that the intent of this policy is to carry forward policies formerly contained in the Bostwick Secondary Area Plan and the South West Area Plan, which has been approved by the Ontario Municipal Board, allowing for the continued development of long-term care home and retirement community on 3030 Singleton Avenue; Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, responding to Mr. Hannay’s comments by indicating that this is a specific change to Policy 976, where, they have the general description for a portion of the lands, he is essentially asking that they put in the street address and not just as they have written it with the eight storeys and the thirty metres, eight stories and one hundred units per hectare, is the change that Mr. Hannay is requesting; noting that it does speak to the senior citizens housing already so that is part of the policy; advising that this policy, as Mr. Hannay noted, is part of the Bostwick East Plan, which is why it is in the specific area policies but they shortened it in the language of the London Plan; and, indicating that Mr. Hannay has asked that it go back with the height and the density added to it. (See attached presentation.)
- E. Saulesleja, GSP Group, on behalf of TDL Group Limited – advising that they are the owners of 1445 Wilton Grove Road; reiterating the points in his communication dated June 9, 2016, item 2 i) on the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda; (*Note: Councillor Turner confirming that Wilton Grove Road used to be the previous Urban Growth Boundary, this parcel was requested to be included and then subsequently added*); Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, responding that that as Mr. E. Saulesleja noted, these lands were all part of the lands that this Council considered as part of the Urban Growth Boundary expansion, as part of that Urban Growth Boundary expansion, two things were done, the Urban Growth Boundary was expanded to include these lands and the second part, which is what he believes Mr. Saulesleja is speaking to, is that it was put into an Urban Reserve Industrial Holding so that they could determine what the more appropriate of the Industrial designations would be; which is what Mr. Saulesleja is asking you to do now is to put the Light Industrial designation on this through this process; advising the Planning and Environment Committee that Bill 73 and the Bill 73 provisions, which is not yet in force and effect, his understanding is that the two year prohibition is on private amendments; noting that the Council can consider an amendment to this Plan at any time if the conditions are appropriate; advising that the second part about that is notwithstanding the two year prohibition, the recommended place type on these lands is a holding place type and the policies that go with that provide the Council with the opportunity to review those lands at the appropriate longer term place type is; these fully contemplate an action to change them; by leaving them in this Industrial holding place type does not prejudice their opportunity to come forward and advance it

within a two year approval of this Plan; *(Note: Councillor Tuner clarifies that the two year prohibition is on appeals to decisions of Council but Council, at its discretion, may choose to amend the Official Plan.)*; Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, responding that it relates to both amendments and appeals to a privately initiated amendment; *(Councillor Helmer enquires of the applicant that they are asking for Light Industrial and there is no interest in Heavy Industrial.)*; Mr. Saulesleja responds that the applicant is satisfied with the Light Industrial types of uses on this particular parcel; Mr. J. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responds that, where Mr. Saulesleja is coming from, that this is a land holding that is in association with additional future growth lands to the east; noting that this is not standing on its own; understanding and appreciating that Mr. Saulesleja is suggesting that this could be Light Industrial, the question is how does that coordinate with what is happening to the east; pointing out on page 302 of the London Plan, it does say that we can move forward with Official Plan Amendments to another place type without the need for a Secondary Plan with certain criteria in place and that might be an opportunity here for us to work with the landowner on together with some of the lands that the City owns in the area. (See attached presentation.)

