

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 112 St. James Street (SPA18-140)

- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – expressing appreciation to staff, Ms. V. Santos, Site Development Planner, specifically, for their processing of this application, it has been a great job working with them and they feel at this stage, depending on what happens tonight, they are very close to completing this process; advising that the application before the Planning and Environment Committee requests a thirteen storey apartment building with one hundred twelve units consistent with the R9-7 Zone that applies to the property; indicating that it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, it conforms with both the 1989 Official Plan, The London Plan and the guidelines that were spoken to earlier; stating that the site plan has been reviewed by the Urban Design Peer Review Panel, they have had a meeting with the St. George-Grosvenor Neighbourhood Association hosted by Councillor P. Squire, they have also had the public open house on a separate occasion which Councillor P. Squire attended as well; advising that they have heard the comments from the neighbourhood and they have addressed as many of them as they can as well as the Urban Design Panel; going through some slides to give the Planning and Environment Committee some idea of how this process started and where they are today with the site plan but they are very happy with where the site plan is today and they are hoping that it will get the Committee's support this evening; indicating that he will go through the slides quickly as the Committee has already seen the drawings from Ms. V. Santos, Site Development Planner; showing a rendering of the building with the colours of materials proposed; noting that the units will be oversized, the applicant is hoping to not only bring in new residents but to keep existing residents who are looking at downsizing their current accommodations and living in a structure such as this; advising that they are exceeding the minimum landscaping requirement to allow them to actually bonus the permitted density on the property; indicating that there will be no long-term garbage outside other than just the day of and it will be screened during the time that it is out there; stating that the entrance is aligned with Talbot Street at the request of staff; noting that it is partly on the lands that are described as being subject to an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning application to be added to the property but there is an easement that exists right now that allows that access to be provided on the subject property; as noted the access enters into the garage entrance and they also have improvements to allow better pedestrian circulation both in the right-of-way crossing the access as well as Talbot Street and they are also providing two pedestrian connections coming in off of St. James Street; showing the parking area to the east of the building; noting that just seven spaces are being provided on the surface and they also have their garage entrance to the south of the parking area, they have a small loading zone for moving purposes and things like that and they have their temporary waste collection area more to the northeast of the building; pointing out the additional lands to be added, it will be mostly for additional landscaped area but it does serve to allow more density within the building; stating that, at the request of the Neighbourhood Association, they are introducing more native species and that is something that their client had no issue with and that will be finalized through the upcoming review process; showing the outdoor amenity area at the northeast corner of the building that is on top of the underground parking garage structure but at grade with the rest of the property and what they are proposing at this stage is to have some planters, benches and just more of a passive seating area for the residents; noting that there will also be the amenity spaces to the north and the west which will basically be grassed over and sodded and mixed with the proposed landscaping; discussing the Tree Preservation Plan and what they have done here is they have preserved the perimeter trees as much as they can;

noting that right now they are all being preserved except for a couple that are close to the construction area but all of the municipal trees along St. James Street are being preserved so it will still have the mature tree presence in front of the property; advising that, as was noted by Ms. V. Santos, Site Development Planner, they are overcompensating for the amount of tree loss, they are providing more trees than what are being taken away; advising that the building is going to be a mix of materials and colours to complement the existing area and that is consistent with the guidelines that were prepared in 2011; (*Councillor A. Hopkins indicating that Mr. H. Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., is coming up to five minutes.*); showing the renderings so the Committee will have an idea in a 3D sense of how this building will look; indicating that there is a lot of glazing on the building, a lot of mixture of materials and colours and that was something that they responded to the Urban Design Panel comments was to bring in a little more glazing and to also rotate some of the ground floor units; noting that the two storey townhome units at the bottom will be facing the street now to give better streetscape presence; indicating that the main entrance was initially at the west side of the building and at the request of the Panel they moved it to be a more prominent location in accordance with the streetscape; reiterating that they are still going through the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law process but it is important to note that this application can still move forward; noting that the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law application will add density to this site but it will only be internal to the building, no changes are required as part of that application. (See attached presentation.)

- Ken Owen, 159 St. James Street – indicating that he is the representative of the St. George/Grosvenor Neighbourhood Association; commending the administration staff that he has worked with on this project for their diligence and courteous responses in their communications with him with regards to this project; stating that the St. George/Grosvenor Neighbourhood Association was founded in 1980 and has been involved, in those thirty years, with many of the projects and many forms of urban regeneration proposals that have been proposed within the community during this time; indicating that the Association is not opposed to developments within its boundaries or in other areas of the City which might impact them or their life in the City; noting that in 1985 the St. George/Grosvenor Association played a significant role in developments and the incorporation of the special provisions in the current Official Plan which guides the future development of the Grosvenor Gate lands as well as the development of the 212 Grosvenor Gate urban design guidelines; indicating that with respect to this application, the Association was apprehensive about the proponents initial development proposal with regard to its scale, massing and expression and, in particular, the organization of the building access points, primary views from the street and adjoining properties; stating that many of these same concerns were also expressed by the Urban Design Peer Review Panel and the Association fully supports the recommendations of that panel in response to the applicants Urban Design Brief; stating that the Association is also very pleased to see that the applicant has subsequently incorporated most of the panel's recommendations in their revised site plan approval application; noting that there do remain, however, some concerns, which he will bring to the Committees attention, regarding waste collection and storage, traffic, and the future intensification development proposals for the Grosvenor Lands; indicating that with respect to waste storage and collection, in the applicant's first submission they proposed a waste storage and collections facilities entirely incorporated and enclosed within the main building structure; noting that this permitted collection vehicles to enter the building for pick up and negated the need for any exterior waste storage or collection facilities; stating that the revised submission, as already noted by the applicant, provides for waste storage only within the main building and that is actually proposed beyond level two in the parking area; noting that the applicant states that waste, on those collection days, will be hauled up from the interior storage room, through two floors of parking, and out to an exterior collection area location on the east side of the apartment building; indicating that the site plan does not propose that the collection area be enclosed and it is the Associations opinion that this area will become a waste storage area, not dissimilar to those already existing on other facilities on the Grosvenor Gate lands, which are unsightly and periodically visited by the fire department to extinguish fires caused through vandalism; respectfully requesting that any approval of this project, advanced by the Committee tonight, be conditional upon the

