

30TH REPORT OF THE
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting held on November 26, 2012, commencing at 4:07 PM, in the Council Chambers, Second Floor, London City Hall.

PRESENT: Councillor B. Polhill (Chair), Councillors J.P. Bryant, D.G. Henderson, J.B. Swan and S. White and H. Lysynski (Secretary).

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors M. Brown and P. Hubert and G. Barrett, S. Bellaire, P. Christiaans, E. Conway, B. Debbert, M. Elmadhoon, J.M. Fleming, T. Grawey, T. Karidas, P. Kokkoros, J. Leunissen, G. Kotsifas, B. Krichker, A. MacLean, S. Meksula, D. Menard, N. Musicco, J. Ramsay, A. Riley, J. Shaughnessy, M. Tomazincic, S. Wise and J. Yanchula.

I. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

1. That it **BE NOTED** that Councillor B. Polhill disclosed a pecuniary interest in clause 21 of this Report having to do with the application of London Property Corporation, relating to the property located at 124 St. James Street, as the application was dealt with by the Committee of Adjustment, by indicating that his son is a member of the Committee of Adjustment.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

2. Near Campus Neighbourhoods Planning Amendments - Notice of Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OZ-7663)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, in response to the letters of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, dated August 21, 2012 and August 24, 2012 and submitted by Barry Card, (on behalf of Arnon Kaplansky), Brian Toth, Jon Leahy, (Escalade Property Corp), and Twee Brown (Adamas Group), relating to applications for amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which were passed by the Municipal Council concerning lands generally bounded by Fanshawe Park Road/Thames River (North Branch)/Kilally Road to the north, Aldersbrook Road/Wonderland Road to the west, the Thames River (South Branch)/Dundas Street to the south, and Clarke Road to the east, as well as City-wide changes to various zoning regulations, the Ontario Municipal Board **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to these matters and sees no reason to alter it. (2012-D11-02)

3. Property located at 75 Blackfriars Street - Notice of Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OZ-8048)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, in response to the letters of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, dated August 30, 2012 and submitted by Donald Cornell, relating to Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments (File No. OZ-8048) concerning 75 Blackfriars Street, the Ontario Municipal Board **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to these matters and sees no reason to alter it. (2012-D11-07)

4. Property located at 754 Maitland Street - Notice of Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (Z-8065)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken in response to the letter of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, dated October 31, 2012 and submitted by Arnon Kaplansky (Kapland Inc.), relating to Zoning By-law application No. Z-8065 concerning 754 Maitland Street:

- a) the Ontario Municipal Board **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to this matter and sees no reason to alter it; and,

- b) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to report back to the appropriate Committee with respect to the amount of the Civic Administration's time and financial resources that have been expended on this matter;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard a verbal presentation and reviewed and received communications, dated November 23 and 24, 2012, from A. Kaplansky, Kapland Construction Management Ltd., with respect to this matter. (2012-D11-04)

- 5. Property located at 1103 Adelaide Street North - Notice of Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OZ-7972)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, in response to the letter of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, dated April 23, 2012 and submitted by Avinoam Chernick, Beth Hickey, Rachel Joseph and Chris McDonnell, relating to applications for amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which was approved by the Municipal Council concerning 1103 Adelaide Street North, the Ontario Municipal Board **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to these matters and sees no reason to alter it. (2012-D11-07)

- 6. London Psychiatric Hospital - Resolution of Ontario Municipal Board Appeal (O-7668)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the appeal of Official Plan Amendment No. 510, the London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan by the Fairmont Lawn Bowling Club:

- a) the attached Minutes of Settlement **BE APPROVED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012;
- b) the Mayor and the City Clerk **BE DIRECTED** to execute the above-noted Minutes of Settlement on behalf of the City; and,
- c) the Ontario Municipal Board **BE REQUESTED** to allow the Appeal in part, by amending paragraph 3 of Section 20.4.3.3.3.ii), by deleting the words "on the rear portion of" and replacing them with the word "within", in accordance with the above-noted Minutes of Settlement. (2012-D11-09)

- 7. Residential Intensification Policies (O-7970)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of the City of London to amend the Official Plan, relating to Section 3.2.3.1 "Residential Intensification Definition" and Section 3.2.3.5 "Public Site Plan Review and Urban Design":

- a) the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend the Official Plan by amending Section 3.2.3.1 "Residential Intensification Definition" and Section 3.2.3.5 "Public Site Plan Review and Urban Design" to add a policy clarifying the intent of the intensification policies; and,
- b) based on the proposed Official Plan amendment identified in part a) above, the Civic Administration **BE DIRECTED** to amend the Site Plan Control By-law, to clarify the site plan matters to be considered in the review of intensification proposals, including a requirement for Public Site Plan review, in those instances where intensification may occur where no planning application or process, other than site plan review, is required;

it being noted that the residential intensification policies will be subject to further review as part of the ReThink London Official Plan review process;

it being further noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication, dated November 21, 2012, from R. Zelinka, on behalf of the London Area Planning Consultants, with respect to this matter. (2012-D11-09)

8. Planning Division 18 Month Work Program

Recommendation: That, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the Planning Division Work Program Priorities **BE REFERRED** to the Strategic Planning and Priorities Committee for consideration. (2012-A08-05)

9. Member Composition for the Urban Design Peer Review Panel

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the Civic Administration **BE DIRECTED** to revise the Terms of Reference for the Urban Design Peer Review Panel to update the composition of the Panel members to include the following positions:

- i) three (3) Architects; and,
- ii) three (3) other professionals that influence the design of the built environment and are registered in their field; it being noted that these fields include, in order of preference, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design, Planning or other professional fields that influence the design of the built environment. (2012-G01-00)

10. Provincial Policy Statement 5 Year Review - City of London - Response

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the Civic Administration's Report, dated November 26, 2012, relating to the City of London's review of the Provincial Policy Statement 5 Year Review **BE FORWARDED** to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for their consideration. (2012-D02-00)