- K. Moser, on behalf of S. Levin, Chair, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) – reiterating the EEPAC comments dated June 10, 2016.
- E.P.K. Costello, Aird & Berlis, on behalf of Esam Construction – pointing out that you may know some of these lands from looking at the map in his presentation; noting that there is a Costco, a liquor store, a Sobey's being constructed, the Westview Funeral Home, those lands are developed but they continue to be owned by Esam Construction who builds the buildings and leases them back; pointing out that one of the buildings on that property is the new EMS facility, which Esam built and leased back to the County to provide emergency medical services in this area of London; talking about the food store and the LCBO complex which are just under construction now; noting that these are almost finished and he believes that some components of them are open now; outlining that there is also the existing Fleetway Bowling Alley and site number six which has now almost finished exterior construction which is the new national headquarters of Goodlife Fitness; expressing concern with the London Plan have broken down into three physical areas, geographical areas, for instance, the lands on Wonderland Road which have just gone through site plan approval and, in some cases, zoning amendments in the last three to four years; advising that they have spoken to Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, and his team about this; advising that Esam is concerned that with the changes to the designation becoming transit village and the eventual, within three years, changes to the Zoning by-law, that their current uses might end up being existing non-conforming which they consider to be an issue going forward; reiterating that they are not sure whether or not the uses that are contained within the transit village would actually work necessarily with heavily auto oriented businesses that have been constructed on the site as they go forward; understanding that things will change over time but they may be looking at a very long stretch of time here; thinking ahead to the change in the Zoning by-law and the coordination of the Zoning by-law with the new Official Plan which is about to be, hopefully; expressing concern with the Fleetway site because the Fleetway site is divided by two zones; noting that the back piece belongs to Fleetway and is zoned Open Space and below is zoned for a Community Facility and Community Recreation; advising that in the current Official Plan you can see the front part of number five as being Community Commercial node and actually identifies the site of the 30,000 square foot bowling alley and the over three hundred parking spaces as being Open Space which has always been something of an anomaly and has been raised a couple of times in the past when they have done amendments to the permissions to have fast-food restaurant and there is permissions for existing uses which are fast-food restaurant and another restaurant and a bowling alley all contained within the same building; advising that what they would like to do is to be able to take those portions of number five, Fleetway, which are not actually zoned Open Space and take them out of what they are about to be designated as which is green space and make them transit corridor so it would be contiguous with the Goodlife office building which employees three hundred people and the front half of the site which currently is vacant parking lot and make that lower portion of five transit corridor leaving the upper part which is wooded as green space which would

reflect the current zoning as Open Space; pointing out that the area that has had the most issues with the London Plan and they have spent a lot of time talking to the Planning staff about these issues, is the area of draft plan of subdivision; noting that draft plan of subdivision was approved in the 1990's, it has been stalled for the last fourteen years by a series of three Environmental Assessments for Mud Creek, which needs to be done by the City before the draft plan conditions can be cleared and the plan registered and construction for the site to be developed; pointing out that, through the London Plan, they have had some very fruitful discussions with staff and a very large part of their concerns have been able to be addressed through the process where the third draft actually shows the remnant high density ending before it reached Oxford Street; noting that, at the moment, there are permissions for high density right out to Oxford Street and this change has been covered actually in the staff report so currently the recommendation by staff is to extend the remnant high density to cover the area which has existing permissions for high density; advising that the only issue remaining out of that is the maximum available base height in the remnant high density is thirteen stories; currently, much of these lands have permissions for fifteen stories under the current Zoning by-law; expressing that he was very interested in hearing Mr. S. Galloway, Manager, Urban Design and Geographic Information Systems, talk about form and height because in the policies for the Official Plan, there is a policy which is policy 293 on page seventy of the London Plan which actually seeks to limit the floor plate of new high rise buildings to one thousand square metres which would be considerably different from what they are used to developing for the majority of buildings in the city and this would lead to slimmer towers and he thinks that there would be room, on that basis, to preserve gross floor area and units and density along a transit corridor to come back and talk in the future about the permitted heights for that site; being right at the transit corridor and, in fact, right at the bottom is an identified transit station for the rapid transit system; noting that it makes some sense; advising that they have already addressed the existing permissions as well through the Plan; pointing out that the yellow, which is Neighbourhood, there is now a site specific policy to allow that to come back to four storeys from 2.5, the existing permissions are for four storeys; advising that the London Plan, in its current iteration without the revisions would reduce that four storeys to two and a half storeys which would be the same as a suburban house; given this location on the future extension of Beaverbrook, they would argue that greater height within the area would be worth pursuing; thanking staff for looking at that and making sure that the existing provisions were extended; noting that those are mostly map issues; indicating that the only other issues had to do with maps which related to the environmental context to the site, environmental features on the site which are maps four and six changed quite radically between draft two and draft three; understanding that the reasons for those changes but it was still a surprise; reiterating that there is the ongoing Environmental Assessment for Mud Creek which will affect all of these lands and a very large part of the neighbouring lands, particularly also to the south of Oxford Street; putting their faith in one of the suggestions in the staff report which falls under other matters and that is the Mud Creek Environmental Assessment; advising that they are quite willing and happy to pursue the modification of these schedules and potentially the modification of the map one as suggested in the staff report through the Mud Creek Environmental Assessment; reiterating his thanks to staff for their cooperation; Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner responds that, on page 30 of the staff report, it identifies these lands and the concerns and considerations that were pointed out as items that they are continuing to work through and will be forwarded to the Ministry once they conclude them; pointing out that there are three processes ongoing here; noting that one relates to the Environmental Assessment of Mud Creek; another relates to the plan of subdivision that is currently in draft form and is working toward registration and the third is the London Plan; indicating that they are making some significant progress but they are not there yet so they made it really clear in the report that they are not there yet; noting that they have made some changes that Mr. Hannay pointed out already and they are prepared to make more as they conclude the Environmental Assessment process and Development Services will be moving forward with the draft plan of subdivision; (*Note: Councillor Helmer enquires as to when the Mud Creek Environmental Assessment will be completed.*); Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner responds that the engineering staff is leading the Environmental Assessment process and they have had