applicant incorporating waste storage and collection facilities enclosed entirely within the main building; stating that traffic has also been a major issue for this neighbourhood; stating that the neighbourhood residents maintain that this development, especially when combined with future medium to high-density developments that are permitted on the Grosvenor lands under the current zoning by-laws, will increase traffic congestion in the neighbourhood; stating that this is a neighbourhood that already experiences an extremely high volume of cut-through traffic making its way to and from downtown and to Western University and there is significant congestion during periods, particularly when the railroad tracks at Richmond Street are blocked; indicating that, for many, it was difficult to believe that the Trip Generation figures that were quoted in the correspondence in Appendix B of this Report are realistic and that staff had neglected to take into consideration the potential for the development of other land parcels within the Grosvenor property while as many as an additional two hundred units being constructed on the Grosvenor lands, on lands owned by the current owner of 112 St. James; (*Councillor A. Hopkins – indicates that Mr. Owen is at five minutes.*); Mr. K. Owen stating that if you include this in the Trip Generation a traffic study would be required; stating that item 4.4 in the Report speaks to traffic calming measures intended to reduce vehicle speed; noting that although a speed is a concern in the neighbourhood it is not the primary issue, the volume of traffic and cut-through traffic and congestion, making it difficult for residents to complete ingress and egress moves from their property is a primary concern facing most of them; (*Councillor A. Hopkins – enquiring as to how much longer Mr. Owen will be.*); Mr. K. Owen indicating that he will need about three more minutes; (*Councillor A. Hopkins asking the Committee if they will grant an extension for Mr. Owen. Moved by Deputy Mayor Helmer and seconded by Councillor P. Squire. Granted.*); Mr. K. Owen stating that in item 4.4 of the Report it suggests traffic calming measures could be introduced to reduce vehicle speed, although speed is not the concern in the neighbourhood the volume of traffic is; indicating that the introduction of traffic calming measures in accordance with the City of London traffic calming policy may reduce the flow of traffic through the neighbourhood it does not seem to be a viable option or solution to reducing the flow of traffic; stating that he would also like to point out that the City Engineer's proposal, to increase to 300 metres, the qualifying street length for traffic calming measures is proof that at tomorrow's Civic Works Committee meeting the sections of St. James and Talbot, adjacent to this development will be ineligible for the introduction of such traffic calming measures; stating that he is very concerned about the installation of a two-way stop sign at a new intersection which is being created with this driveway being introduced as the extension of Talbot Street; noting that this intersection of this street is a very busy pedestrian access point to the Thames Valley Trail and Gibbons Park; stating that aligning the access driveway to 112 St. James Street is logical, however, creating unimpeded traffic flow northbound on Talbot into the site and out of the site south onto Talbot, east on St. James will lead to confusion, result in unnecessary property damage and, more importantly, increase the risk of personal injury; indicating that the Committee should note that Mr. Elmadhoon stated to him that southbound traffic from the development site must stop, as per the by-law, traffic should stop when changing from a private road to a public road; stating that this statement contradicts what is in the Report which said there should be a free flow of traffic southbound out of this site onto Talbot Street eastbound to St. James; stating that he respectfully requests that any proposal of this project advanced by the Committee tonight be conditional upon the installation of all-way stop signs at what will effectively be a four-way intersection when the development is completed; stating that there is a precedent already set for this at the intersection of Waterloo and Epworth, unimpeded traffic flow around this area, southbound onto Waterloo from Epworth and northbound from Waterloo onto Epworth was changed when the King's College introduced a driveway aligned with Epworth Avenue into their parking lot on the east side of Waterloo; indicating that at that time all-way stop signs were installed at that intersection, including Waterloo, Epworth and their access driveway; stating that also, in the future development of Grosvenor lands, the Report references two instances in which approved site plan control applications for the lands east of the subject property, known as 24 St. James, that approval of two 36 unit buildings has not been initiated; indicating that those proposals, which is in a development agreement today, cannot be constructed as proposed because of a provisional consent decision by the London Consent Authority on May 6, 2019, which establishes access easements over the 124 St. James property will prohibit the construction of these buildings as proposed; (*Councillor A. Hopkins requesting that Mr. Owen sum up.*); Mr. K. Owen requesting that the condition that is

attached to that provisional consent require the owners of 124 St. James to amend or deregister the existing development agreement pertaining to those properties; indicating that he respectfully requests that the Committee attach that same condition to the approval of this application that is before them tonight; thanking the Committee for their time and the extension of time; pointing out that the City has to find a better way to communicate the notification of public meetings to people who are resident tenants of properties within the community because there many more that would have been here but they did not know about this meeting.