

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 536 and 542 Windermere Road (Z-8945)

- *(Councillor Stephen Turner enquiring about the side yard setback, the zoning would require 0.5 metres per metre of height for the main building or fraction thereof but no less than three metres, Ms. Melissa Campbell, Planner II, discussed both the maximum height and the proposed height, the maximum height being 10.5 metres, the proposed height being 9 metres, wondering which one applies to that condition of the Zoning By-law.); Melissa Campbell, Planner II, responding that as the by-law is written before the Planning and Environment Committee, the Special Provision would require a three metre side yard setback for the proposed buildings regardless of the height; advising that the Special Provision does not have that same consideration that the standard condition has for the variation in height; the standard condition as the height increases would increase that setback, what they were able to evaluate was that the three metre setback would be comparable to a setback that one would expect in the R-1 Zone that surrounds the property for a building height of 9 metres which is what the applicant proposed as well as the maximum that staff is seeking which is 10.5 metres; (Councillor Stephen Turner indicating that the difference is that the proposed building height is 9 metres and the maximum building height that we are looking to allow and confer in the special provision within this R5-5 Zone would be 10.5 metres so the building height itself would be no more than 9 metres if they built as proposed but we would restrict it to no more than 10.5 metres; wondering if that is correct.); Michael Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that yes, that is correct, 9 metres but the zoning could allow up to 10.5 metres; (Councillor Stephen Turner, saying thank you and recognizing that this is an increased intensity as compared to R-1, why would we make the comparison to the side yard setback as compared to an R-1 to say a 9 metre height of 3 metres which would be the normal allowed associated with an R-1 in this circumstance it talks about increased intensity, it talks about side yard setbacks and says no less than 3 metres but says generally 0.5 metres for every metre of height so about 4.5 metres in this circumstance if the building height ended up being 9 metres.); Melissa Campbell, Planner II, responding that the intent was to demonstrate that the expectations that the community had about what could develop on the site through the current R1-6 Zone would not ultimately change with a townhouse form, a townhouse form is still 2.5 storeys which is what could be permitted in the current zone albeit it is a different housing type than a single detached dwelling but the height is something that as of right could be permitted in the R1-6 Zones today as well as the other R1 Zones that surround the property; (Councillor Stephen Turner indicating with respect to the corner of the property that injects into that corner on Orkney Crescent, the northwestern most corner, looking from Orkney Crescent, it is fairly vegetated there and there is a fence inside the vegetation, in the report it talks about controlling access through to Orkney Crescent with vegetation and landscaping, is there also the opportunity to also control it with fencing.); Melissa Campbell, Planner II, responding that that would be a site plan matter but typically in these cases they would see the combination of a board-on-board fence, 1.8 metres or greater in height in combination with landscaping; advising that the applicant is showing on their conceptual site plan the potential for that 1.8 metre fencing along there, the addition of enhanced landscaping that could help to mitigate pedestrian flow along that westerly property line is something that staff felt would help to mitigate some of the concerns from the community about the potential for pedestrians using that as a cut-through to Orkney Crescent.*
- *(Councillor Michael van Holst enquiring about the extra 1.5 metres to 10.5, could that make the 2.5 storeys into a 3 storey.); Michael Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that theoretically it could, what that 10.5 metres*

represents is a reduction from the standard height, but to answer the question, yes it could.

- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – See attached presentation.
- Sandy Leckie – See attached presentation.
- Fred Rodger, 131 Orkney Crescent - See attached presentation.
- Alex Morrison, 95 Tecumseh Avenue East - See attached presentation.
- Alan Brockelbank - See attached presentation.
- Mario Scopazzi, 123 Orkney Crescent – advising that his property is located to the west of the proposed development at 536 Windermere Road; expressing concern with the special provision recommended by staff for a 3 metre side yard setback west; indicating that his concern deals with the survival of the mature coniferous trees that run along the side of his side of the property line and which provide an effective privacy screen; advising that these trees were planted over twenty-six years ago when he moved to this location and now have grown to maturity; according to the recent Tree Assessment report from Ron Koudys, Landscape Architect, they are in good condition; however, the building of these townhouse developments 3 metres from the property line will adversely affect the health and longevity of these trees; indicating that the area required for heavy equipment to excavate to the footing of the proposed development would compromise the buffer zone needed to ensure critical root protection; that is to say that a 3 metre setback will allow only 1.5 metres from the building exterior available for excavation to the footing which would not be sufficient for equipment to excavate soil safely without damaging the root structure of his trees; stating that to prevent damage to these irreplaceable trees, he is thus requesting a side yard setback west of 5.5 metres as defined for R-5 Zone standard regulations and this is based on 0.5 metres for every 1 metre of main building height with a proposed building height of 10.5 metres.
- Tony Mara, 127 Orkney Crescent - See attached presentation.
- Erin Mara, 127 Orkney Crescent – indicating that they are on the north side of the proposed development; advising that when they moved into this property twelve years ago, they were initially taken by the lush foliage and mature trees that lined both their property and their neighbours which created a natural canopy for shade as well as privacy for each of our families; stating that this has allowed our children a safe and protected place to play and grow; from the very beginning, after the initial shock at the outrageous size of the development proposed and the significant impact it would have on their property and way of life, they have been very clear about their request as a couple and as part of the neighbourhood in order to support the development of this property; advising that her husband shared this request with the developer early in the process; however, they have continually ignored the requests of the neighbourhood, continually pushing for the maximum density and failing to address the primary concern of the neighbouring homes to maintain a sufficient buffer space and the current tree line remain in place; recognizing that London must grow and change over time and the process of infill development needs to occur; noting that they are not fighting this but feel that the needs of the developer should not be made greater than the needs of the current tax paying residents of the neighbourhood; advising that they have four girls aged fourteen and younger who love to spend time in the yard together with family and friends; pointing out that with the proposed development the rear of the building will have the same façade as the front of the building with the placement of a wall of windows and removal of all the trees along the north side of the property, eliminating any buffer from the path of surveillance the developer feels is so positive with this building design; advising that, in her opinion, it will feel more like active surveillance and significantly impede their comfort and use of their property as it currently stands; with its proximity to the University, it is very possible that this property will be filled with students; stating that as a Mom of four girls, the idea that they could be watched by potentially young males while attempting to enjoy the backyard with

the lack of any buffer or privacy feels invasive and unfair to them as current London taxpaying residents; in order to ensure that their children are allowed to continue to enjoy their property and not feel objectified by those observing from above, it has been their primary request that the buffer area and the tree line currently in place be maintained; advising that there is no wall high enough that would provide the same type of privacy that the current tree line provides particularly in summer; believing that anyone who is a parent can understand the desire to protect our children from this invasion of privacy, particularly girls, as they are fighting to do so for theirs; reiterating that they are not fighting development but requesting that it balance and meets the needs of all parties as considered and she hopes the Planning and Environment Committee can understand her concerns with the proposed development as it stands and take this into consideration with the Committee's decision.

- Joel Faflak, 2 Angus Court – indicating that he has resided here for the past twelve years; stating that, as a Member of the Orkney-Angus Ratepayers Association, he submitted a petition regarding this application with 108 signatures representing sixty-six homes within the surrounding neighbourhood, more than 95% of all homes surveyed are in opposition to this development as proposed and he assumes that he is joined by most of those signatories here in the balcony; having spent over half of his life in London, he is excited to see the city expand into a vibrant urban centre, one that claims to take an enlightened approach to fulfill municipal and provincial mandates to ensure under-used lands within city limits are appropriately intensified and fit productively and reasonably with existing properties; having said that and with due respect to the developer and sitting Planning and Environment Committee, the existing proposal does not reflect appropriate or responsible intensification; advising that what is clear to his neighbours and those outside the planning process that they have spoken to, is the requested rezoning which also requests further concessions to accommodate excessive density and in order to work around the easement for the main city water supply that prevents development along the east side of the site is simply trying to cram too much onto the existing site; the development, as planned, in the midst of the lowest density R-1 Zoning is at the very least a jarring shift and entirely not in keeping with the spirit of either the 1989 Official Plan or the London Plan to introduce feasible, harmonious, reasonable intensification that will augment rather than diminish the quality of life in the greater Windermere Road community; advising that they have been told that their input would be crucial to the site plan process at the site plan stage once rezoning is complete but that guarantee is not sufficient; advising that past rezoning, their input might be welcome but would not be binding; indicating that he is not saying that this developer would act cynically but amendments need to be in place at this rezoning stage to ensure non-negotiable easement between future development and the existing neighbourhood; being clear, as everyone else has been, he does not oppose development of the existing site; however, recently, their neighbourhood has seen the gradual creep of single family dwellings turned into rental properties with attendant problems, multiple vehicles, noise, garbage, traffic congestion, etc; pointing out that this application proposes infill that attempts to accommodate a range of tenants from single families to extended families to students, yet by maximizing density, it will create a host of similar problems that ratepayers will be left to live with and deal with; believing that there must be a more reasonable solution to redeveloping this site, one that is less intrusive in how it integrates with the surrounding neighbourhood; expressing trust that, at the very least, the Committee will consider their recommendations to create an adequate buffer between the development and surrounding homes and to protect existing trees on the site which already provide that buffer; stating that the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement already referred to calls for the “appropriate growth of healthy, livable and safe communities”; in this spirit we trust our Councillors to intelligently balance progress and profit with flourishing and sustainable civic

development for all concerned; indicating that they trust the Committee to do just that.