many meetings with the various landowners that will be affected by the Environmental Assessment, including the City of London; advising that the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority is a primary stakeholder in this conversation, they are ultimately the ones that hold the permitting authority; advising that the expectation is that an August timeline was recently thought to be a timeline where they are getting close to conclusion; advising that there is an opportunity that has been given to Mr. Hannay's clients and others if they wanted to absorb the draft modeling that has been processed to date and see if there are any other factors that they would like to consider to maybe have an impact on those draft results; Mr. Braam, Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer responds that Mr. Fleming's answer is correct; and, believing that it is scheduled for later this summer or early fall. (Mr. Hannay's presentation is included in the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda starting on page 230.)

- Jug Manocha, 401L Inc. – Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research comments on Mr. Manocha's presentation; responding that he appreciates Mr. Manocha's comments and staff have been working with Mr. Manocha for some time and as he indicated he has had these lands since they were within the Town of Westminster; reminding the Planning and Environment Committee that these lands were part of the South West Area Planning process and the developable portions of those lands came out of the Urban Reserve Industrial Growth and went into a Light Industrial Land Use designation; pointing out that the other thing that the South West Area Plan did was that it confirmed the extent of the natural heritage system on those lands; believing, in all fairness, that Mr. Manocha's issues tonight are around the potential naturalization triangles and certainly when you see them all here and for graphics that is why they pop up so large but there are five triangles that identify potential naturalization areas on the lands associated with Mr. Manocha's properties and the Ecologist Planner can speak to the specifics on how they were applied, but in general the context has been done, there is nothing brought forward on the Plan that has been recommended to you today that is any different than has already been addressed; first off, through the Annexed Area Zoning by-law amendment and the subsequent Ontario Municipal Board hearings that were concluded in 2005, then the South West Area Planning process that was started in 2010 and went through the Ontario Municipal Board in about 2014 and now through this process; advising that the one change that is made that is in front of the Planning and Environment Committee tonight is the application of the potential naturalization triangles; indicating that the other matters that are there have all been dealt with through three previous Ontario Municipal Board hearings, the extent of the lands identified for Light Industrial and natural heritage save and except the triangles have been in front of the Ontario Municipal Board in the past; Mr. J. Fleming advises that the triangles, naturalization areas were applied City-wide and why they are applied here, Mr. MacKay did have a huge hand in the Plan and particularly the environmental policies; Mr. J. MacKay, Ecologist Planner responds that the five naturalization triangles that are on Mr. Manocha's property were looked at through air photograph interpretation so he added a number of these based on looking at what natural heritage features were already designated in the area and what unevaluated features or natural areas that may have been present looking for other opportunities to potentially strengthen the natural heritage system through the development process that would happen down the road; pointing out that most of the triangles are located outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, a large number of them are focused on the Dingman Creek corridor and other natural heritage features that were identified through the Environmental Review lands study and that is where this really came from; *(Councillor Usher thanks Councillor Squire for allowing him to speak at the Planning and Environment Committee meeting as he is not a member of the Committee; asking about the recreational areas is there any specific zoning that keep us within the Urban Growth Boundary or can recreational areas be moved south of the Urban Growth Boundary without faulting.);* Mr. Barrett responds that the Provincial Policy Statement and the new guidelines associated with agricultural lands from the Province speaks to three types of uses that are permitted with lands that are designated Agriculture or as we call them now in the London Plan, the farmland place type, agricultural uses, on farm diversified uses (essentially home occupation), and agriculturally related uses are the three types of land uses in general that are permitted; advising that the question the