11. Property located on a portion of 890 Southdale Road West - Phase Two of Highland Ridge (Crestwood) Subdivision (H-8124)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager of Development Services and Planning Liaison, based on the application by Highland Ridge Land Corp., relating to a portion of the property located at 890 Southdale Road West, the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2102, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands **FROM** a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h.h-94.R1-6(4)) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h.h-94.R1-8) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h.R1-8) Zone and a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h.R1-8(4)) Zone **TO** a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h-94.R1-6(4)) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h-94.R1-8) Zone, a Residential R1 (R1-8) Zone and a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-8(4)) Zone, to remove the "h" holding provision. (2012-D11-03)

12. Property located at 1480 Riverbend Road and a portion of 1552 Riverbend Road (H-8123)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, based on the application by Pemic Land Corp, relating to the lands located at 1480 Riverbend Road and the City-initiated review of the zoning on a portion of the property at 1552 Riverbend Road, the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, to change the zoning of the subject lands **FROM** a holding Residential R1/Neighbourhood Facility (h•R1-4/NF) Zone **TO** a Residential R1/ Neighbourhood Facility (R1-4/N/F) Zone and **FROM** a holding Residential R1 (h•R1-4) Zone **TO** a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone, to remove the holding provisions. (2012-D11-06)

13. Properties located at 311-319 Wharncliffe Road North (H-8082)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, based on the application of Zelinka Priamo Ltd., relating to the properties located at 311-319 Wharncliffe Road North, the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands **FROM** a Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h · h-5 · R8-4(18)) Zone **TO** a Residential R8 Special Provision (R8-4(18)) Zone, to remove the “h” and “h-5” holding provisions. (2012-D11-08)

14. Property located at 3455 Morgan Crescent (H-8061)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager of Development Services and Planning Liaison, based on the application of Sifton Properties Limited, relating to the property located at 3455 Morgan Crescent, the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands **FROM** a Holding Residential R5/R6/R7 (h·h-53·R5-4/R6-5/R7·D100·H-30) Zone **TO** a Residential R5/R6/R7 (R5-4/R6-5/R7·D100·H-30) Zone, to remove the holding provisions. (2012-D11-07)

15. Property located at 160 Sunningdale Road West (H-8084)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Tricar Developments Inc., relating to the property located at 160 Sunningdale Road West:

- a) the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands **FROM** a Holding Residential R9 Special Provision (h · h-100 · h-119 · R9-7(16) · H48) Zone, a Holding Residential R4 (h · h-100 · R4-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-100 · R1-5) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-100 · R1-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-82 · h-94 · R1-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-94 · h-100 · R1-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-94 · h-100 · R1-6) Zone **TO** a Holding Residential R9 Special Provision (h-100 · R9-7(16) · H48) Zone, to remove the h. and h-119 holding provisions; and,
- b) the application to change the zoning of a portion of the subject lands **FROM** a Holding Residential R9 Special Provision (h-100 · R9-7(16) H48) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-100 · R1-5) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-100 · R1-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-82 · h-94 · R1-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-94 · h-100 · R1-6) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h · h-94 · h-100 · R1-6) Zone and a Holding Residential R4 (h · h-100 · R4-6) Zone **TO** a Residential R9 Special Provision (R9-7(16) · H48) Zone Residential R1 (R1-5) Zone, a Residential R1 (R1-6) Zone, a Residential R1 (R1-6) Zone, a Residential R1 (R1-6) Zone, a Residential R1 (R1-6) Zone and a Residential R4 (R4-6) Zone, **BE DEFERRED** until such time as the holding provisions have been addressed to the satisfaction of the City. (2012-D11-07)

16. Andover Trails Subdivision - Phase 4 - Special Provisions (39T-07510)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a subdivision agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Sifton Properties Limited for the subdivision of land over Part of Lot 35, Concession 2, (Geographic Township of Westminster), City of London, County of Middlesex, situated generally between Southdale Road West and Wharncliffe Road South, municipally known as 1451 Wharncliffe Road South:

- a) the attached Special Provisions to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Sifton Properties Limited for the Andover Trails Subdivision, Phase 4 (39T-07510), **BE APPROVED**;
- b) the Mayor and the City Clerk **BE AUTHORIZED** to execute this Agreement referred to in part a) above, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions;
- c) the financing for this project **BE APPROVED** in accordance with the "Source of Financing Report" provided as Schedule "A" and the associated Claims and Revenues provided as Schedule "B" to the associated staff report, dated November 26, 2012;
- d) the Municipal Council **BE ADVISED** that the anticipated reimbursements from the Capital Works Budget have been negotiated for the cost of a pathway in Park Block 8 in this Plan; it being noted that the estimated cost of the pathway is \$6,000; it being further noted that the cost is being limited to a maximum amount of \$6,000; and,

it being further noted that prior to execution of the subdivision agreement, final registration of the plan and removal of the holding provisions on the lands within this subdivision, the City will confirm the implications of the request for a Part II Order on the Municipal Class EA Study for the Pincombe Drain Storm/Drainage and Drain Restoration. (2012-D26-05)

17. Fire at 1156 Dundas Street

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official, the report, dated November 26, 2012, relating to the recent fire at 1156 Dundas Street, **BE RECEIVED**. (2012-P09-00)

18. 4th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) from its meeting held on November 7, 2012:

- a) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to provide the Thames River/Creek Survey Annual Report to the Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE); it being noted that the ACE received a presentation from A. Van Rossum, Environmental Services Engineer, with respect to the Thames River Annual Report; and,
- b) that clauses 2 through 6, inclusive, of the 4th Report of the ACE, **BE RECEIVED AND NOTED**.

