

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

7. Property located at 169 Foster Avenue (Z-8651)

- Nathan McInnis, applicant – expressing appreciation to the Planning staff for being so accommodating during this process; advising that this is their first application and they have had lots of questions and staff have been very accommodating; expressing disagreement with the planning report recommendation for this application which they would like to oppose; expressing disagreement with the special provision to the proposed zone to eliminate the apartment use in the R8-4 Zone; stating that the Planning Department had explained that one of the main reasons for their recommendation was that the public had been shown that this specific project would be a single bedroom building for seniors, which is true, that is how they presented it; however, the public has been made aware of all of the additional permitted uses for the property within the zoning request including apartment, on several occasions; notably when the Notice of Application to Amend the Zoning By-law was sent out on July 20, 2016, also when the Notice of Application was published in The Londoner on July 21, 2016 and during the meeting that he and his wife held at the Kiwanis Seniors Centre on August 8, 2016; during that meeting he explicitly stated that if funding did not work out with affordable housing they would have to look to other models to make the project feasible; indicating that the Planning department also stated that an apartment building could be presented in any form of intensity necessary to accommodate twelve units with up to three bedrooms per unit subject to conformity within the regulations; advising that, by that same logic, the same sort of intensity could be applied to a seniors only building just as easily, which would make it not compatible with the neighbourhood; noting that it would be too intense for the site; indicating that the reality is that there are provisions in place to prevent that type of over intensification to the site such as near campus housing and meeting requirements through site plan approval; pointing out that a seniors building is the preferred prospect for the site and is the plan that they will be submitting to affordable housing once the zoning application has been approved; however, since he was informed of the Planning department's recommendation to remove the apartment use, he has had several discussions with members of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and members of the London Housing Development Corporation (LHDC) to see how the restrictions would affect a bid for an affordable housing application; advising that both groups indicated that a mixed-use apartment building is now a preferred building that they would like to see and that they want to get away from single use buildings; noting that this is a new direction that the LHDC and CMHC are taking since the new request for proposals came out on July 16, 2016, which was after their application had been submitted to the City, they changed how they were going to proceed; stating that if the funding does not work out with affordable housing, they have to look at different suitable models to make a new building feasible and this includes all the potential uses offered by the proposed zoning change so if an apartment building is not allowed on the site, the remaining range of permitted uses is very narrow and either a specialized, usually government supported financed project for which there is very little funding available or specialized accommodations that are few and unpopular, such as emergency care facilities and lodging houses; two horizontally spacial for the small subject site such as townhouses; or not compatible or complimentary to the neighbourhood; marketing in the private sector would be highly impeded if the apartment use was not included; indicating that if the affordable housing model were to fall through the alternative building model for 169 Foster Avenue would be almost exactly the same as what they are currently proposing, in that it would be a building composed of one bedroom units and it would likely be focused on a working demographic and a seniors demographic; understanding the neighbours being concerned about a developer coming in and throwing up a twelve unit building with five bedrooms each; however this could never be the case as such a building would be way too intense for this site and would never pass the site plan approval process; proposing what is close to the maximum that the square footage of the land would allow for and the guidelines of the zoning which ensures that over intensification could not take place;