Councillor asked around commercial recreation is a very interesting one because they did run into that on some of their own lands and the short answer is that it is not a preferred land use within lands that are identified for agricultural or farmland purposes; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, responds that there are provisions with the designations and zoning that permit public parks and public lands basically in any zone but utilizing industrial lands, which these are, for parkland conflicts with some of the industrial policies that we have and these lands are just inside the Urban Growth Boundary, not outside the Urban Growth Boundary; and, most of these lands affiliated with the floodplain and natural areas are lands where they would be protected for their natural heritage significance; reaffirming that as Mr. MacKay said, through any development process, they would assess where they could fill in gaps and bays between natural heritage features and the proper compensation to the landowner if they were able to implement one of those naturalization areas; Mr. Manocha responds to Councillor Usher's enquiry about the naturalization triangles by indicating that from what he understands and no one has been able to give him a straight answer on what a triangle really means and what five triangles mean, what they said is that they are looking at it, all they have done is looked at it from the air, we have not walked the ground, we have not done a site specific assessment; those things would be required to be done if you develop the land anyway; the significance of doing this baffles him especially when you do not see it on other properties that have been harvested and have similar type of criteria; advising that this is his frustration with it because no one has been able to give him a straight answer. (See attached presentation.)

- R.G. Waters, 72 Frank Street, Strathroy, on behalf of J. Ross – advising that there are two matters that he would like to bring to the Planning and Environment Committee's attention; pointing out that the first one is contained in the letter he submitted to the Committee dated June 9, 2016, listed in the Added Agenda as item 2 p); advising that his client is concerned with the places designation that has occurred on his property; indicating that, attached to the letter were Schedules from the previous Official Plan and what has happened is that there is a pocket of land that Mr. Ross owns that is adjacent to property that is in the process of a draft plan of subdivision and this is land that is previously, when his client was able to see the draft plan of subdivision by Drewlo Holdings, there appeared to be a road accessing to this very parcel; advising that the land itself is farmland and is not within the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority's floodplain or regulatory limit; pointing out that this land that his client views as important from a financial perspective for him in the future; noting that he attended, with his client, at the original public meeting a couple of weeks ago and noticed that the triangle was placed exactly on this spot; advising that the concern that they had at the time is that there might be other uses put to it than what his client envisions; noting that the Planner that they talked to was very helpful and indicated that it might be recreation land or something else other than what his client's intended purposes are for it, which is residential; indicating that, from their point of view, calling it a potential naturalized area when it is currently cropped, it may be near a wetland but it is not in it and there is adequate area there to work with; noting that this is a concern that his client wanted to put before this Committee; advising that there was a second communication, delivered by his client, came as a result of review of 1150 Fanshawe Park Road East; noting that this is on the corner of Stackhouse and Fanshawe Park Road East; reviewing some of the other submissions, they noted that there is an issue with regard to their particular property; pointing out that the property is already zoned CC-5 and currently, because of the Neighbourhood designations, there may be a limit with regard to the number of square meters that you have can have with regard to commercial buildings; indicating that you will see in his letter that the actual zoning that he has now allows a 1,765 square metres of commercial use whereas there is a potential, if the Neighbourhood designation stays on this property, that it end up being two hundred metres and considerably less area; pointing out that, in the past and this goes back to 1995, the City has already negotiated a situation where access to Fanshawe Park Road would not be allowed and that it would be off of Stackhouse; noting that the address shows as Fanshawe Park Road so these designations may occur based on the address; advising that the concerns that they have is that this might go ahead in the Official Plan and they are really concerned that there is no planning rationale that would change a parcel of this nature which has an existing zoning; saying that, if someone was going for an Official Plan