III. SCHEDULED ITEMS

19. 4th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) from its meeting held on November 14, 2012:

- a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Stewardship Sub-Committee report:
 - i) the Heritage Planner **BE REQUESTED** to forward the Statement of Significance, for the property located at 3378 Homewood Lane, to the owner for signature;
 - ii) the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) does not have sufficient reason to designate the property located at 75 Bathurst Street;

- iii) an expenditure of up to \$100.00 **BE APPROVED**, for refreshments to be provided at the Stewardship Sub-Committee meeting to be held on December 5, 2012, with public history students from the University of Western Ontario; it being noted that the LACH has sufficient funds in its 2012 budget for this expenditure; and,
 - iv) the Stewardship Sub-Committee minutes from its meeting held on October 31, 2012, **BE RECEIVED**;
- b) the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) does not have sufficient reason to designate the property located at 1523 Bradley Avenue; it being noted that the LACH requested that the Heritage Planner be allowed to document the building and that all salvageable heritage aspects of the property be retained; it being further noted that the LACH heard a verbal presentation from D. Menard, Heritage Planner, with respect to this matter;
- c) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit application of G. & M. Baumann, requesting permission for window replacement to the designated heritage property located at 195 Elmwood Avenue East, **BE APPROVED**; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed window replacement and has advised that the impact of such alteration on the heritage features of the property identified in the reasons for designation, is acceptable; it being further noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage heard a verbal presentation from P. Molloy, Duo Construction, with respect to this matter;
- d) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit application of New Brighton Housing Co-op, requesting permission for an alteration to the designated heritage property located at 473 Baker Street, **BE APPROVED**; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed alteration and has advised that the impact of such alterations on the heritage features of the property, identified in the reasons for designation, is acceptable; it being further noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage heard verbal presentations from L. Baker and M. Simpson, with respect to this matter;
- e) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit application of E. Greenfield, requesting permission for a roof material replacement to the designated heritage property located at 986 Richmond Street, **BE APPROVED** and that the owner **BE ASKED** to salvage the reusable slate; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed replacement and has advised that the impact of such alteration on the heritage features of the property, identified in the reasons for designation, is acceptable;
- f) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit application of the City of London, requesting permission for an alteration to the designated heritage property located at 10 Meadowlily Road South, **BE APPROVED**; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed alteration and has advised that the impact of such alteration on the heritage features of the property, identified in the reasons for designation, is acceptable; it being further noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage heard verbal presentations from T. Fediv, AECOM and K. Grabowski, Transportation Design Engineer, City of London, with respect to this matter;
- g) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to prepare an integrated plaque for the heritage features of the entire Meadowlily area, including the former mill;

- h) that clause 14 of the 4th Report of the LACH, **BE AMENDED** by adding the words “and that the property located at 283 South Street is a Priority 1 listed building on the *2006 Inventory of Heritage Resources*”;
- i) that clause 16, of the 4th Report of the LACH, **BE AMENDED** by deleting the number “527” and replacing it with the number “272”; and,
- j) that clauses 8 through 13, inclusive, clause 15, and clauses 17 to 20, inclusive, of the 4th Report of the LACH, **BE RECEIVED AND NOTED**;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard a verbal presentation from G. Goodlet, Chair, LACH, with respect to these matters.

20. 3rd Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 3rd Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) from its meeting held on November 15, 2012:

- a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Applewood Hills Sergautis Lands located at 660 Sunningdale Road East:
 - i) the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner **BE REQUESTED** to consider, as part of the Official Plan review process, changing the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) process from being development based to a natural heritage system approach; and,
 - ii) the attached comments, prepared by the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) Working Group, with respect to the Applewood Hills Sergautis Lands located at 660 Sunningdale Road East, **BE FORWARDED** to N. McKee, Senior Planner, for her review and consideration;
- b) that clauses 2 through 25, inclusive, of the 3rd Report of the EEPAC, **BE RECEIVED AND NOTED**;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee did not hear a verbal presentation from D. Sheppard, Chair, EEPAC, with respect to these matters.

21. Property located at 124 St. James Street

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Planning, the following actions be taken with respect to the site plan approval application of London Property Corporation, relating to the property located at 124 St. James Street:

- a) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that at the public meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee held with respect to this matter, the following issues were raised by the neighbourhood with respect to the application for Site Plan approval to permit two, three and one-half storey thirty-six unit apartment buildings with each unit containing three bedrooms:
 - i) the significant loss of trees on the site;
 - ii) the addition of windows and dormers to the proposed development;
 - iii) the possible groundwater contamination; and,
 - iv) the stability of the ground for the proposed development; and,
- b) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that, upon the applicant fulfilling the areas of concern noted in part a) above, the Municipal Council supports the granting of approval of the site plan and elevations, as submitted in the Civic Administration’s Report dated November 26, 2012; and,

