

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 1146-1156 Byron Baseline Road (Z-8847)

- Ben Billings, LDS Consulting – thanking Ms. M. Knieriem, Planner II, for her professionalism through this process; noting that it has been highly appreciated; advising that the report is well-written, well balanced; however, they do not agree with the assertion that it does not comply with the Provincial Policy Statement, the current Official Plan and the upcoming London Plan; advising that you will note that throughout the report, the report does say that the application generally applies with but the only stickler seems to be that it does not fit on this site; advising that that wording is consistent throughout the report; their contention is the fact that the application, the proposal does fit the site; advising that they have a secondary process called site plan approval which they work with the municipality to make sure that the development complies with the zoning regulations that they take into consideration the concerns of the residents so they believe there is a secondary process in place for those concerns; appreciating that there is considerable opposition to this particular application; however, the planning paradigm is changing throughout Ontario, the municipalities and the Province alike are requiring higher densities, even in established areas as they redevelop so they see there is a shift in paradigm in terms of density, infill and intensification proposals throughout the Province; indicating that they have not really had a confirmation of what municipal staff will support in terms of the height as the height seems to be the major issue here; advising that they had talked about, in terms of three storeys but there were never able to get a confirmation from staff that three storeys was acceptable; stating that their proposal is four storeys and the net result of that is that they are talking about one storey in terms of potential impact on the surrounding neighbourhood; thinking that they are quite close with the municipality but they are not really sure and they do not agree with the assertion that the project, as submitted, does not comply with the applicable planning policies; *(Councillor S. Turner indicating that Ms. M. Knieriem, Planner II, indicated that the applicant was working with staff and had agreed to move forward past the application deadline or the consideration deadline prior to it being brought forward to the Planning and Environment Committee and, as an applicant, you had requested that it not come forward to the Planning and Environment Committee at that time and now an appeal has been made; wondering what that represents.);* Mr. B. Billings, LDS Consultants, responding that represents that they were, in their opinion, unable to reach an agreement with staff with respect to how to go forward with the application; as mentioned, there was some discussion about a three storey proposal but that was never confirmed in writing by Planning staff so that is where things broke off in terms of discussion.
- Dan Doroshenko, 374 Foyston Road and Greg Thurston, 18 September Lane - See attached presentation.
- Terry Wisniewski, 27 September Crescent – advising that she has been a resident in that area for thirty years; indicating that they have seen a lot of change in Byron over that time and most of it has been welcomed by the community; stating at the outset that she and her husband are not against developing that property, in fact, they have looked at it for years and said that it is an empty site and they would like to see it developed; unfortunately, there are a number of issues with this recommendation and the greatest outside the fact that the building is way too large for the existing site is parking; the consultants have stated that the above-ground spaces are more than adequate as the people in the said buildings, the majority of which will be using public transit; expressing amazement that they can look into the future and know this; advising that most people that she knows own at least one car, if not two; the answer is not how to provide adequate parking would be to simply put it underground; no need now to

push the building right on top of the sidewalk in order to squish enough spaces for the required parking spaces; underground parking will also eliminate a lot of the noise issues and allow for the green spaces to be created around the building to provide everyone with much needed buffer zone and privacy; the winter snow adds another issue, in order to clear the lot of snow, it would be pushed right to the backyards of the neighbours and what happens when the run-off from the large banks of snow; underground would be more expensive but all the latest multi-level construction that has taken place recently in Byron has this feature; the simplest way to resolve all the many issues is to deny this request and send the builder back to the drawing board to create a new plan that will be much more in tune with the existing surroundings of the single family homes of one or two storeys; a two storey condo, which would still allow the building owner to make a lot of money off these properties; when all is said and done, these properties were purchased with the designation of single family homes she is unaware, as well, of any compromise on behalf of the builder; allowing a developer to go ahead way beyond the set out guidelines could easily lead to a domino effect that will become a free for all with regards to all small lots within the city.

- Robert Toft, 34 September Lane – indicating that he submitted a written document to the Planning and Environment Committee; agreeing with everything that everyone else has said here tonight on the residents side; advising that he was here at 5:00 PM and he heard that some of the other developers actually seemed to work with the community openly and get their input before they submit plans and then are willing to change those plans if they have further comments that are in need of consideration; advising that the developer for this application has not done that and, in fact, he attended some of the meetings and he was quite heartened that the panel of architects that the City employees to review these projects thought it was a pretty poorly conceived document that they had submitted in terms of their planning report; indicating that when he read their planning report he was shocked at how much misrepresentation was in it as Mr. G. Thurston and Mr. D. Doroshenko pointed out and he pointed it out in his report; advising that he is of the old-fashioned belief that there needs to be honesty and integrity in dealing with the city, in dealing with the residents and they simply have not had it from this developer.