Amendment in the future, there are specific uses in the CC-5 Zone, but if it is going for a different one in the future, there would be an issue in that they are back in Official Plan redesignation and their concern is that they wanted the Planning and Environment Committee to be aware of this in advance; Mr. Barrett responds that, with respect to 1597 Sunningdale Road, as Mr. Waters has noted in the letter, this is a matter that has been adjudicated, he believes, three times now; believing that the issue that he has raised this time is notwithstanding the fact that it has been identified as Open Space, the Province has identified it as a Provincially Significant Wetland, as well as the triangle has been put on as a potential naturalization area because there is a portion that is above the channel of the existing drain; reiterating that it is another potential naturalization triangle issue is the only change on it; relating to 1150 Fanshawe Park Road, they did receive a communication this morning outlining the same concerns that Mr. Waters has spoken about; advising that those properties do have a zoning that provides for a limited range of commercial uses on them and there is a size limit on there that is at odds with what would be permitted under the Neighbourhood designation or the Neighbourhood place type for a collector and an urban corridor; reiterating that the lands are zoned for the use and there is commercial use already existing on a portion of the lands; noting that the other portion has not been developed; Mr. Waters expresses concern with the Neighbourhood designation and the limitation with regard to the commercial and he thinks that the planning rationale is a concern and his clients simply wanted to get this before the Committee; advising that they have put forward the idea that there may be a legal non-conforming use with regard to the zoning, the issue going forward is if a purchaser comes along and wishes to amend the zoning that they are now facing, this is a hurdle; (*Councillor Usher requests to be shown the area that is being dealt with.*); Mr. Waters indicates that the lands themselves are currently held by Drewlo Holdings and Mr. Ross; looking at the north-east quadrant, south of Sunningdale Road and to the west of Highbury Avenue, some of the lands in the beige colour are the lands that they are discussing where the triangle has been put; noting that that is the concern in relation to that; advising that, in the actual documents from the City that they saw at the open house, much of the land is outside the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority's fill limits; finding it interesting and the road mapping really has no particular relevance because he thinks that it does not necessarily match the draft plan submitted by Drewlo Holdings but his client, from the past, has been aware that they had a road exiting at the edge of this property which would be, he assumes, in their mind a future residential area; (*Councillor Helmer indicates that this is the second submission where the issue around two hundred square metres of commercial space has come up and wondering if the Civic Administration could speak generally to that provision in the Plan*); Mr. Galloway, Manager, Urban Design and Geographic Information Systems, responds that, in terms of the square footage, the intention was to consolidate retail into certain locations as they go into the neighbourhood and then as you move out towards the main arterial road or urban thoroughfare or civic boulevard, you are still at a smaller oriented road in terms of a neighbourhood connector, it is not a full-fledged, what we would call arterial today, and that is why the reduced amount in terms of traffic generation and those types of things that would filter into the neighbourhood why the two hundred metres was chosen; pointing out that when you get to larger streets, like a civic boulevard or urban thoroughfare, you would get a larger two thousand square metre which is your standard type of development; advising that the intention was to try to focus those types of larger oriented floor plates of retail towards the larger intersections to deal with the traffic generation and the transit facilities. (Note: the attached communication referenced during the presentation, dated June 13, 2016, was received during the meeting.)

- J. Pastorius, Manager, Old East Village BIA – (see attached presentation.)
- M. Zunti, Sifton Properties Limited – Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responds to Ms. Zunti's presentation by commenting that from a staff perspective, they did receive this correspondence today and Ms. Zunti is correct, these are amendments that need to be incorporated into the Plan; noting that G. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research was consulting with Ms. Hall, Solicitor II, that the City is ok from a notice point of view; thinking that the Committee's resolution today if the Committee does choose to move forward with this should indicate that no further notice be required; advising that staff will make the changes to the Plan before the June 23, 2016

Council meeting; Mr. Barrett clarifies that they are speaking about three Official Plan Amendments that have been approved by the Municipal Council and, as Ms. Zunti noted, the one she spoke of was December, 2015, it received the final notice not until January and there were two others; indicating that the map changes have been made for these three Official Plan Amendments however the text policies that go with the maps were missed; reiterating that these have gone through a full public notice, one of them has been adjudicated by the Ontario Municipal Board so it is just a matter of getting these policies added to the final Plan that you adopt this evening. (See attached communication.)

