

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 307 Fanshawe Park Road East (Z-9006)

- Dave Hannam, Associate, Zelinka Priamo Limited, on behalf of the applicant – hoping for a positive endorsement from the Planning and Environment Committee for their proposed development; realizing staff recommends approval and supports the application; noting that Mr. C. Smith, Senior Planner, has done a comprehensive synopsis of the development but he thought he would take the opportunity to pick up on some of the positive planning merits of the proposal and work through that; mentioning that the proposal fronts onto Fanshawe Park Road East, a busy thoroughfare in close proximity to a commercial community hub; advising that it is surrounded by predominant one and two storey residential properties; the lands are designated and zoned for residential purposes and this type as they are seeking now; noting that there is a history of approved intensification on the site previously with a three storey apartment building that was approved by Council back in 2011, he believes; indicating that that particular proposal also included the retention of the existing dwelling on the site; stating that, as of January 3, 2019, the City approved a demolition permit to actually remove the existing dwelling and barn and the site is now vacant; outlining the concept plan, the project has been designed to try to deliver on all of the required requisite facets of an appropriate development; indicating that they have the three storey building at the front of the site to dress and frame Fanshawe Park Road and then building heights step back and internalized within the site itself onto an internal surface parking area that provides the requisite number of spaces; as mentioned, there are centrally located areas for recycling, for Canada Post and then around the site there are peripheral areas for outdoor amenity space, snow storage, increased landscaping and planting buffers as well; speaking to the access point, there is a new relocated access which will be right-in, right-out only, the existing break in the median on Fanshawe Park Road will be removed; *(Deputy Mayor J. Helmer indicating that Mr. Hannam has one minute left as he seems to still be at the beginning of the presentation.);* relating to the renderings and the elevations, they were obviously prepared, City urban designers went through and deemed that and commended the proposed development; obviously the future site plan process will iron out details such as architectural treatments, materials, etc., as well, the development includes additional amenity space and private balconies; turning to some of the issues that have been raised by the residents; understanding that this project is a big deal for some members of the local community and contrary to what some people might think, there has been quite a lot of thought and process has gone into conserving the existing character and amenity within the area; understanding that you cannot facilitate community building without some impacts and obviously good land use planning is about balancing those impacts; *(Deputy Mayor J. Helmer asking Mr. Hannam to wrap up.);* advising that he was going to get the Engineer to talk about stormwater management as well so perhaps they could touch on some of the other concerns and finish with his five minutes on stormwater; *(Deputy Mayor J. Helmer indicating that unfortunately that is not the way that it works, it is not five minutes per person you have working on the file, it is five minutes for the applicant; he tried to be clear about that at the outset; he thinks that what is going to happen though is that there is going to be discussion probably about the stormwater and he can certainly answer questions at that time; he is sure that members of the Planning and Environment Committee might have questions, members of the public might raise questions and that would be an opportunity that he could address issues specific to the stormwater.);* requesting that the Planning and Environment Committee approve the application. (See attached presentation.)

