

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

23. Beaufort/Irwin/Gunn/Saunby (BIGS) Neighbourhood Secondary Plan (O-8478)
- Diane Padoin, 368 Wharncliffe Road North – asking the Committee Members, as residents of London and as members of this City Council, to oppose this plan and vote no; indicating that she is not opposed to development, she totally understands the nature of the area that she lives in; noting that she just moved in recently; knowing it is not a suburban area like Oakridge or Byron; indicating that she completely understands where she lives and where she chose to live; pointing out that she really did not choose for this neighbourhood to become what it is planned to be; outlining that what is laid out in this Plan, to her and to many of us, really, it is looking like it is going to become the Beaufort and Gunn area, which has really become quite crime-ridden and students and all the other things; noting that it is a quite violent area and we certainly do not want that for our neighbourhood; advising that they have been told numerous times that zoning cannot be resident people and it was just outlined there a few minutes ago, that it cannot be resident based, but the comment has always been, the discussions around it, are always the Plan is close to Western and it is accommodating this area that is close to Western University; reiterating that a lot of the development is accommodating what is at Western University; pointing out that, to her, that means students; expressing concern that the discussions that we have had have been good and we appreciate the City and the planners coming to us and listening to us, but she is looking at this as it is a neighbourhood with a nice mix of families and students and why is this not allowed to be remaining the way it is right now, this close to Western; enquiring if there is a reason why everything close to Western has to become like Beaufort and Gunn, which to her is unacceptable; wondering does it really have to be parking lots and concrete and high-rises and all students; pointing out that we are talking about a small crescent area, in the area which she lives, which is Wharncliffe Road North and Cedar Ave; noting that it is along Gibbons Park, the forest area, right along the water and it just makes no sense to have some of the things planned that are planned and the creeping and all of the things we have been talking about; understanding, from a development standpoint, what needs to be done, but we are really not an old village or Old East Village or Wortley Village, we are a small crescent trying to maintain a sense of community and neighbourhood and amongst the chaos that is already been around or allowed all around us, it is really becoming an issue; if we have to become part of what has already been approved and allowed to be built; indicating that a yes vote, to her, continues the chaos that so much of this area around us is already in; providing an example, we were told there would be no access to the apartment buildings from the side streets, and ours would be a side street and the apartment buildings would be on the Wharncliffe area; advising that the Plan states that while access to development along the civic corridor may be provided from side streets, traffic impact associated with such will be directed away from the internal portions of the neighbourhood area; saying that it can be provided from side streets; stating that, to her, that wording is not strong enough to allow not having access to side streets, which is where we live; noting that she is close to that end of Wharncliffe; indicating that having access on a side street is right in her front yard; reiterating that the issue is that Beaufort Street is a living example of that statement being turned into a variance and allowances and having it happen; pointing out that another thing is just about the setbacks that are written in; looking for stronger wording; knowing that things can happen, no matter what wording is in there, but we are certainly looking for stronger wording, proper setbacks written in; indicating that there is wording in there that allows for the setbacks to be in line with the streetscape; pointing out that if they line up with the streetscape to the south, they are closer to the road, if they line up with the streetscape to the north, then they are setback properly; indicating that it is all dependent on how those words are taken, and again it is not strongly worded enough, in her opinion; pointing out that there is some discrepancy because, in the Plan, it talks about the setbacks, yet they are allowing tree enhancement promises as well, which, if the buildings are right close to the road, she is not sure where they are going to be putting trees; advising that the property located at 350 Wharncliffe, which is directly across the street

from her, having some commercial capability in there, could possibly be a restaurant; reiterating that this would be directly across the street from her and again, we are talking about a small crescent area; reiterating that it is not like a Wortley Village area, it is a small crescent that we are talking about; expressing that she is not sure how the wording will be taken, but if we look at experience and we look at what has happened in this area of the City, it certainly has not been taken word for word, as it was written before; feeling the wording is pretty loosely done right now and can be misconstrued a number of different ways so we would like stronger wording; asking the Committee to vote no; indicating that she does not want this Plan to go through the way it is; advising that she would like to see it revised to support what is here right now, to support the neighbourhood and community and allow for, certainly, necessary development and the growth that is needed, but with our true neighbourhood staying in tact and not being dismantled and left to be consumed by this, what she feels is a very development-weighted plan.