- c) the Civic Administration **BE DIRECTED** to meet with the Ward Councillor and the Neighbourhood Community Association to address the concerns identified at the public participation meeting;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – advising that they have had discussions with the residents, the Community Association and the Civic Administration; indicating that an application for minor variance was applied for and has been appealed; advising that the core of the neighbourhood supports the application; advising that the reports that have been submitted permit the development to proceed; indicating that they asked for a one metre height variance; indicating that the second building could be higher; indicating that the proposal is in keeping with the neighbourhood; and that the applicant will endeavor to retain the existing trees without compromising the development.
- Anna Maria Valastro, 1–133 John Street – advising that she lives just outside of this area; indicating that she has requested that the hydrology and soil density reports be released to the public; noting that, in the Engineering Report, the ground is not stable due to its proximity to the flood plain; indicating that the proposed development is being forced; indicating that the project has failed to look at the impacts on the roots of existing trees; indicating that the project will contaminate the groundwater; requesting that the surplus parking spaces not be built to allow the existing trees to remain; reiterating that there are two city trees that are not to be removed; requesting that the black walnut tree not be removed, but that the building be built around the tree; advising that the development is exclusionary; indicating that the development should be welcoming to everyone; and requesting that a second meeting be held with respect to this matter.
- Nancy Whynot, 428 St. George Street – advising that the proposed design seems more inclined to arterial roads; and advising that it does not fit where it is being proposed.
- Mary Cave, 220 St. George Street – expressing support for the groundwater and floodplain concerns that were previously mentioned; advising that the structure is unattractive for the area that it is proposed to be built in; indicating that St. George Street is becoming an artery for people travelling west on Oxford Street or east onto Talbot Street; indicating that the four-way stop at St. George Street is tenuous; and expressing concern with traffic only having one entrance and exit on the proposed development.
- Tom Miles, 114 Sydenham Street – advising that the proposed student residences are identical to the student rentals located on Wharnccliffe Road; expressing concern that the proposed development is not on a main artery, but now in a residential neighbourhood; indicating that you will always be able to retain students; advising that people who want to live in Old North, and have always lived in Old North, are now living in apartments in Old North; indicating that a four storey building on a two lane street is overwhelming; advising that the trees are jewels the City should want to maintain; indicating that the Ivey family is a wonderful family for the City; noting that they have owned many homes in North London; indicating that he has met with Mr. Stanton and requested that the residential be built prior to the student housing; expressing praise for the Grosvenor Community Association who realized that they were unable to stop the development; and advising that the Community Association does not represent everyone in the area. (2012-D25-00)

22. Property located at 195 Dundas Street (TZ-8100)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, based on the application of Millennium Downtown Corporation, relating to the property located at 195 Dundas Street, the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-I, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to extend the Temporary Use (T-54) Zone, which permits a surface commercial parking lot along the Dundas Street frontage, for a period not exceeding three (3) years;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication, dated November 22, 2012, from J. MacDonald, Executive Director, Downtown London, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individual made an oral submission in connection therewith:

- A.R. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, on behalf of the applicant – expressing support for the application. (2012-D11-05)

23. Property located at 129 Riverside Drive

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Services and Planning Liaison, the following actions be taken with respect to the site plan approval application of 789220 Ontario Limited, relating to the property located at 129 Riverside Drive:

- a) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that at the public meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee held with respect to this matter, the following issues were raised by the neighbourhood with respect to the application for Site Plan approval to permit a three storey, twenty-eight unit, apartment building:
 - i) the significant loss of trees on the site;
 - ii) the increase in traffic; and,
 - iii) the unattractiveness of the proposed building; and,
- b) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports the granting of approval of the site plan and elevations, as submitted in the Civic Administration's Report dated November 26, 2012;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication, dated November 25, 2012, from J. Price, by e-mail, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – responding to the public's comments; advising that part of the tree removal issue is the installation of a privacy fence that the applicant has agreed to install; and noting that some of the trees to be removed are not healthy.
- Joe McCarthy, 13 Moir Street – advising that the property is zoned R9 and Office 1; and noting that, in the City's Official Plan, this is for Office Use only.
- Peter Maglaris, 150 Mount Pleasant Avenue – expressing concern with the amount of traffic currently travelling along Mount Pleasant Avenue; noting that there is a school bus zone and a church pick up zone in the area; indicating that this will increase the volume of traffic; expressing concern with congestion and children playing in the area; and indicating that the aesthetics of the proposed building are boring and unimaginative.
- Krissy Dougherty, 162 Mount Pleasant Avenue – enquiring as to the status of the zoning variance. (2012-D25-00)

24. Request for Demolition – Property located at 1523 Bradley Avenue

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the property located at 1523 Bradley Avenue:

- a) the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council does not object to the request for demolition for the Priority 2 listed property located at 1523 Bradley Avenue; and,
- b) the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council does not wish to issue a notice of Intent to Designate this property under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;

it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage has been consulted on this request for demolition;

it being pointed out that there were no oral submissions made at the public participation meeting associated with this matter. (2012-D10-00)

25. Properties located at 510, 518 and 526 Southdale Road East (Z-8092)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Dr. Afzal Mohammed, relating to the properties located at 510, 518 and 526 Southdale Road East:

- a) the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Residential R3 Office Conversion (R3-2/OC5) Zone at 510 Southdale Road East and a Residential R3 (R3-2) Zone at 518, 526 Southdale Road East, which permits single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, triplex dwellings, converted dwellings, and fourplex dwellings in the R3-2 Zone and dwelling units, medical/dental offices in existing buildings and offices in existing buildings in the OC5 Zone **TO** a Restricted Office Special Provision (RO2()) Zone, which permits clinics, medical/dental offices, medical/dental laboratories and offices including a minimum parking setback of 15 meters from the ultimate road allowance; and,
- b) the Site Plan Approval Authority **BE REQUESTED** to address the following design issues through the site plan process:
 - i) a site plan identifying phases of development, and a landscape plan which identifies continuous screening of parking areas along the Southdale Road frontage, to provide an attractive street edge condition, until the frontage is occupied by built form;
 - ii) ensure landscaping along Nixon Avenue screens adjacent parking areas from the street; it being noted that this may include a low-rise wall clad with materials also used on the building, in addition to plantings;
 - iii) provide or relocate an entrance at the street corner “two storey commercial building” to offer convenient pedestrian access from the street intersection;
 - iv) ensure a street corner height element is provided in the street corner “two storey commercial building” and articulated sufficiently to identify it as a special focal element at the street intersection;
 - v) provide or relocate an entrance on the “medical building” facing Southdale Road to offer convenient pedestrian access from the sidewalk;
 - vi) include landscaping techniques along the Southdale Road frontage, such as a paved forecourt and a broad sidewalk between buildings, to create functional and pleasant pedestrian connections between the building entrances and public sidewalks; and,

