

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Improvements to Public Engagement in the Planning Process - City of London (15 PRO p)

- *(Councillor S. Turner enquires if it is the requirement to give addressed notification, personally addressed notification, to the owners or to distribute notification within one hundred twenty metres of the application site.); Ms. B. Debbert, Senior Planner, responding that it requires first class notice by mail or by e-mail; pointing out that, at this point in time, e-mail notification for the first round would be really difficult because they do not have e-mail addresses for all of the people who live within the one hundred twenty metres; reiterating that it does require first class mail delivery; (Councillor Turner confirming that it is first class mail so unaddressed ad mail in a city envelope addressed in a large swath that would cover all of the areas would not qualify.); Ms. B. Debbert, Senior Planner, responding that she would need to review the exact wording in Bill 73, The Smart Growth for our Communities Act, to see if it changed; however, she does know that prior to that change that definitely referred to first class mail; (Councillor Hopkins enquiring when staff is going to consider expanding the one hundred twenty metre radius; wondering if that is going to be looked at now; realizing that it is in Phase 3.); Ms. B. Debbert, Senior Planner, responding that the intended scheduling for Phase 3, they are hoping to bring forward in Q1 of 2018; (Councillor Helmer indicating that he is trying to imagine what one of these signs would look like when the graphics are not quite as good or if they are perhaps not ready when the application goes up; a lot of applications come in, when the application comes in the renderings are available, staff has good ones to choose from, the sample provided at the meetings is cropped to show specific details as well as a broader view and sometimes we do not have that quality or range of renderings available; in a situation where there were low quality renderings, perhaps lacking in detail but showing the context of the particular redevelopment and the larger neighbourhood; something that might be blown out to the point where driving by it might not catch your eye or it would all be a bunch of grey instead of colour and things like that; has staff looked at how that would look on the sign; realizing that they are designed to have no images at all but wondering what a bad image looks like and at what point you say this bad image is worse than no image at all.); Ms. B. Debbert thanking Councillor Helmer for his comment; they had talked a lot about having standards around the images that come in so that they can use them on the signs but they were focusing more on the technical details like the number of pixels and the aspect ratio; thinking that the Councillor raises a really good point and as they are developing their standards for the developers to adhere to, they will keep that in mind; (Councillor Cassidy enquires about the common terms, there is a separate hyperlink that someone can click on and they can see common terms and what they actually mean and the reason that this jumped out at her is because she saw the word bonus zoning and we use that a lot; wondering if that will be one of the common terms that will be defined and how will somebody know, they will see this list of summary items and they might not know that bonus zoning would be in that separate area so would those terms themselves be a hyper link to take them to the common terms page or would there at least be an asterisk or some kind of indication that we recognize that you might not understand what this term means and that is why we have this other page here.); Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that this is something that they are just going to start to work on; he cannot say with any certainty right now, although his vision for this is the hyper link, that seems to be pretty common, that a word is hyper linked and you can click on it and it brings you to the definition; that is how the zoning by-law definitions work right now as well; in terms of bonus zoning, he noted it so that whole list of defined terms, they do not have that yet, but he has noted that for future use; (Councillor Hopkins enquiring if minor variances were looked at, at times there are applications at Committee of Adjustment that the community is concerned about and wondering if staff had a look at how we could advertise minor variances.); Ms. B. Debbert, Senior Planner,*

responding that there are certain types of applications that they know are under the *Planning Act* that they did not review as part of this process, they include minor variances, consents and site plans, partly because they would have been bringing almost one third administrator into that and they were finding it difficult enough just to coordinate between Planning Services and Development Services; they certainly would intend, in the future, that some of these products would also roll over into those other application types, they did not want to undertake more than they could handle; at this time they have not really looked at those types of applications specifically, they are a little different in that the process is so quick and the volume is so high, especially for minor variances that they probably would not be able to sustain something like application specific web pages for those, but certainly in terms of the appearance of the notices, they would hope to eventually roll that over into those other types of applications as well; Mr. T. Grawey, Manager, Development Services and Planning Liaison, adding that the volumes of some of the applications such as minor variances are up in the two hundred per year range and site plan is one hundred twenty plus so it is somewhat of a different type of advertising that we may be looking at for those types of applications; the other aspect of it is for site plans, they are not subject to appeal by the general public as Zoning or Official Plan Amendments or Plans of Subdivision are; putting the signage up may be a little bit misleading in some cases; providing the public an opportunity to comment where they do not have a right of appeal, they are looking at those longer term and hopefully they will be able to make some changes in terms of at least the mail out notices, the formats and the simple language and some of the other aspects that they are looking at for the planning applications; *(Councillor Hopkins stating that she thinks that there are some minor variances that do have a public participation component to it and she thinks that they would be important to look at, understanding there are quite a few of them, or can be but she wonders how many would require a public participation meeting and it would be a great way to communicate that to the community.); (Councillor Cassidy refers to the part where staff discusses posting notices in apartment buildings, Ms. Debbert noted that we cannot make them do that so our change is that we request landlords to post it; wondering about Bill 73 and their requirement that at least in buildings with seven or more tenants that it be posted, are they not compelled in Bill 73 and our request is in addition to that.); Ms. B. Debbert, Senior Planner, responding that the wording of Bill 73 is to request landlords to post.*