- L. Kirkness, Kirkness Planning Consultants, on behalf of Creative Properties and the London Area Planning Consultants – Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responds to Mr. Kirkness's presentation on behalf of Creative Properties by indicating that the Roundhouse development, as has been pointed out, is a fantastic development and what has occurred there to date is tremendous and an application is coming forward in the near future; indicating that they will be responding to that but that is not for the tower component that is being discussed today; advising that the London Plan proposes a maximum height of sixteen stories along what is identified here as an urban corridor place type and it has segment policies that relate to the main street character of this area; noting that there are three different segments that have these main street policies applied and that allows for that ultimate height of sixteen stories; suggesting to the Committee that, in his opinion, it is probably not a good idea to be making a decision on a twenty-five storey tower now for that site; rather what could be done is the proponent could bring forward a planning application now, even after the London Plan is adopted by Council in the coming weeks and they can deal with that proposal through a public Official Plan process for a site specific amendment; it would be an amendment to the current Official Plan as well as the ultimate London Plan and there is the opportunity for that privately initiated Official Plan Amendment to come forward now so that the Committee can consider, in the context of a public process, whether a twenty-five storey tower is appropriate at this location and how it relates to the context; noting that he conferred with Ms. Hall, Solicitor II; (*Councillor Hubert indicates that he would like to move away from the specifics of it because he does not think that it is appropriate to argue the merits or non-merits of a particular site, but in general, can you help him understand why they are not trying to – because he thought this was all about inward and upward and how, when you say that is a main street corridor but it is actually industrial uses and designations along there in many respects particularly on the sections that are backing onto Bathurst Street because that was the railway corridor and hence the industrial corridor so he is a little confused on that and he thinks that if you take the railway lands, and this is not uncommon for many municipalities, that there would be many properties along there that would have potential for redevelopment and would have the same sort of issue.*); Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, points the Committee to the height table that shows the different heights; starting out with the Downtown; advising that it shows the gradation that might answer the question of the Councillor in height; indicating that the intent of the Plan is to allow for greater opportunity; noting that there is significantly more opportunity for height and intensity in the London Plan than there is in the current Official Plan; pointing out that, in the Downtown, the first column that you can see is twenty storeys in height and the second column is with type two bonusing where you can get up to thirty-five stories in height; the transit villages which are at the terminus of the rapid transit corridors are fifteen, with twenty-two storeys with the bonusing and you can see along the rapid transit corridors that you can get up to twelve storeys; however if you are close to a station, within one hundred metres of a station, then you can go up to sixteen storeys and in this case we are talking about an urban corridor and you can see that it is six to eight but in fact this is a special segment within the urban corridor and although main street might sound like something that is bringing heights down, it actually brings the heights up through the segment policies because it relates to the major main street areas which is the SoHo area, the Old East Village and Richmond Row; reiterating that there is the opportunity along this corridor to go up to sixteen stories; the intent is to allow for greater intensity but the question is, do you want to have, for example, a thirty-five storey tower or a thirty storey tower throughout the entire city or do you want to, in a planned way, allow for greater intensity and height but plan out where you want those heights and the gradation of those heights throughout those corridors so they work in context with the

concept of the place type vision; *(Councillor Hubert indicates that what Mr. Fleming is saying is that they could bring an amendment to the Official Plan that would allow them something greater; advising that the confusion is main street versus urban corridor as urban corridor is only eight with bonus; and wondering which zone they are in now.);* Mr. Fleming responds that this is one of the more complex parts of the Plan, this is in the urban corridor place type but there are special policies for three main streets in the urban corridor place type; indicating that there is a reason for that and without getting into a lot of details, this relates to the urban structure plan and you could go up to a maximum of sixteen storeys with bonus in the main street segment of the urban corridor place type; an amendment could come forward for the twenty-five stories which would be a specific site policy which Council could then consider whether they think that is appropriate or not, it could be outside of the urban structure plan and the place types that have been set but they recognize that there are certain individual sites that are unique in one way or another and he thinks that is what the applicant would be showing why this particular site is unique and why it makes sense for that requested height, that would be the test of the application as well as the additional policies in the current Plan; *(Councillor Hubert indicates that what Mr. Fleming is saying is that there are parameters that will take it this far but there are tools that will take it to another level, there are mechanisms that could get it to twenty-five storeys);* Mr. Fleming responds that what he is suggesting is that rather than the Council making that assessment right now within the context of the London Plan an application be brought forward but to do that in the coming weeks or months before the Plan is in effect, approved by the Ministry, in which case the opportunity will not be there for a privately initiated amendment for two years; *(Councillor Turner enquires about, in a circumstance such as this or on a mid-block residential where a property owner had amassed a few properties adjacent wanted to do something that was non-confirming with the Official Plan and wanted to make the application to change that, what is the process; currently it is an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment, how does that parallel in the new regime.);* Mr. Fleming responds that it would be the exact same process as it stands right now which would be an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment; believing that the London Plan is more flexible and they think that there would be less requirement for an Official Plan Amendment across the board because there is more flexibility, there is a greater range of heights that are allowed for and they are not getting hung up on the details of density, for example, where the Plan does not have specific densities limiting the potential for zoning amendments without those amendments to the Plan; reiterating that it would be the same process and the only difference is, and this is because of new legislation that is not yet in effect but the Province brought forward new legislation and is about to bring it in effect in July, 2016 that says that when a new Official Plan comes forward there is no opportunity for privately initiated Official Plan Amendments for a two year period; noting that that does not preclude the Municipality from initiating and making an Official Plan Amendment; *(Councillor Turner talks about in previous discussions the concept of development permit systems had also been floated and this merge, he thinks that it comes up with Bill 73 at some point or has it already been established.);* Mr. Fleming responds that the authority for a municipality to establish a development permit system is already in place and the regulations are there as well; however, what has been changed through the new legislation or what will be changed is the notion of referring to a development permit system as a community planning permit system and he thinks that reflects more of the character and the vision for what could be done through that type of system; what he wants to be clear about is that you will hear from time to time people speaking about zoning and he just wants the Committee to recognize, as he thinks the Committee does, that this is the Official Plan which leads zoning but they are not dealing with the Zoning by-law at this time or with the development permit system but it is something that he can assure you that they will be looking at in terms of the implementation of this Plan once the Plan is adopted they are going to be quickly moving to a discussion of implementation and a big part of that will be looking at a community planning permit system where they will have meetings with the development community, their own internal groups and the Urban League and other community stakeholders to understand whether that is a useful tool in implementing this Plan which he thinks it could potentially be; *(Councillor Helmer advising that it is good that we have this one specific example because it is looking at an important principle overall that he*