- vii) consider the October 17, 2012 advice of the Urban Design Peer Review Panel to maximize the qualitative contribution the development makes in the enhancement of the street corner location;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Laverne Kirkness, Kirkness Consulting Inc., on behalf of the applicant – expressing support for the application; advising that they have worked with the Civic Administration and the Urban Design Review Panel throughout the application process; indicating that during the site plan process, special provision was made to plant trees along the property line to ensure that the people abutting the property would see a fence and backdropped landscaping; advising that the proposed development conforms to the Urban Design Review requirements; indicating that the application is in conformity with the Official Plan; and advising that there is a good demand for medical/dental at this corner.
- John Collins, 537 Winblest Avenue – expressing opposition to the application; indicating that his father built the house he now resides in; indicating that the house was in the middle of nowhere when it was first built; indicating that the subdivision is comprised of ½ acre lots; indicating that the current residents were not expecting houses at their backyards when they purchased their properties; advising that, across the street, half of the mall is empty and wondering why that space cannot be used instead; indicating that, 10 years ago, his father fought against the building of a gas station in the area; advising that this affects the entire subdivision; indicating that there is a group home moving into the area; noting that the people they back onto will not be looking at a parking lot; reiterating that this is not necessary, there is lots of room in the mall; advising that residents on Winblest Avenue are going to be looking at an 8 foot fence along the back of their properties; indicating that there is a Rexall on the other side of the street; indicating that the applicant is proposing to tear down houses to build new houses; and indicating that if you allow this on one corner, you need to allow it all down the street. (2012-D11-05)

26. Property located at 1205 Riverside Drive (39CD-12512/Z-8099)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services Division, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Riverwood (London) Corporation, relating to the property located at 1205 Riverside Drive:

- a) the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands **FROM** a Residential R5 (R5-1) Zone, which permits a wide range of housing including single detached cluster housing and cluster stacked townhouse dwellings **TO** a Residential R6 Special Provision (R6-2()) Zone, to permit single detached cluster housing with a 1.2 metre side-yard setback on the corner units (numbered 8 and 16), in place of the minimum requirement of 3 metres where there are no windows to habitable rooms, and 6 metres where the wall of a unit contains windows to habitable rooms, to permit 40% lot coverage maximum in place of the 30% and a minimum rear yard setback of 8 metres;
- b) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that there were no issues raised at the public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee with respect to the proposed draft Vacant Land Condominium application;
- c) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that there were no issues raised at the public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee with respect to the proposed Site Plan Approval application;

- d) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports the granting of approval to the vacant land condominium for 23 cluster single detached residential units;
- e) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports the granting of approval to the Site Plan applications for 23 cluster single detached residential units; and,
- f) the Approval Authority **BE DIRECTED** to utilize, if possible, one agreement in place of a separate development agreement, condominium agreement and servicing agreement, to address the development of this site;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individual made an oral submission in connection therewith:

- Laverne Kirkness, Kirkness Consulting Inc., on behalf of the applicant – expressing support for the recommendation; expressing appreciation to the Civic Administration for their efforts on this application; and advising that the applicant will make the development beautiful. (2012-D11-06/D25-00)

27. Property located at 450 Oxford Street West

Recommendation: That, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the application of Bluestone Properties Inc, relating to the property located at 450 Oxford Street West **BE REFERRED** to the Civic Administration to report back at a public participation meeting in May, 2013 regarding the following matters:

- a) notwithstanding the High Density Residential land use designation, an Office Area designation is supportable within the area of the property available for development; and,
- b) the Civic Administration and the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority to identify the flood line;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter:

- a communication, dated November 20, 2012, from J. Johnston, 1114-605 Proudfoot Lane; and,
- a communication, dated November 19, 2012, from H. Katz, Esam Construction Limited;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- A.R. Patton, Patton, Cormier and Associates, on behalf of the applicant – expressing opposition to the Civic Administration's recommendation; indicating that the property is located on the corner of an arterial road and a collector road; noting that the roads are serviced by the London Transit Commission; indicating that the property is fully serviced, with water, storm and sanitary sewer; advising that this area of the city is growing quickly; indicating that this property is designated and zoned for offices and daycares; indicating that it is unfair to say that the proposal needs over 300 parking spaces; indicating that his client has received interest from a bank and offices; indicating that his client only needs 129 parking spaces; requesting that the Committee refer the application to the Civic Administration to prepare an implementing enacting zoning by-law to be brought back to the Committee in January or February of 2013; reiterating that there is no reason to refuse this application; advising that in 2007, Mr. E. Wszol was appointed the Engineer for Mud Creek; indicating that the flood line is a moving target; noting that it is not rocket science; advising that the line should be able to be nailed down; indicating that parking can be permitted; advising that the Upper Thames River

Conservation Authority comments are not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement; indicating that bits and pieces of the process have been very frustrating; indicating that his clients were promised the Mud Creek study in 2011; advising that landowners paid for a study to be completed in 2007 out of their own pockets and the City will not release the Study information.

