

**From:** Michelle Bogdan Stanescu

**Sent:** Thursday, September 20, 2018 2:28 PM

**To:** City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>; Cassidy, Maureen <[mcassidy@london.ca](mailto:mcassidy@london.ca)>; Squire, Phil <[psquire@london.ca](mailto:psquire@london.ca)>; Morgan, Josh <[joshmorgan@london.ca](mailto:joshmorgan@london.ca)>; Salih, Mo Mohamed <[msalih@london.ca](mailto:msalih@london.ca)>; [notricartower@gmail.com](mailto:notricartower@gmail.com); van Holst, Michael <[mvanholst@london.ca](mailto:mvanholst@london.ca)>; Armstrong, Bill <[BArmstro@london.ca](mailto:BArmstro@london.ca)>; Helmer, Jesse <[jhelmer@london.ca](mailto:jhelmer@london.ca)>; Hubert, Paul <[pHubert@london.ca](mailto:pHubert@london.ca)>; Hopkins, Anna <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>; Ridley, Virginia <[vridley@london.ca](mailto:vridley@london.ca)>; Turner, Stephen <[sturner@london.ca](mailto:sturner@london.ca)>; Usher, Harold <[husher@london.ca](mailto:husher@london.ca)>; Park, Tanya <[tpark@london.ca](mailto:tpark@london.ca)>; Zaifman, Jared <[jzaifman@london.ca](mailto:jzaifman@london.ca)>; Corby, Mike <[mcorby@London.ca](mailto:mcorby@London.ca)>; Saunders, Cathy <[csaunder@london.ca](mailto:csaunder@london.ca)>

**Subject:** Reject Rezoning of 230 North Centre Road (File: OZ-8874)

**Importance:** High

Good Afternoon Councillors and Planning Staff,

My name is Michelle Stanescu and I am a resident at 145 North Centre Road and I am emailing you today with my final comments regarding 230 North Centre Road (Project Ref: OZ-8874).

**Mike Corby** - Please add my comments to the upcoming PEC meeting notes.

**I request that councilors reject the rezoning application of 230 North Centre Road.**

**The first reason** why I'm requesting a rejection of this proposal is because both Tricar and Planning Staff have failed to be compliant with the motion unaminomously accepted by Councillors at the July 16 PEC meeting. Additionally, the developer's third proposal (to be presented on September 24<sup>th</sup>) has failed to address any of the concerns brought up by community at the previous PEC meeting.

Concerns like:

Shadowing and overlook

Massing and Density (new proposal actually increased massing from 215 units to 230 units)

Reduced quality of life for residents of Richmond Woods Retirement Centre

Traffic congestion concerns with one shared entrance onto North Centre Road

Traffic safety concerns with one shared entrance (bypass using Richmond Woods or issues for emergency response vehicles due to one shared entrance).

View shed for Gibbons Lodge and Richmond St still affected (lost)

Lack of visitor parking (parking issues will occur with only 5 surface visitor parking spots for a proposed 230 units).

Natural habitat disruption of designated wetlands (Gibbons ESA)

Inappropriate scale of development in pre-existing community. Over-intensification of a small piece of land.

Lack of green space.

No geotechnical report. This report needs to be completed prior to rezoning.

Lack of transitional intensification in our designated transit village area (one storey bungalow next to an 18 storey development isn't right).

When the developer first publicly presented their second proposal to the *Planning and Environmental Committee (PEC)* on July 16, 2018, the committee unanimously voted the passing of the following amendment... "Planning staff BE DIRECTED to continue to work with the applicant and the community to move towards a design that would result in reduced shadow or overlook, reduce massing, etc.; it being noted that planning staff will continue to process the application and will consider the public, agencies, and other feedback received during the review of the subject application as part of the staff evaluation of the subject application;" .

At this meeting, even Councillor Turner stated that "this is still a very live conversation and I would anticipate that there is still a lot of questions and issues that need to be resolved prior to it coming to us [*Planning and Environmental Committee*] for approval. And I would imagine that the form it will take when it finally lands here will be somewhat different. Even from the iterations it has gone through from the 22 storeys to the 18 storeys. " (Approx. time of comment 4:06:00 - <https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/meeting.aspx?Id=d17bed3c-5efe-4cde-a631-e3ff9bc8191d&Agenda=Merged&lang=english#18>).

Since the PEC meeting on July 16, both the developer and planning staff have stopped the conversations with the community and not meet the above addendum requirement of working with the community on developing a new iteration of the proposal. There have been no opportunities for the public to meet with Tricar and/or Planning Staff to work on developing a proposal that reduced the number of concerns presented at previous meeting (listed above). All my neighbours (including myself) were surprised to hear that a "revised" proposal would go before PEC councillors – when we were not included in any conversations post the first PEC meeting on July 16 2018. My community has been silenced and our concerns are being swept under the rug.