- Sandra Miller, 32 Upper Avenue – advising that she is on the Board for the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario – London Branch (ACO); however, she is not speaking for ACO but certainly this issue is something that they have discussed; indicating that they are very pleased with this whole project and commendations and kudos to all of the staff that were involved in this initiative; realizing that it has been a lot of work and a long term process and it is something that they have been hoping to see come about; noting that they did send a letter in last year; stating that in the staff report there was some feedback from the development community and building community, a bit of discussion about the responsibility of the development community to bring forth a consistent level and could that, at some point, possibly be put out to the private sector and the developers to put out these types of postings and public signage and information; recommending that this whole project and initiative stay within the civic realm due to retaining the clarity, the transparency, the consistency of information and a certain consistency of documentation and resources for the public; thinking that if it were to go to the private sector or leave it to the developers and builders you might get a real range of piece meal information whereas if it rests in the civic realm and the public sector, she thinks that we will be able to maintain a real consistent level of information which goes back to the whole point of this project; pointing out that Councillor Cassidy had mentioned the language issue and, of course, the longer you spend in planning meetings, the more familiar you become with terms and you pretend you are a planner, but few of us are; noting that she is familiar with a lot of the terms and, as the Committee knows, the general public is not; noticing on the summary of supposed clear terms there was a lot of words that, personally, she would qualify as jargon, things like mixed use, public realm, etc., which obviously are familiar words but, in this particular context, really probably mean little or nothing to the general public who do not follow planning initiatives on a regular basis; urging the Committee to revisit things that they may think are common terms but really are not because mixed use could mean a

recipe to a lot of people; reiterating that this is something that she would definitely recommend; expressing support for linking terms; realizing it is more labour intensive but she thinks it would go a long way to helping people; suggesting that with respect to the height issue on the signs and in the public notices, she recommends including metres, feet and number of storeys because people work in different mindsets; if you say twenty storeys, a storey can be any number of feet or metres high whereas feet and metres are very specific measures; reiterating that she recommends using all three; realizing it is labour intensive but staff most likely has all of that information readily available; relating to the number of parking spaces, one thing that she urges the Committee to consider is the addition of the number of bicycle spaces; moving away from a car culture; thinking of including bonusing, car share spaces and/or bicycle parking would be nice to add to the signage to put out the impression that we are really supporting alternative and multi-varied transportation modes; enquiring about the list of Community Associations and how it is kept up to date; advising that she belongs to a brand new Community Association that is not on the Urban League's map or on their website; noting that this is something else to keep in mind.

- Janet Hunten, 253 Huron Street – thinking that she may be the only person who reads the printed notices but she finds them a quick, excellent summary of what is going on and she sometimes catches things that the computer guys have not spotted because they are dealing with too much information; advising that she would like to see more than the legal minimums in identifying a place; expressing frustration with not knowing what is going to happen soon enough to get information together, developers working and getting reports months and years and then, all of a sudden, this is what we want to do; anything that can be done, we always quote confidentiality and anything that can be done to get the information out to the public sooner so that they can get their reports together or gather a community group together; pointing out that a frequent source of big problems is having to do something at the last minute; advising that she has a friend who is a computer geek who curses the city website because it is so hard to find anything.
- Derek McBurney, 4-466 South Street – advising that there has been a lot of wonderful work done on this project but we are talking about having as many people as possible, citizens to be able to be involved in the process; indicating that one of the things that he could not help noticing is that we see in the process where the Urban League has been consulted and a number of people were looking for who else was consulted; noting that unless you belong to the Urban League or unless you are on the Urban League site, you had no opportunity to have your say and people would like to have had a say at that stage; indicating that there is also a charter issue because you cannot raise any group or individual above another; thinking that this could be addressed quite easily by removing from Phase 3 developing protocols for non-statutory community information meetings; suggesting meetings need to be advertised more as people had no idea this meeting was going on; requesting that notices be sent to everyone; requesting that the development of protocols be done immediately.
- Mohamed Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue – referring to page 97 of the Planning and Environment Agenda, the section entitled “Implications for Applicants for Signs”, “give permission for the installation of the sign on private property, acknowledge possible site disturbance due to sign installation and option for property restoration if desired; understanding that someone can apply for a sign on a site that they do not own according to the *Planning Act*; indicating that it is not forbidden for someone to apply on something that they do not own; asking for permission to apply for a sign on private property that may not be owned by somebody; providing the example of a certain developer from three and a half years ago had waited to bring an application on hospital lands on another property that they did not own; wondering how you get the sign on that property; advising that, in his opinion, what needs to happen is that, although the *Planning Act* does not foreclose from someone making an application such as that, it also does not say that Council cannot make a by-law stating that somebody has to have rights, the property owners permission, if they do not have title to the property or unencumbered rights to the property, this will rear its head at some point in time; noting that this is not just with respect to signs, but other issues as well; thinking that this is something that needs to be taken a look at; expressing support for the fact that the jargon has been taken out, the AODA requirements, staff has spent a lot of time doing this; stating that more colourful brochures

on glossy paper, chloroplast with nice glossy pictures on it is not going to solve public apathy when it comes to coming to these meetings, the public participation meetings or any other meetings; advising that it is a broader issue, it is not just the colourfulness of the graphics or as the case may be; thinking that what people need to understand is that when they do come to a public participation meeting that they are being heard, they are being listened to; noting that that does not rest with staff, that rests with the horseshoe; enquiring how the issue he pointed out on page 97 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda going to be resolved for somebody who does not own a property or have unencumbered rights to that property.