- Michael Hannay, MBTW Group – advising that a site plan was submitted with the application; indicating that the proposal was submitted to the Urban Design Peer Review Panel in April, 2011; indicating that they have received very positive comments from the Peer Review Panel; indicating that the dotted line on the application is their best guess where the flood line is; indicating that the issue of the scale is uncertain; advising that the proposed building is close to the street; noting that it is a strong, forward looking building with a high level of finish on all sides; and reading the “Discussion” section of page 351 of the Planning and Environment Committee agenda.
- Ed Wszol, Designated Consulting Engineer, Development Engineering – indicating that the flood line has been a fluid exercise over the years; indicating that there are ways to mitigate any impact; noting that the Manager of Stormwater verbally referred to work that was proposed earlier in the meeting this evening; noting that the Civic Administration could not come up with a cost effective solution; further noting that the Civic Administration were presented with five to seven solutions; indicating that the applicant would reconstruct and lower the culvert located under the CN Rail; noting that the culvert was originally constructed in the 1920’s; further noting that the culvert was constructed when the land was used for farm purposes and orchards; indicating that the culvert needs to be rebuilt and they hope to do so with the cooperation of CN Rail; indicating that there is an opportunity to provide for a stormwater management solution; and indicating that they have not been able to review the information provided by Delcan and would like an opportunity to address the Delcan report.
- Bernie Bierbaum, President and CEO, Bluestone Properties – advising that they have had a lot of patience in dealing with this application; indicating that he has been involved with this for 15 years; advising that his most recent involvement was in 2006/2007; indicating that he attended all three public meetings; advising that ESAM represents the majority of the landowners; indicating that, after the series of public meetings, he thought the development was moving forward; noting that there has been no movement; indicating that the flood line going down is good news for them; advising that he met with the Stormwater Management Unit in 2012; indicating that the Civic Administration was going to provide the flood plain information to Stantec by November, 2010; noting that, to date, no information has been received from the Civic Administration; advising that he met with former City Manager, Jeff Fielding, to try to resolve this issue; indicating that, in February, 2011, the Corporate Approvals Team met on this issue; indicating that the Stormwater Management Unit indicated that it could have the information within seven months; advising that he went ahead and worked with the Consultants on the application late last year; advising that the information that he was provided in 2007 indicated that the flood line was ok to use for development; advising that he has not received the information that he was promised; requesting that the application be approved; and asking to work with the Civic Administration on this application.
- A. M. Valastro, 1-133 John Street – indicating that the floodplain is occupied by deer, geese and goslings; advising that it is a wildlife corridor; indicating that a fast talking lawyer wants to put through development; advising that deer are showing up downtown as there is no longer a buffer; advising that these places are very valuable; and indicating that she does not want to see a pushy lawyer twisting the Councillors arms.
- Jean Johnston, 1114-605 Proudfoot Lane – advising that she has lived in her residence for 18 years; agreeing that the area is a wildlife corridor; indicating that Mud Creek currently floods; reading the communication she submitted on the Added Agenda; indicating that there are deer, rabbits, squirrels, chipmunks and a pair of snapping turtles in the area; advising that ever year, ducks land in the swimming pool in Forest Hill and are removed; indicating that it is a marvelous area; noting that the

Creek needs some cleaning up; advising that she knows the difference between Oak and Maple trees.

- Jeff Brick, Upper Thames River Conservation Authority – advising that the Provincial Policy Statement, the City's Policies and the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority policies do not allow development in floodplains; noting that parking is development; advising that there is no firm indication for the floodplain; indicating that modeling needs to be completed; advising that the City cannot advise on the elevation; advising that the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority needs to peer review the application; and advising that they will provide the floodplain information once they have it. (2012-D11-01)

28. Demolition Request – Property located at 75 Bathurst Street

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the property located at 75 Bathurst Street:

- a) the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council does not object to the request for demolition for the Priority 1 listed property located at 75 Bathurst Street; and,
- b) the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council does not wish to issue a notice of Intent to Designate this property under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;

it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage has been consulted on this request for demolition;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individual made an oral submission in connection therewith:

- Tanya Park, 300 South Street, President, SOHO Community Association – expressing support for the application. (2012-D10-00)

29. Property located at 2095 Coronation Drive (Z-8076)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Banman Developments (West) Inc., relating to the property located at 2095 Coronation Drive:

- a) the attached proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 11, 2012, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Community Facility/Residential R1 (CF1/CF3/R1-13) Zone, which permits churches, community centres, elementary schools, group homes, libraries, post office depots, private schools, secondary schools, police stations, public recreational buildings, public swimming pools, studios and single detached dwellings **TO** a Holding Residential R5 Special Provision (h.h-5.R5-5()) Zone, to permit a cluster townhouse development with a reduced front yard setback and maximum deck heights no higher than the first finished floor level for each dwelling; it being noted that holding provisions require that a development agreement be entered into, full municipal services, and the holding of a public site plan meeting before the development can proceed;
- b) the Site Plan Approval Authority **BE REQUESTED** to address the following design objectives through the site plan application process:
 - i) a site plan and building elevations of a higher standard of design than shown in the illustrations be submitted;
 - ii) minimize the number of points of egress and ingress to the site and at these points, use building materials on the adjacent units to create a gateway effect;

- iii) no garages fronting onto Coronation Drive;
- iv) corner units at the intersection of the private road and Coronation Drive to incorporate the same building form, architectural elements, and materials as those units seen from the street to create a gateway effect;
- v) buildings shall be located to frame the public park and architectural elements, such as principal entrance doors and windows, are to be located on building facades facing the park;
- vi) fencing around the perimeter of the park to be low in height and of a high quality e.g. decorative black iron;
- vii) internal sidewalks around the perimeter of the park should connect with sidewalks in the neighbourhood;
- viii) landscape features are recommended at entrances from the sidewalks into the public park;
- ix) landscape features to attenuate the visual effect of parking areas are to be provided;
- x) pedestrian access to the park at the end of the driveway into the neighbourhood should be considered;
- xi) landscaping is to be provided on the west side of the site along Coronation Drive to strengthen the street edge; it being noted that landscaping to screen the parking area at the south driveway into the site should be provided;
- xii) privacy for residential properties to the north and east of the site should be considered;
- xiii) incorporate architectural variations in the individual units of the elevations on the street and park frontages;
- xiv) limit the maximum deck heights to no higher than the first finished floor level for each dwelling; and,
- xv) ensure the property is graded to not flood the neighbouring properties;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication, dated November 26, 2012, from R. Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc., with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- R. Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc., on behalf of the applicant – expressing support for a majority of the Civic Administration’s recommendation; indicating that he does not support part b) vi), by indicating that this is modest, not upscale housing and the cost of the wrought iron fencing being asked for by the City is three times the cost of the city standard fencing; further indicating that he does not support part b) x), by indicating that the public park will be connected to Coronation Street; noting that the townhouse development is different than the current existing housing; and expressing concern with the liability of having a public thoroughfare; requesting a legal agreement; requesting that this be left as an open issue; indicating that the sidewalk will end at the Park along Coronation Drive; advising that there will be no sidewalk along the perimeter; indicating that there will be no finished decks above the first finished floor; noting that some decks are walkout units which caused privacy issues for the abutting neighbours; advising that the setbacks have been reduced; indicating that there were a number of issues raised at the community meeting; advising that the number of vacant condominium units in the area are likely because they tried to hit the market too high; advising that his client purchase the subject lands from West Park Baptist Church; advising that the proposal is in accordance with the Hyde Park Community Plan and the Official Plan; and indicating that the grading issues will be dealt with by a stormwater management facility on the property.
- M. Enrices, Kimball Crescent – expressing opposition to the application; indicating that he takes his grandson to the park; indicating that they currently cross the empty lot without any problems; advising that he was expecting to have a community centre, not more housing; indicating that he would rather see a community centre built; advising that his church deals with troubled kids from the area and provides them with healthy entertainment; indicating that he received three parking tickets because