- Jamie Crncich, 384 Cedar Avenue – speaking against this proposal from the perspective of a Cedar Ave. resident; noting that her father is a prominent developer in the city and she is also an urban planning university student; indicating that this Plan being displayed to us is being displayed as something that protects our neighbourhood but many of neighbours do not feel very protected; understanding, as a current urban planning student, that the purpose of zoning in the Official Plan is to develop the needs of the city while still protecting the residents that live there; stating that this development will take away from the sense of community that exists within our area; going a little textbook here, zoning is a planning tool to ensure that there is harmony between built form, such as the sizes of the houses, and private amenity, such as the open space that exists within our neighbourhood; disrupting the balance between these two issues will create nothing more than a concrete jungle; providing an example, just reading through this proposal, through the civic corridor section on form, the Plan proposes that building units right on the property line, and that will not leave very much room for enhanced street tree planting, especially since there is street widening going on in that area as well; pointing out that if you review the objectives for this Plan, they include creating space for community events and open space networks throughout the neighbourhood, which do not seem possible when you are proposing building without proper yard setbacks; expressing concern that the zoning setbacks and buffers that have existed in this area have not been followed time and time again with the buildings that already exist in our area; recommending that you take a look at the number of site-specific zoning special provisions that have been made in the area; wondering what ensures that this time the restrictions will be followed; advising that for many reasons she feels this Plan does not support us as a neighbourhood and that the crescent we live on; stating that she strongly encourages the Committee to vote against the proposal; asking to please let the next Plan for this area protect the family homes that exist here and restrict the sprawl of high-density units that threaten our neighbourhood.
- Lotus Why, Upper, 364 Wharncliffe Road North – pointing out that she is not going to repeat some of the same things previous said; advising that, today she just found out something that she did not know about; noting that she has only been in the neighbourhood a year; stating that she found out that the Secondary Plan does not really have an effect until the Official London Plan is rewritten; noting that this is her interpretation of it; asking the Committee to address that; knowing that now, she is concerned, as she has always been concerned, as we are talking about the property at 351-365 Wharncliffe Road North, which is directly across the road from me; knowing that the Secondary Plan does not have any effect, it means that the zoning is R8-4, which then she asks the question, does that mean that four storeys could be built on those three little buildings that are in front, that currently have two storeys and the answer was yes; wondering, if the zone is R8-4, and there are a few other properties zoned R8-4 in the neighbourhood, where, particularly the one at 315-323, (the one in front of 60 Beaufort), could it be something similar to that if someone was to redevelop right now; believing the answer might be yes; stating that that building is an issue because it is what she might call a monster building and she certainly would not want that to happen right there; stating that that is basically her concern, and then if this Plan is written for the future, because she understands that the Secondary Plan gives the details to the Official Plan, could we, in part e) not to use the word “grandfathered”, but for the property at 351-365 Wharncliffe Road North, redevelopment along the streetscape shall maintain the existing scale, which