thinks is worth the Committee discussing; in many ways the way they are doing the place types and the street types is all about what the building fronts onto and he thinks that what this is getting at is that the building also backs onto something and in this case it backs onto the Downtown and when you think about the transition and the context you could have a thirty-five storey building on the north side of the tracks and then you would go down to much shorter buildings on the way down to a main street so it is not as if it backs onto another main street, there are the train tracks there and then there is the entire Downtown where you have the highest possible forms of development; he thinks that is something where, in all these cases they need to be very sensitive to that and think in our planning about what it is backing onto is almost as important as what it is fronting onto; certainly this is at the back end of the main street and is not right out onto Horton Street, it is further back; thinking that in some ways what is on the north side is a bit more important than what is on the south side; wondering about this one hundred metres from the transit station as that is not very far; thinking that we know from the research on transit oriented development that it is the area about eight hundred metres around a station that you see the most land value uplift and the most redevelopment and pieces like that; advising that his question is why one hundred metres; this area here, for example, seems to be like three hundred fifty metres away from what could be a transit station at Horton Street and Wellington Road and, if that were the case, that is really not a very far walk so he could see a lot of people living there and being close to a transit station so, without getting into the specifics of the site, he would like an answer about the one hundred metres around the station.); Mr. Galloway, Manager, Urban Design and Graphic Information Systems responds that the one hundred metres was arrived at because, as many of you have heard before, the discussion about the peanut butter, with the peanut butter representing the amount of growth in terms of high rise forms and remembering that the intensity is greater at the stations, the one hundred metres, but a lot of the areas still in rapid transit corridor place type which still gets up to twelve storeys in height through the bonus provisions, you are still getting a lot of intensity but the one hundred metres allows them to focus in on the transit station proper; keeping in mind that there are thirty plus transit stations so in terms of all of that intensity, if you were to expand it out that is a lot of growth that could suck other growth opportunities out of the Downtown and other areas like the transit village where you hope to intensify given the amount of growth that they have; (Councillor Hopkins thanks Councillor Squire for recognizing her as she is not a member of the Planning and Environment Committee; advising that she has a general question on high density; in his presentation Mr. Galloway talked about London has twenty years supply of high density; requesting clarification on what that means; is that in the Downtown area or is that right across London.); Mr. Galloway responds that that is referencing the total high density overlay, not all high density, just the overlay that exists within the built area boundary there is a twenty year supply; noting that the red dots are related to the high density overlay; there is much more given the transit villages and all of those things; Mr. Fleming responds to Mr. Kirkness's presentation on behalf of the London Area Planning Consultants by thanking their planning colleagues on the private sector side of the ledger as they have been very helpful through the process and have given them great suggestions that have made the Plan better. (See attached presentations).