- Gordon Payne, 70 Orkney Crescent – indicating that he has resided at his residence for over 27 years; advising that they have several objections to the proposed development although he will focus on three main areas; first, as the Committee has heard, the development is just too large for the available real estate; the developer is trying to squeeze too many residents into this small area; they are dead set on getting sixty bedrooms in there and that is just too many; the proposed foot print is unacceptable because of the lack of appropriate buffers and parking, as the Committee has heard; understanding the developers desire to extract as much money as possible from their venture but hundreds of area residents will have to live with the consequences if this is allowed to proceed in its current form; advising that parking is his second major concern; the developers have proposed only twenty-five parking spots for potentially sixty residents, read students; wondering where will all of these cars be parked, even if only half the residents have cars, there still will not be enough spaces and what about their visitors, where will they park, what about winter time when you cannot see the parking lines and everyone takes up one and a half spaces; noting that if you tried to park somewhere this morning, you will understand; reiterating, where will everyone park, there is no parking on Windermere Road, there are private parking lots across Windermere Road at Scouts Canada and Spencer Leadership Centre but he is sure they will kibosh parking there in short order; stating that only leaves the adjacent neighbourhood streets, Orkney Crescent and Angus Court, conveniently accessed by two walkways; advising that they do not want cars constantly parked in front of their homes; wondering who would; advising that it would interfere with snow removal, garbage pick-up and yard maintenance to name a few; wondering where their guests will park; indicating that it is clear that this development is targeted to students; noting that he was a University student for many years and he can tell you that University students are nocturnal; believing it is an absolute reality that late at night, visitors and residents will be passing through those walkways and disturbing the local residents with undue noise; indicating that corner of their neighbourhood is tree dense with several mature trees; the western most lot of the proposed development is a haven for song birds; indicating that he has documented over eighty species of birds in their neighbourhood and has seen Great Horned Owls roosting in the tall spruces on that property; indicating that this development will wipe out all of the bird and animal life there; given the many faults of this proposal, he would urge the Planning and Environment Committee to refuse this application outright unless it can be made acceptable.
- William Fisher, 143 Orkney Crescent – concurring to all of the earlier assertions about the inappropriateness and over intensification of the proposed townhouses, he would like to address directly what might be considered to be the elephant in the kitchen; whether they are talking about twelve five-bedroom townhomes or sixteen three or four bedroom townhomes, these are family sized apartments with no family amenities, there is no playground, there is no room to barbeque, it is asthmatic and highly likely that these apartments will be occupied by individual residents of sixty individual bedrooms, unrelated single individuals; echoing earlier sentiments; indicating that there is also inadequate parking and he wants to emphasize that these sixty bedrooms, these so called family apartments with no family amenities are situated in between two direct walkways that will funnel the residents parking and revelling into Orkney Crescent and Angus Court; noting that they are in the shortest direct walking line between this so called family development which will be occupied by individuals and multiple entertainment venues, all of which sell alcohol and are licensed at Masonville; echoing earlier comments, none of them in this quiet single family development are looking forward to street revellers, urination on the street and other things that characterize many of the closed in neighbourhoods; appreciating the opportunity to provide feedback; respectfully requesting an outright rejection of

this on the realistic basis that this is essentially a proposal for a sixty bedroom rooming house with inadequate parking, it is likely to occupy our streets with cars and with late night revellers.