he parked his work vehicle on the road as he had no where else to park it; and reiterating that they work with kids with social issues from the surrounding area and that a community centre would be beneficial on this site.

- Jeff Whitney, 1828 Bayswater Crescent – advising that the neighbourhood has concerns with this development; noting that privacy concerns are not identified; indicating that the application has gone from nice iron fencing to low quality fencing; enquiring as to where else the applicant is cutting costs; indicating that they do not want raised decks so that no one is peering into their backyards; enquiring why another medium-density development meetings to be built in this area; noting that the intersection of Hyde Park Road and North Rutledge Road has vacancies; further noting that only half of the lot on the northwest corner is built and the other half is an eyesore; also noting that the southwest corner was recently purchased by Palumbo Homes and it is not complete; advising that most of these developments were started five to seven years ago; and requesting that the existing vacant lands be utilized.
- Tim Boston, 1852 Bayswater Crescent – advising that the townhouses will be built three feet onto his property from the south side; indicating that if he places a laser level on the top of his fence, it is six and a half feet high; noting that with a six foot fence, people will be peering over his fence; indicating that he has had flooding issues; indicating that the city built a berm and enquiring as to where the water is going to go if this development is built.
- Andrew Vamos, 1888 Bayswater Crescent – indicating that this subdivision consists of single family detached homes; advising that the developer wants to install medium density, attached homes in the middle of the subdivision; indicating that this will detract from the makeup and style of the current housing; indicating that the proposed development is a repetitive style and will change the neighbourhood, as all the current houses are different; advising that this will directly and indirectly affect the value of homes; expressing concern with the volume of traffic; indicating that Hyde Park Road will not be expanded for years; indicating that this proposal will put a lot of traffic through the core of a residential subdivision; indicating that this will not fulfill the needs of the community and requesting that the current zoning remain.
- Ali Medhi, 2055 North Routledge Park – advising that he has owned their residence for two years; noting that he owns the third house from the corner; indicating that it takes a few minutes every day to get out of his driveway; indicating that you can sit in traffic on Hyde Park Road for 15 to 20 minutes any time of day; enquiring as to where the neighbourhood children are going to go to school; advising that he was informed that there would be no townhouses in the subdivision; enquiring as to why 102 more townhouses are necessary; requesting that the space be used as a community centre or turned into a park; and indicating that if houses are built, they should be single family dwellings, not medium density attached homes. (2012-D11-01)

30. Beaufort/Irwin/Gunn/Saunby/Essex ("BIGS") Street Neighbourhood Plan

Recommendation: That, the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to report back at a future public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee with a final Beaufort/Irwin/Gunn/Saunby/Essex (BIGS) Street Neighbourhood Plan, with respect to the following:

- a) investigate the residents' concerns expressed at the public participation meeting held on Monday, November 26, 2012;
- b) take into consideration the comments received from agencies and other City Departments; and,
- c) further consultation be undertaken with the affected neighbours;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter:

- a communication, dated November 12, 2012, from D. & T. Gonyou, 350 Wharncliffe Road North;
- communications, dated November 19 and 23, 2012, from S. Scott, 372 Cedar Avenue;
- a communication, dated November 22, 2012, from P. & H. Cortese, 383 Cedar Avenue;
- a communication, dated November 23, 2012, from M. & B. Nolan, 396 Cedar Avenue;
- a communication, dated November 12, 2012, from E.A. Smuck, 928 Western Road;
- a communication, dated November 25, 2012, from C. Crncich, 384 Cedar Avenue;
- a communication, dated November 25, 2012, from J. & R. Carvalho, 388 Cedar Avenue;
- a communication from W.H. Liu, 390 Cedar Avenue; and,
- a communication, dated November 23, 2012, from R. Salazar, 376 Wharncliffe Road North;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Edgar Allen Smuck, 928 Western Road – advising that at the community public meeting, there were three plans presented; noting that they were the preserve model, the urban model and the village model; advising that the community rejected the village model; indicating that an on-site manager should be required for cluster dwellings; enquiring as to whether people want to see the area remain the same, whether people want to see real change or whether or not people want to see Mr. Smith's village plan that was rejected by the community; indicating that he supports the high rise plan; noting that there is one developer willing to build in this area; advising that the area was enlarged to allow the increase in the Western University to be managed; referring to the 2008 Wynfield case; and advising that he provided Mr. C. Parker, Senior Planner, with a 21-page communication on why Mr. P. Smith's report should be rejected.
- Morrison Reid, 376 Wharncliffe Road North – advising that he is a business owner; advising that the residents need more time to read the Peter J. Smith Report as the residents living outside of the Beaufort Street, Irwin Street, Gunn Street and Saunby Street area did not know they were included in the Neighbourhood Plan; advising that, approximately 15 years ago, an application for a high rise in this area was rejected by the Ontario Municipal Board; indicating that this Plan would destabilize a stable community; indicating that the Peter J. Smith report is flawed; and indicating that many of the houses are owner occupied.
- Sheila Scott, 372 Cedar Avenue – advising that she has happily lived there for 40 years; requesting that the Wharncliffe Road and Cedar Avenue area be protected and be preserved; indicating that a majority of the people in the Wharncliffe Road/Cedar Avenue area did not know that they were included in the study area; advising that she has attended both community meetings; indicating that the community was provided with three models to choose from; and indicating that the whole study involves students; and enquiring as to whether or not any students have been consulted on this matter.
- Rosine Salazer, 376 Wharncliffe Road North – advising that she has respectfully lived near students for years; indicating that the single family dwellings should remain single family dwellings; requesting that the Committee drive by their properties to see that they are ranches, not cottages; and advising that the Peter J. Smith report includes the bike path along Wharncliffe Road which leads to the Thames River; and noting that the bike path leads to a cliff.
- Glen Matthews, on behalf of Gitta Kulczycki, Vice-President, Resources and Operations, Western University – see attached communication.