advising that the Planning department has determined that the proposed building site satisfies the Provincial Policy Statement, supports the Official Plan by encouraging infill in residential areas where existing land uses are not adversely affected and, in terms of zoning, no additional provisions are needed to accommodate the height of this building as it meets the required setbacks, lot coverage and open space requirements of the proposed zone; reiterating that staff is completely happy with the footprint, the problem is with the tenants; outlining that historically the research shows that this property has been continuously in use as an apartment building since at least the 1930's; advising that since the current building has been in continuous use as an apartment building for such a long time it seems contradictory for the new proposed structure to not be allowed to continue with such a use; pointing out that 169 Foster Avenue has a long proven record of blending with the community at Oxford Park and its uses as an apartment has been a very appropriate use for this site for a very long time; pointing out that it seems very strange that now, after a continued use for eighty-six years that its use would no longer be deemed compatible with the neighbourhood; indicating that they feel that eliminating the use as an apartment building would be punitive; advising that 169 Foster Avenue directly abuts several properties that hold the same zoning that they are requesting; pointing out that it is located across the street from a major commercial centre and is located on the proposed rapid transit route; advising that the land use policy framework for the Province and the City is about infill and intensification and this site epitomizes the opportunity, being so close to such a broad range of commercial and transportation services; stating that the London Plan has also made it very clear that the intensification of strategic properties is a priority to help slow urban sprawl and it is only appropriate that the zoning to allow a variety of potential tenants to have access to such conveniences and not restricting to only one segment of the population; *(Councillor Helmer talks about the definition in the Zoning By-law under Chapter 2, what we are talking about is a part of the building, senior citizens and it says that it means an apartment building designed for the accommodation of the elderly which is owned and managed by a public housing authority or non-profit organization or charitable institution which may be associated with a church; enquiring whether or not the applicant is a charitable institution, a non-profit organization, realizing that they are not a public housing corporation, obviously, so do they meet the definition of what is described under the Zoning By-law);* applicant responds that no he does not; *(Councillor Helmer enquires, to staff, to make sure that he is reading the right definition as he knows that they have changed some things but he just went and checked to make sure it is the right one but he wants to double check that, and, if that is the case, what are we doing here.);* Mr. M. Corby, Planner II, responds that, in order to meet the definition the applicant would be required to receive the funding from the government and then they would be a seniors apartment to meet the definition; noting that that is another way to ensure that the use that has been proposed is put in place; *(Councillor Helmer clarifies that what the Planner is suggesting is that an organization that is receiving money through investment or affordable housing or some other granting program like that, we would interpret it as being a public housing authority since it is getting public money to support the project.);* Mr. M. Corby, Planner II, responding that that is correct.

- Deborah Worsfold, 169 Columbia Avenue – indicating that her property is located at the back of the property that is being discussed but adjacent; advising that she attended the meeting that was held by the applicants to discuss what is happening here; expressing concern after hearing the applicant speak is that what he is saying that they intend to do with the property is not at all the same that was discussed at that meeting; expressing confusion as to what their intention is; pointing out that she is here with her neighbor who is directly behind the property and they had a short list of concerns that it looked like in the application that the City looked at that was going to accommodate their concerns; stating that the property is close enough to her that when she is sitting in her home in the evening, the headlights that all come through into that park all shine into her home even though there are lots of trees; establishing that it does have that ability to affect them all quite a bit; pointing out that the existing property is half the size of what they are proposing and they all live with that but at that meeting, where many more people were there to discuss it, predominantly from Foster Avenue, everyone was up in arms about the concern about the amount of people that already create traffic problems, etc; stating that whether or not you use it for seniors or for someone else, the thing is that if you are talking about

doubling it, she does not see how that can make any sense if there is already an issue with how it exists; pointing out that you can say that it is an apartment building but really it is an old house; noting that a friend of hers owned it previous to the applicant and it is just six apartments in an old house; understanding going forward and trying to make good use of the property and the amenities around but everything else in that area around their side of Oxford Street is zoning that is mostly single residential with very large lots and they do not want it messed with; indicating that right now she is feeling deceived as what was written down in terms of what was going to be and this sounds like they do not want it to be about seniors; expressing concern with how you could make that accountable; enquiring how you can police that it is only for seniors; hearing that it is something else again; expressing concern as to what they are asking to do as her neighbour.

- Paul Carroll, 170 Columbia Avenue – indicating that his property is directly behind 169 Foster Avenue; advising that he has the same concerns as his neighbor; noting that the concerns may directly impact him more; stating that his previous concerns have been addressed; expressing appreciation that the things like headlights and lighting, the trees and so on, that the City has responded to those things and put it right in the report that they were recommended; noting that made him feel really good; expressing concern that if it is not going to be seniors, there will be extra traffic, parking may not be good enough at what was originally recommended if it is regular tenants in there; indicating that seniors do tend to leave less of a footprint; stating that because things have changed they have to start worrying again about things like privacy and lighting, the kind of people that are going to be in there and that kind of thing; pointing out that right now it is a nice, big stone house with six apartments and now it is going to be almost twice the footprint, closer to the perimeter of the properties, taking away any lawn and space for those twelve people to live in; reiterating that things have changed if it is not seniors.