- Mary, Chippewas of the Thames First Nation – (Councillor Hubert enquires when they can receive the Chippewas of the Thames First Nation comments.); Mary responds that they have two Council meetings in a month and they are aiming for the second Council meeting which is the third week of June; provided that she can get that information to their Environment Committee, this is the goal; (Councillor Turner indicates that he thinks that it is very important for them to see the comments as well and he hopes that it is not straight to the City and off to the Ministry; he would like the Municipal Council to see the comments as well.). (See attached communication).
- Mohamed Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue – requesting clarification on page 147 of the Planning and Environment Committee, thanking someone he has never met, does not know and has never retained, but who takes a keen interest in his property Downtown; having said that he would like to be added to the circulation list and any notices to be forwarded to him; advising that he discovered early Sunday morning that his property is in the Added Agenda in regard to the Downtown; referring to the triangles, the potential naturalization zones, he may be the only one here today that is outside the Urban Growth

Boundary that wants to address something; there is something that is being added today, after Policy 13.38 and it refers to adjoining adjacent property owners, there is a triangle at the very west end of town, on map five there is a triangle that would be within Komoka Provincial Park; wondering about the rationale of that triangle; from his understanding and the fact that these maps do not have property lines, his understanding and his reading of that is that it is right inside Komoka Provincial Park; expressing concern with how it affects adjoining property owners; realizing that the potential naturalization areas are defined but they are defined a little bit vaguely but there are terms that adjacent property owners shall be bound by and there are no perimeters that are given in table thirteen of the Plan with respect to potential naturalization areas; enquiring as to how that affects adjoining property owners of which he is to the direct east of, an agricultural property; noting that he is not speaking of development here and the Plan is about development and the growth of the City but having put that right in the middle of a Provincial Park, are we not also trying to create a law that may be in conflict with provincial matters as the Province owns that land and part of it is under Upper Thames River Conservation Authority and others are, in fact, the Provincial park; there are ANSI's, there are ESA's, are we looking at a conflict at some point where that one specific triangle may cause conflict and not another layer of protection but another layer of paperwork; Mr. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, responds that the red triangles are opportunities for naturalization and those are supported by subwatershed studies and the history, they are supported by big picture vision that comes through Carolinian Canada but also through their own policies; advising that they participated with the Province on the Master Plan for the Provincial Park, are aware of their plans and what they are proposing should match their plans; noting that they are not suggesting that they are going to force them to do anything but all of these are potential naturalization areas based on a broader picture of the natural heritage system where gaps in areas could be filled in to achieve widths of corridors that are better for wildlife management, natural features and functions; reiterating that they did participate in their master plan and they are not going to impose anything on the Province but it does conform with their plans as well; Mohamed Moussa responds that any perimeters or buffer zones around that is more the concern as to how does it affect adjoining property owners which is something that is being added today which brought this to his attention; Mr. Macpherson responds that part of the rationale behind this is to work with landowners that are outside the Urban Growth Boundary, through programs with the local Conservation Authority, these provide some direction where there is the biggest bang for the buck for naturalization programs that may be tree plantings done in conjunction with landowners and those are cooperating landowners, people who would like to expand along river corridors; reiterating that there is no implication or suggestion that people have to do anything with those triangles but it does provide some big picture guidance about where they should be focusing their efforts; *(Councillor Helmer expresses appreciation to the speaker about his vigilance about what is going on with the changes identified there and wondering if this policy is going to become 13.39; the areas adjacent to the park will be dealt with in conformity with the policies in the Plan; later on in the Plan, Policy 13.40, it says that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in or adjacent to areas of natural or scientific interest unless it can be demonstrated that there is no negative impacts on the natural features; thinking that the real question is, is my property adjacent to this triangle and does it mean that I am not going to be able to develop.);* Mr. Barrett responds that with respect to the new 13.39, that is wording that came from the Province to clarify that the lands within the boundaries of Komoka Provincial Park would not be subject to the policies of this Plan; the reference to adjacent lands just meant that the Province acknowledged that if you are adjacent to the Park, of course you are covered by the policies of the Plan; reiterating that that is what it means in the instance of 13.39; with respect to adjacent lands under the natural heritage system, that has a different definition; indicating that the Councillor is correct, that the potential naturalization areas are identified as potential components of the natural heritage system; thinking that the word "potential" is one that is very important, as Mr. Macpherson indicated, these are put on more as signals to show that if, and there is a whole list of things that if you are doing an environmental study, if you are doing an EIS, Conservation Master Plans, hydrogeological studies, this is an opportunity for those study processes to also look at these areas that have been identified as potential naturalization areas to see if they are worthy of being

added; advising that that is the natural heritage context; indicating that they are not adjacent lands as it would relate to an identified component of the natural heritage system, they could be adjacent lands if you went through that evaluation and became part of that whole natural heritage system.