- Jackson Carvalho, 388 Cedar Avenue – advising that he has lived in his residence for 17 years; indicating that the document that the City is using has no credibility as the information is wrong; and advising that other owners live in the area; noting that the study indicates that the area is not owner occupied.
- Anna Maria Valastro, 1-133 John Street – advising that, earlier in the meeting, there was a similar issue in North London; indicating that it is only a priority to the City if the area is owner occupied; advising that the renters of the properties are not notified of the meetings; indicating that this happens in every city; and requesting that the City give value to its renters.
- Wanda Graham, 387 Wharncliffe Road North – advising that she owns a duplex and rents out the other half to a University professor; expressing disagreement with the proposed changes in the Peter J. Smith report; advising that there are student rental signs in the neighbourhood; indicating that the Smith report is incorrect; and advising that the area backing onto Gibbons Park is all owner occupied.
- Christine Crncich, 384 Cedar Avenue – indicating that she was away most of the summer; expressing alarm upon reading the report; indicating that she has the poor condition home on the street; noting that she sided her house in board and batton; indicating that she has deer and foxes eat from her garden every day; advising that she is proud to have the woods, the River and the deer; indicating that she likes to stay hidden; indicating that they do not have street lights and their street does not get plowed; enquiring as to how the most disagreed on Plan is the one that was chosen; requesting the Councillors drive through the neighbourhood at night to see the stars; indicating that, from her property on, all 32 of the houses were counted as rental properties; indicating that one of her neighbours has won the Trillium Award seven years for her beautiful gardens; indicating that no one in her area received the notice as all properties were thought to be rentals; indicating that she did not know that Essex Street and Hollywood Avenue was included in the Study; and enquiring as to who hired Peter J. Smith with her tax dollars.
- Dan McFadden, Real Estate Agent – advising that there are beautiful houses on Cedar Avenue; indicating that the area has deep value; advising that the last two sales in the area sold for \$1,200,000; indicating that the houses in the Beaufort Street, Irwin Street, Gunn Street and Saunby Street area that he has torn down have been condemned; and indicating that he was one of the first to build new houses in this area.
- Andre G., 371 Cedar Avenue – advising that he has owned this property for three years; noting that he purchased the property as an investment; indicating that he has spent a lot of money in renovations; indicating that the area is beautiful; advising that he was about to ask his tenants to leave so that he could move in when they advised him that they were moving out; and advising that this area is too beautiful to change.
- Annette Lance, 72 Gunn Street – requesting some control and balance in the neighbourhood; indicating that the City Council is doing the neighbourhood residents a disservice; indicating that a lot of mature trees will be removed if Mr. Peter J. Smith's recommendations are implemented; advising that the setback is closer to the street than the existing homes on the street; advising that one of the developments that was built had to resize the foundation as the foundation was too large and the neighbours called and complained; indicating that the neighbourhood is a lost cause; and expressing hope that other neighbourhoods have more success.
- James Corcoran, 43 Gunn Street – indicating that the study was not their idea; advising that, in a short time, eight oversize duplexes have been built in the Beaufort Street, Irwin Street, Gunn Street and Saunby Street area; indicating that the neighbourhood is now like the Wild West; indicating that only part of the area is not under floodplain control; indicating that this is the path of least resistance for developers; advising that the few remaining single family houses in the neighbourhood do not fit in with the big box houses; indicating that there is a fourplex and a duplex boxed in beside the Varsity Mills townhouse development; and requesting that the neighbourhood be rezoned from an R2-3 Zone to a R3-2 Zone. (2012-D11-00)

IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION

31. Old East Village Enhanced Incentives Program

Recommendation: That the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to report to the appropriate Committee with respect to the financial implications of granting a two year extension of the Forgivable Upgrade to Building Code Loan Program and the Forgivable Façade Improvement Loan Program to the Old East Village Business Improvement Area and Downtown London;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter:

- a communication from K. Keane, Chair, Old East Village Business Improvement Area; and,
- a communication, dated November 20, 2012, from J. MacDonald, Executive Director, Downtown London, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee received the attached presentation from Clark Bryant, Board Member, Old East Village Business Improvement Area, with respect to this matter. (2012-F12-00)

V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

32. Dalmagarry Road

Recommendation: That the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to report to a future meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee with respect to an update on the status of the completion of Dalmagarry Road and the reason for the delay.

VI. CONFIDENTIAL

(Confidential Appendix to the 30th Report of the Planning and Environment Committee enclosed for members only.)

The Planning and Environment Committee convened in camera from 11:00 PM to 11:01 PM, after having passed a motion to do so, with respect to the following matter:

- C-1 A personal matter about identifiable individuals, including municipal or local board employees, relating to the 2013 Mayor's New Year's Honour List.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:01 PM