

## Public Participation Meeting Presentation for November 14, 2016

I am here to represent the opinions of the residents of the three single detached homes directly to the east of the proposed development.

I would like to begin by acknowledging the efforts to date by the City of London and the developer to come up with recommendations that also take into consideration the input from a variety of stakeholders. Those efforts are appreciated.

Our most pressing concern about the zoning bylaw amendment request is the proposed building height and its location, relative to the front property line. The urban design peer review panel itself suggested that the setback of 1.49 metres is inadequate when considering future potential street widening of Commissioners Road West. The current proposal is for a reduced front yard setback of 2.09m measured from the nearest portion of the building, which is still inadequate in our view.

Secondary to that concern, is the lack of visual integration of the proposed building into the surrounding environment and established street frontage. We do not think the current proposal is a compatible interface with existing low density residential homes to the east. The current proposed design ignores the value attached to enhancing the community - not only because it is so blatantly different, and unattractive I might add, but because it would have the apartment tenants - practically living on the sidewalk for passersby to view them on display.

While the developer suggests that it is anticipated that the single detached dwellings to the east will be redeveloped over the long term that could be as long as twenty-five to thirty years down the road.

Consideration for doing what is right for the Byron community must remain in the forefront. The proposal does not fit within the context of the community of Byron. The site and building design must be compatible and complementary with the adjacent single detached homes, as well as the townhouses to the west and the condominiums to the east. The proposed building is not sensitive to the neighbourhood streetscape character that exists.

While we applaud the recommendations to provide individual entrances to ground floor units on the south façade, some tweaking of this suggestion is necessary. The fencing/walls should be extended to the front setback and should be both aesthetically pleasing, and functional in terms of providing a noise barrier, and providing privacy (higher than current proposal of 1.2m), and the screening of tenant possessions like BBQs, bikes, and toys. Also, wooden fencing running along the property line east of the development needs to be replaced, and built at a height that provides privacy for the homeowners on that east side.

To align the proposed development with the streetscape, there should be noise wall buffers, along with trees and low lying vegetation, at the point where buffers are currently located to the east and west, in front of the townhouses and condominiums. This would create continuity and be more visually pleasing along the street frontage.

The proposed apartment building could then be set back so that it is aligned with the other townhouses or condominiums. Privacy and buffering would thus be managed. As a four storey building with fewer tenants, fewer parking spots would be needed in the back of the property. It is not necessary to have 65 parking spots. We know that fewer 'millennials' drive cars, and in a city that is promoting the use of public transit, having fewer parking spots (for example: 55 - 58) would free up space for the building form, allowing for a 4 storey building with plenty of open space.

Aside from the negative visual impact of a 5-storey building there are also concerns about shadowing to adjacent properties, the loss of views, and light pollution from outside lighting. For example, the house east of the proposed development is in shadow in the early morning and late afternoon, exactly when people want to be out on their patio: for breakfast, and when they come home from work for dinner. The proposed building could be shifted further west on the property to avoid shadowing on the single detached home to the east, without affecting the townhomes to the west.

There are concerns about future property values if a larger development is allowed; and potential impacts on our properties, and other nearby properties if these are not managed and mitigated properly. There is no reason that an apartment development with a different design, that places the building further back on the property (6.09m from the nearest portion of the building to the property boundary, with some massing set further back to 8m), and stands 4 stories in height, could not be just as viable for the developer and for the Byron community.

We do not know if city council is passing a bonus 1 or bonus 2 zoning by-law to allow for the increased height of the proposed building in exchange for the developer to include the proposed public pathway. It seems so, given that the density, lot area, lot coverage and landscaped open space calculation is to be based on a lot area which includes the lands in the abutting open space special provision zone.

If this is indeed true, we do not think the public benefit of the path is commensurate with the extent of the amendment request for a greater building height and subsequent density. This proposed pathway, according to feedback received from the community, is not wanted nor desirable, given that Warbler Woods and Springbank Park are a short walk away in either direction. We do not need a 10 minute walking loop in this naturalized area. We need this piece of Carolinian Forest to be left alone.

Robin Rundle Drake  
Ken McLennan  
Chris Langdon  
Lynne Mortimer  
Tim Parker

November 14, 2016