Additionally, the new proposal to be presented on September 24<sup>th</sup> does not reduce the shadowing or overlook or massing – as promised in the motion passed at the PEC at the last meeting. "Planning staff BE DIRECTED to continue to work with the applicant and the community to move towards a design that would result in reduced shadow or overlook, reduce massing, etc". The elevation of 18 storey building has stayed same as what was presented on July 16<sup>th</sup>, and the massing of the building actually INCREASED (from 215 units to 230 units).

As our elected officials, you need to hold developers accountable to protect our communities. You are our voice in ensuring valid concerns are addressed (and fixed), and that a reasonable proposal are presented.

**The second reason** why I request councillors to reject this proposal is due to the inconsistent notifications to the community. It has been extremely difficult to understand the differences between each proposal Tricar has submitted. **Especially Tricar's most recent proposal** (i.e. third proposal to be presented on September 24). Tricar's proposals for 230 North Centre Road have constantly changed, and each proposal seems to have different documentation being distributed (ex: sometimes just a handful of renderings, sometimes a fully written proposal, sometimes nothing). This had made the overall proposal process very confusing. All previous proposals were officially posted on the City of London's website. This most recent – third- proposal has not been released on the City website, and my community has had to hear about the changes through word-of-mouth. All previous proposals had drawings submitted and posted on the City website as its own stand alone document.

- First Proposal Submitted: February 15, 2018 (Posted on the City of London Website).
- Second Proposal Submitted: June 14, 2018 (Posted on the City of London Website).
- Third Proposal – Never posted on the City of London Website.

This has led to a number of conflicting reports regarding the number of towers, building heights and elevations, design, parking, etc. For example, by chatting with Maureen Cassidy and Mike Corby about this project, I've received conflicting explanation regarding elevation and number of towers via email.

**Maureen Cassidy Email (Aug.30):** 3 connected structures of 18, 16 and 6 stories with 2 storey townhouses fronting along Richmond and North Centre Road.

**Mike Corby Email (Sept.6):** 18 storey tower with two storey wings totalling 16 storeys. One 10-storey wing along Richmond and one 6- storey wing along the north side of the development. No mention of townhouses.

I believe it is a basic right for our community have a clear understanding of what will be presented to our community from the developer. The proposal should be rejected until the developer is compliant with city publication by-laws (20-days notice) and transparent with their designs.

**My final reason** to request the rejection of this proposal is due to my current frustrations with bonusing allotments given to this proposal.

When originally proposed, building bonuses were supposed to be an incentive given by the city to encourage developers to build within London, while still benefiting the community. When bonusing was originally proposed it stated that requests from the city "had to be reasonable". **Height and density should NOT result in an inappropriate scale of development.** "So we aren't just bonusing to receive public art but rather, height and density is fitting with good planning and compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood" (John Fleming, October 7 2014). Bonusing in my area extremely favours developers and hurts my community. This is the last sliver of land that needs to be developed on North Centre Road. **When it comes to infill development in established neighborhoods, I plead for councilors to find an appropriate balance in development and respect the character of my established community.** On page 198 of The London Plan it states that Transit Villages will have quote "Transition height and intensity between...surrounding neighbourhoods". A 18 storey building less than 33 meters from a 1 storey bungalow is not compatible development and it shows just how Tricar is trying to take advantage of the BRT bonusing. This proposed high-density development does not have "transitional intensification" due to this extra bonusing.

As Councillor Cassidy mentioned at the July 16 PEC meeting "Masonville Place... this is a major commercial zone...with a high concentration of employment. It's not simply about people living in a high density or medium density residential area...but getting people from other areas of the city on transit to these employment areas." (Maureen Cassidy at 3:43:00 - <https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/meeting.aspx?id=d17bed3c-5efe-4cde-a631-e3ff9bc8191d&Agenda=Merged&lang=english#18>). Each Transit Village Hub has different character and community of development. What is developed around the downtown hub verses the Masonville hub is very different. However, bonousing allotments are the same for each transit

village hub. I believe the character of each hub needs to be taken into consideration, and that each community's Transit Village Hub have a different allotment of bonusing maximums and minimums.

Our individual communities are not one-size fits all. A more community driven approach with reduced bonusing allotments would be perfect for my area. However, if these outrageous bonusing incentives stay I cannot accept a high density proposal for my community – as it has no benefit for my community and will only create problems.

Thank you for your time in reading my email and for your consideration.

I sincerely, hope you will vote to reject the rezoning proposal for 230 North Centre Road (Project Ref: OZ-8874).

Development can still happen at medium density, and it would be a perfect fit for my community.

Sincerely,  
Michelle Stanescu  
Resident of 145 North Centre Road