- is no change to part e) in the transition; adding the part existing scale and height of the current buildings and setback to the original buildings onsite.
- Sheila Scott, 372 Cedar Avenue – indicating that she is a long term resident of this area and the area is very special to her; advising that she has worked very hard to try to have a balanced approach to this; stating that their particular area has been designated as a preservation, which we are very happy about, but it is the other areas that we are concerned about as well, not just our own particular backyard; pointing out that in the planning documents, it states that this is to be a mixed neighbourhood with different housing types, different densities, different tenants, different residents, and the way the Plan is at the moment, she thinks it is very weighted to students; outlining that the primary developer in this area is man we are all familiar with, Mr. Stanton, and he does not build for seniors or families or professionals, he builds for students; noting that his footprint is all over our neighbourhood; enquiring if, with this Plan, can we have any guarantee that the rules will be obeyed because in the past they have not been; advising that she has had personal interactions with Mr. Stanton over developments at Cedar and Western; indicating that we objected to his plan as being over-sized, ambitious, but it went ahead anyway and then a few months later, oh whoops, he did make a mistake and we need a variance and it was granted and this is just one example of what has happened in this whole area with that particular developer; thanking staff and Councillors for listening to our concerns and you have certainly amended things in many, many ways and she thanks you for that; stating that she still has a concern about the big picture.
  - Jenny Majnaric, 22 Essex Street – indicating that she sent Councillor P. Squire and Mr. Maitland, Planner I, two letters and each time the letters were never brought up at the Council meeting; stating that she does not want the BIGS Secondary Plan adopted; advising that she does not agree with the development that is about to happen on Hollywood Crescent and Essex Street; reading from her submission on the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda; advising that she is not happy about that; noting that it is just that Mr. Stanton strictly builds for students, student rentals, not to young professionals; stating that she just wants it known that we want to bring in other types of people besides students.
  - Christine Crncich, 384 Cedar Avenue – believing that the Committee knows that she is opposed to this, so no surprise there; indicating that she listened today to Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research and Mr. Maitland, Planner I, who took some time with her to explain it; realizing that it is not a zoning issue but when she is reading through it, a lot of it sounds like you are talking about, we will listen to setbacks, we will honour these sort of things; thinking that because she is in real estate, she has a little bit more background so that she can pull up on the computer and find out, for example, what the zone R8-4 entails and she can see thirty-one changes to that R8-4 zone, of which she found was owned by Mr. Stanton; noting that five in the area had numerous changes; pointing out that, to her, that means you made an R8-4 rule in zoning to protect our area, but when you allow variances, one of them has eight, although she saw that they also broke lot coverage and landscape areas; indicating that when these are broken, somewhere in your system, it is broken, it might not be in this proposal we need to deal with it but what is happening is huge places with no setbacks, side yards, that it says no exceptions to 14.8 feet and she is out there with a measuring tape and it is 9.8 feet; stating that was an exception that was supposed to be 30 feet, that they went in no case, no exception to 14.8 feet; seeing rules broken over and over and over again and now it is pushing down our street and she is a partial owner of that property as well; pointing out that this could be across the street; stating that he can go from two storeys that he already has to four and if he can push all the setbacks, and come up to the street, we can make a wall that is comfortable for pedestrians to walk along; stating that it is worded wrong and we need more strength in that proposal if we are going to keep the development to where you want it, which is along the corridor; indicating that then we do not get to add a single family residence like at 350 that goes down the street, two doors over from the zen garden that she is building in her backyard, where a restaurant could be located; advising that that is what we have seen and that is what has ruined the Beaufort area; recommending you look up 60 Beaufort and look what they did, the house is sitting on its property line; noting that it did not have anything proper that it said in that R8 zone and that is what she is worried about, that going into our neighbourhood; asking

the Committee to please protect our neighbourhood, drive down it, pull into 60 Beaufort on your way home before you have to make a vote and look at if that were happening in your neighbourhood; indicating that they are saying things like they will support bigger windows on the lower level when that means, that is how he builds, he does not go down into a deep foundation, he pulls it up a little higher and you end up with a higher property; pointing out that, in every single one of his buildings, in five cases that she looked at, he was more than 10 feet over the given amount of maximum for the area; realizing that she sounds crazy, she is a horrible orator and writer of letters; expressing sorry to Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research and Mr. Maitland, Planner I, and everyone who has had to read her horrific letters and to Councillor Squire who has tried to help our neighbourhood but rules are being broken and they are coming into our neighbourhood; hoping that you would have support if they were coming into yours; stating that she does not want to live in Byron or Oakridge or Hunt Club, she is somebody who wants to live in the woods, on the river and she does not want that taken away from her; bringing friends of hers into the neighbourhood and now it is becoming like what happened in the BIGS, true, original BIGS area and she does not want that to happen to ours.

- Jamie Cleary, Vice-President, University Students Council – advising that students would be largely in favour of this Plan but he does not want to get into specifics; agreeing with this group over here that we would emphasize that the plans, the rules and regulations and zonings that have been outlined in this need to be followed, especially since we would be in favour to see the heritage sites, make sure they're maintained and he thinks the urban planning throughout all of this Plan also needs to be emphasized throughout all of this as a greater connection between Western students and the community that they are living in; emphasizing to the Committee is it seems like we always talk about here is the community and here are students; pointing out that what we need to remember is that students are a part of this community and if neighbourhood members are emphasizing that they want an inclusive and diverse community, we need to recognize that students are a part of that and we need to have a neighbourhood that allows students to live and thrive in the neighbourhood that best fits their needs and integrates them within the community; noting that we cannot keep segregating our student population into neighbourhoods, this is where students are living, they want to be a part of this community, they do not want to live within it or be segregated within it, they want to be able to be a part of it and he thinks the best way to do that is by following this Plan to the best of their abilities.
- Bart Stolienski and Wieslaw Pociecha, 354 Wharncliffe Road North – stating that there was no consultation in changing the inclusion of his property with the actual property owner from where it was, originally, and now has been taken out of the neighbourhood node; pointing out that the way it is situated, the property actually fits perfectly to be part of the higher intensification with its property line, as it is situated directly across from, as the ladies who spoke previously, have mentioned, Mr. Stanton's property, which, from the evidence in London, pretty much does whatever he wants; advising that there is a pretty good chance that there will be a pretty large high-rise standing right in front of the property, in the near future; advising that this house was bought by Mr. Pociecha as a retirement home, but the way things are going, it was bought from his aunt who lived there for forty-five years, to be a retirement home; however, based on the fact that Mr. Stanton does whatever he wants in the City of London, those three properties that he owns across the street, with that land behind it, most likely will end up as a multi-storey unit, which will end up being an entrance way into probably thirty-one or twenty-seven units, whichever building he decides to put up; indicating that Mr. Pociecha believes that, if his property was included in the original Plan here, there might be a potential for him to have a way out of that property without being stuck with it with a high-rise standing right in front of it; understanding that the ladies who spoke previously want a buffer, but that does not mean that a property should just be stuck on to something because nobody said anything or has been consulted on where they feel that it should be; looking at the map, the property aligns with the corridor with the property lines at the back of the corridor, along Western Road, and it would fit perfectly where it was until it was added last week because of somebody else's decision in the public, without consultation from the owner; advising that he was not here to talk about it because there was no reason to, he felt it was in the proper spot; stating that they do want to go on record that we feel that it was not added purposefully, it