- Randy Warden, 205 North Centre Road – advising that in his concurrent activity last year he had the opportunity to meet many of the people in this room and to get familiar with the subject property; stating that it is overly intensified again it is far more than that neighbourhood deserves and the comment about being nocturnal for students, anyone that has lived next door to students knows that is exactly the case; indicating that people have been allowed to inconsistently been allowed to finish their thoughts and he would like to turn over the balance of his time, with the Planning and Environment Committee's permission, to Mr. Alan Brockelbank to finish the point he was trying to make; given Mr. Alan Brockelbanks' expertise, he was really hoping to hear the point Mr. Alan Brockelbank was trying to make when he was cut off; indicating that he has nothing further to say and he finds that this is a great loss that the Committee is not allowing this man with this expertise to finish the thought that he was trying to present.
- Mike Latham, 570 Windermere Road – advising that especially on that section on the north side of Windermere Road, between Doon Drive to the west and Doon Drive to the east, when you look at that area; knowing that his neighbours and his wife and he designed and built their house, took great pride in that home and very respectfully built a property that adds to that community; advising that it is a community of more upscale homes, setbacks and properties that are well maintained and take great pride in their properties; stating that this does not appear to be that type of development and he completely objects to the rezoning of that; noting that all of those properties are single family properties; they are not students, they are not young professionals, they are established professionals with people that are well established in their community already and take great pride in their homes; thinking this is, as others have stated, is not respectful of that section of Windermere Road and would be of great harm to the values and the aesthetics of that section of Windermere Road.
- Anna Casavecchia, 42 Angus Road – advising that, as a female, she feels safe in her neighbourhood currently to walk at night, to go for runs; indicating that with this building there she does not know who is living there, she does not know the faces coming and going or who is going to be parking on her street making her feel unsafe especially with all of the things that you hear in the news right now about harassment and sexual assaults happening; feeling that, as a student at Western University, she does live at home with her parents and she knows that her friends are going to love to live in that new place, it is nice, it is convenient, it is a ten minute walk to campus but they also like to party so there is going to be lots of garbage left around, they are going to park on the streets that are close by that they are not going to get ticketed on and they have seen this with the apartment LUXE that is built just a little further down Richmond Street where cabs are sitting outside of that apartment causing traffic and driving concerns; wondering what is going to stop people from doing that at this place as well as the traffic that is already there; indicating that ambulances uses Windermere Road all of the time; advising that she has to walk to campus because it takes over forty minutes to bus; expressing that this is already a concern, there is already so much traffic happening, they will have approximately sixty new residents living on Windermere Road and wondering where their cars will go; they are obviously going to need to use Windermere Road and they do not have the roads for that right now; reiterating that it is going to be unsafe, she would not want to walk by that at night, she gets cat called as it is on campus, she does not want to be cat called in her neighbourhood.
- Bernadette Pitt, 167 Orkney Crescent – indicating that she moved to Orkney Crescent in 2017 so she is a new neighbour; advising that she only became aware of this a little while ago; advising that she has a water main in her backyard and when she bought the property her lawyer very clearly stated that

there was no building over the water main, that is a condition of purchase so anybody who buys a property that has that water main is stuck with that easement and knows that when they buy it so that should not be a consideration in her opinion; indicating that when she bought the property she looked at the zoning and she took a lot of comfort in the fact that it was R-1 Zoning because she knows that zoning is important; expressing that she feels like she has been blindsided to be honest; indicating that she cannot believe the massive structure that is being proposed for these two sites, one of which has a major easement on it; stating that all of the property basically is on one of the two lots so basically one lot is all property; believing that it is not good planning; noting that a lot of people have addressed a lot of the reasons why but when you look at it you can see that it is crammed in there, there is no other way of putting it, it is crammed in there; expressing disappointment with the Planning and Environment Committee, sorry, but she still thinks that twelve units is too many; indicating that this is an R-1; wondering what is the meaning of R-1 if it is not R-1; advising that she does agree that they want to put some sort of intensification but let's look at intensification that is good planning, let's not have intensification for intensifications sake, let's have intensification for the way it should be, carefully planned and done correctly; hearing the argument for having the sixty bedrooms because it is the only way that it becomes financially feasible; advising that the people who are buying this property are buying two lots, they are not buying a piece of land that has been promoted for having apartments and this basically seems to her like sixty bedrooms because of the continual, very strong emphasis, they are going to get their sixty bedrooms; it does not matter how you want it to look, there are going to be sixty bedrooms and by the way, if you do not do it the way they want you to do it, they will have no choice but to fill it with students; indicating that she did not like that approach either; advising that this is not the way that she wanted to meet some of her new neighbours because she wants to live in a neighbourhood; noting that it is a wonderful neighbourhood, just come and look at it, drive through it, it is an amazing neighbourhood, there is a lot of diversification in ages, it is a very friendly neighbourhood; stating that when you see R-1 and you hear some intensification, you expect maybe one extra property, rather than one unit, you have two, that is how she looks at intensification, she does not look at one property to sixteen because they are all basically on one lot; advising that she is a teacher and she says that London is the Forest City and we are not role modeling that here; wondering if we want London to be a Forest City or do we not want London to be a Forest City, how important is this to us, let's show what we truly believe.