was just added because a bunch of neighbours in the neighbourhood decided that that is the property they want to use as a buffer; asking that you keep that in mind and think about amending that decision.

- Edgar Allen Smuck, 928 Western Road – stating that he has lived at that address for about 26 years and he was living at 920 Western Road for five years, so he has been on the street for nearly 31 years; indicating that he also has an interest in 920 Western Road, 924 Western Road, 928 and 930 Western Road, which are part of this node where commercial will be permitted; indicating that when he was here a couple of months ago, the Plan which was in front of this Committee, Councillor Turner said he was prepared to accept that Plan that night; advising that he said that he preferred not to comment on the Plan that night because many things in it were new to me, particularly the addition of 350 and 354 Wharnccliffe Road North into the node, which would have rounded out the parcel; indicating that the Plan in front of us tonight is not the plan that was here two months ago, it is a different plan as 354 Wharnccliffe Road North has been removed; indicating that, to him, we want to make some kind of sensible redevelopment parcel, and what he has heard tonight is they want one developer to do the whole thing and we do not want to see each and every individual property owner going in their own direction; noting that that is what he thought staff had done two months ago, they created a parcel of land that had a straight line running across the back of the property and something that a developer could work with; indicating that, in the interim, he did obtain reference plan 33R19516 and that deals with the road widening and that is the reference plan that has been deposited by the City of London at the registry office and it shows the various parcels of land that are going to be required for the road widening; noting that it also shows that the little plaza that is framed off by Wharnccliffe Road North and Essex Street, is in jeopardy because twenty feet of that plaza is going to disappear, which is a significant amount of their parking, almost half of it; advising that he doubts whether that plaza is going to survive because there are two things they have got to face; stating that, first of all, in six months the road is going to be closed, and secondly, when the road is reopened, half their parking is gone; looking at a situation where the only variety store that serves an enormous amount of people who live in the area is going to disappear and we have to have some other source or place to put other services where people do not have to go very far to get bread, milk and so forth; thinking that the most logical place to put it is in the node where we are framed off by Cedar Avenue, Western Road and Wharnccliffe Road North and that is exactly what he thinks the planning staff intends; noting that there would be commercial on the first floor with up to five layers of residential on top of it; believing that we have to keep 354 Wharnccliffe Road North into this Plan or he cannot support it; however, if you put it back in, he will support the Plan; reiterating that if we are going to throw it out, the answer's no, as he does not see how this is going to work as you are setting up a plan that a developer cannot work with; reminding the Committee that there has to be underground parking and this is very expensive; pointing out that this is not going to be a cheap project and he thinks that the people that live behind us, when they say they need a buffer, the buffer they can have is something substantial on the front of the block that will provide mixed housing, where other developers will not go back into the subdivision and buy a house and rent to students because the students will live at the front, with other people; thinking the project will be large enough to accommodate a variety of people, retired people, people who work at the University, people who work downtown and students; reiterating that we have to rethink the whole thing as 354 Wharnccliffe Road has got to stay in, it cannot be bumped out of the node, or you will not have his support.
- Morrison Reed, 376 Wharnccliffe Road North – indicating that he has lived there with his family for about thirty-three years; appreciating the comments from the student representative from Western as this area has always integrated students ever since we have been there and we have had students, seniors, low-income folks, families, a very nice mix of people and it has been a stable community; thinking that most planners are familiar with the work of Jane Jacobs, who would say that the worst thing a planner can do is destabilize a stable community; reiterating that this is a stable community; believing that the Plan needs to be rethought, there are many positive elements, the main one being that the bulk of the neighbourhood pieces are preserved and most of us like that; objecting to the designation of 350-365 as urban corridor because that is not an urban corridor, that is a neighbourhood, it is not an urban corridor at all, it is actually a street that, if it did not

turn into Cedar, it would be dead end, it goes nowhere, except into the river, so it is not an urban corridor at all, it's a neighbourhood; advising that he does not understand why it would be designated urban corridor, when it is not; reiterating that that would be a main objection; stressing that certainly, we like living with students, we like the energy, the creativity that they bring to the neighbourhood; noting that this is not about students, it is about preserving the mix that we have and not disrupting that; advising that his basic point is again, at the least, maybe there is some rethinking that needs to happen about the Plan.

- Gary Brown, 35A - 59 Ridout Street South – indicating that he has heard far too many words that have been brought up in our conversation last year, brought up again, the word setback and people's yards; noting that he bikes down Essex Street on a regular basis as he is a diabetic and the clinic is at the end of the street; further noting that he was dating a young lady whose kids went to the Waldorf School, which is one block away; talking about integrating a neighbourhood with students, with all due respect, that neighbourhood has a lot of students, how many more do you want; apologizing that you need to ask that question sometimes but it is a balanced neighbourhood as it is; wondering if you want to add more and make it unbalanced; stating that he goes down Essex Street and he has watched what they have built down there; discussing that when someone says they are worried about their yard, we had the same problem in Old South and he knows who voted yes and who voted no; pointing out that we had the same problem with setbacks of houses that have been there 150 years; indicating that they have a yard in the backyard, they build a giant two storey house with a brick wall, ignore setbacks all the way back, set the house back 100 feet with a driveway, no yard anymore and guess what, their yard is no good for the rest of their life; indicating that this is a problem that we have brought up before and he sees it happening in many other neighbourhoods; pointing out that he would not have spoken to this issue but he hears the same problem going on; knowing this neighbourhood intimately, he can tell you every street, he has walked down them all, actually walked them all before many times and it is a very well integrated neighbourhood; understanding the expansion of Wharncliffe Road has to happen but we are cutting a neighbourhood in half doing it, never forget that; indicating that we have to do it as best as we can; understanding we go back to one lane a hundred yards from there, he has driven down there many times and it needs to be a two lane road, it has to be; indicating that we can do all the stuff we want on the outside of the City, but without fixing our bottlenecks in the core, it is never going to matter; advising that he supports roads, but he can see that myself; stating that we need to look at that, we need to listen to what they are saying; advising that it is very important to their neighbourhood and other neighbourhoods, that setbacks get addressed, that we have an overarching plan across London that addresses all these issues, not just in a single neighbourhood.
- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. – representing the London Property Corp; thanking staff, specifically, Mr. L. Maitland, Planner I and Mr. G. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, for meeting with us prior to this meeting and addressing the majority of our concerns and comments; thinking that there is a bit of a misconception that Ray Stanton is driving a lot of this process, where in fact a lot of the changes that we have requested have been to recognize existing uses on the property; advising that the one change that we did ask for, that was agreed to by staff, was to add stacked townhouses to Hollywood Boulevard where street townhouses were already contemplated; noting that there is not a big difference there by adding stacked townhouses; pointing out that the one area where we did ask for some intensification was rejected by staff and that was noted by Mr. Maitland, Planner I; encouraging this Plan going forward as it is right now; reiterating that we are satisfied with it; trying to maintain the status quo and where there is intensification it is something that was brought forward by staff as part of this process; speaking to the added correspondence that was provided by Mrs. Majnaric; apologizing if he mispronounced the last name; advising that she speaks about Mr. Stanton and the type of development that he builds in the city and Mr. Stanton has a long standing reputation with the City of London, with City staff, as he has had a lot of good developments for student housing; noting that a lot of the stuff that he develops is not consistent with the near campus neighbourhood strategy and these are the kinds of developments that the city is looking for, in terms of housing students and this is the kind of development that Mr. Stanton provides the City of London and for the students of the University of Western Ontario; pointing out that he did some research with respect to the two properties that this

correspondence comes from and he noticed that they both have rental licences, one for three units with three and two bedrooms and the other with two units, so I just ask the Committee to consider that when they are reviewing this correspondence from Mrs. Majnaric and K. Tonkovic.