- Michael Crawford, on behalf of the Community Association – advising that they have streamlined their presentations together in the interest of time; noting that they have specialized each of their talks so he is speaking on the regulatory context and the summary of the plan and others in their community are going to address discreet points; indicating that contrary to expectation, perhaps, their community actually supports this change of land use in the sense that they are open to intensity; stating that the *Ontario Planning Act* absolutely requires clarity in the explanation provision of information for citizens to assess and understand generally the zoning proposed and this has not been the case; noting that any time they have asked for specifics, they have been told do not worry, it is site plan, this is just conceptual at this point so what can they sink their teeth into; advising that even the zone being asked for is muddy and it has been muddy because the density being requested is really, really hard to fit in to with any of the usual parameters and the reason for this is that they are trying to fit a square peg into a round hole; stating that the highest density for any intensification is seventy-five units per hectare but this plan also involves a change to grading and is inserting this change of grade into the context of topographically lower R-1 single family dwellings; noting that there is a big whack of stacked townhouses going in, three and a half and two and a half storeys; advising that the plan also necessitates the removal of all fifty-odd trees from the property as well as a lot of the hedge; noting that the hedge is actually a twenty foot high line of mature trees; believing this is going to have obvious implications not for just for sound, etc., but also for water and stormwater management; advising that it is hard to understand the plan because so little detail has been given to them to evaluate the effect of this graded plateau, the buffering, the water management and the traffic; outlining that traffic may seem fine, the consultant said it was all good, but can you really picture doing u-turns on Fanshawe Park Road in the middle of rush hour; noting that apparently it is legal so go for it; showing an aerial photograph of the site from the Zelinka Priamo Limited document and you can see that there are a lot of trees there and the proposal is to reinfer, because that is all they can do, lacking the specific details that they asked for, that this grading is going to create a plateau because the grading of the site itself depresses by, they think, eight and a half feet; to create this plateau there is going to be fill, parking lot, impermeable surfaces put on top so where is the water going to go, it is going to go downhill, where is the melt water from snow removal going to go, it is going to go downhill, where is that, into their neighbouring gardens; thinking that the proposal seems to suggest the swales, ie. drainage ditch, around the circumference of this and you can imagine how unsatisfactory that is to have standing water in the middle of summer with mosquitos; noting that they have had west Nile virus, etc.; stating that the Provincial *Planning Act* absolutely requires a thorough examination of stormwater management and this, from their perspective, is not a benign intensification, the by-laws are very clear as are the City plans that the neighbourhood should not be adversely impacted and obviously it is there contention that they will be. (See attached presentation.)
- Deb Beverley – pointing out that as her colleague, Mr. M. Crawford, has stated application for land use are only permitted where there will be no adverse consequences across the adjacent properties; explaining why their community strongly believes that there will be a dramatic adverse impact from the development as it is currently proposed; clarifying, because there has been some discussion around the different zonings for this property that all of their presentations are addressing the rezoning that is before the Planning and Environment Committee as recommended by the City which is the R5-7; discussing the issues with the grading or the raised plateau that will be necessary to level out the topography of the existing lot; indicating that, at the south end of the lot, the grading will be approximately eight and a half feet in height making what appears to be appropriate two and a half storey buildings actually tower over the existing properties, making them appear more like three, three and a half storeys; indicating that even the three and a half storey building,

the one that fronts onto Fanshawe Park Road, is going to have to have a little bit of grading as well because there is quite a dip right off of the sidewalk; advising that the three and a half storey building is going to be closer to a four storey with balconies and windows that are directly looking into the adjacent properties leaving children at play, people gardening or swimming completely exposed; believing that what appears appropriate on paper actually is not appropriate based on the topography of the land as it is right now; advising that the removal of all trees and the surrounding twenty foot hedge will accommodate the two structures, the buildings, and the required sixty-three parking spaces; noting that this translates into sixty-five percent of the green space becoming an impermeable surface which, again, sounds reasonable; however, when you consider that the property, as it exists right now, being one hundred percent green space has been integral to the natural stormwater management that is currently in place when you then make sixty-five percent of it impermeable and you raise the lot up eight and a half feet or so, you are dramatically increasing the water runoff into the neighbouring properties, properties that today are able to sustain themselves with the current water management that naturally occurs; showing a property that is adjacent to the subject lands and on the circle you can notice the puddling that has occurred; noting that this is about three hours after an all-day rainstorm has occurred; advising that it is a couple of inches deep; showing that there is still a small puddle twenty-four hours after the day of rain so most has been absorbed into the land and the land is able to manage it; as you might imagine, though, because this is adjacent to 307 Fanshawe Park Road East, the same puddling and water absorption is occurring on that property so once you remove the permeable surface that exists there today you are going to dramatically impact things because you no longer have the ground able to absorb or the mature trees that are all taking in the water that is helping naturally manage this; speaking to the number of parking spaces that are required for this application, as well as the limited landscaping, also do make snow removal an issue; acknowledging that Zelinka Priamo Limited has tried to address this which they are appreciative that they have tried to find a solution but she does want to point out that what appears to be appropriate, a twenty-two foot space for the collection of snow that has been removed is actually on the graded part of the property so it slopes down significantly onto the easterly side so you are going to have snow piled up on a grade that is already eight and a half feet above the surrounding properties; noting that the snow will remain against the easterly side fence until a thaw occurs and at that point you will have salt-laden, chemical melt that is being absorbed into the natural area; indicating that they have not had flooding in twenty to thirty years and possibly longer; stating that, to the best of her knowledge, there has never been any flooding which is due to the natural water management that is in place; speaking to the removal of the trees, in addition to the natural management, which she has significantly remarked on, the removal of them will also eliminate the privacy and noise buffering that is currently in place and that is actually key enjoyment to both outdoor spaces on either side of the fence line; advising that they do support development, absolutely, they do believe that there needs to be some intensification, they just do not feel that this is the appropriate amount but they are happy to see some intensification that will fit with the City's mandate as well as the builder and the developers. (See attached presentation.)

- Claudia Clausius – addressing the by-laws; indicating that the recommendation has numerous variances and most of them are significant; stating that there are multiple by-law infractions in the setbacks; showing a rendition and a picture is worth one thousand words, how both buildings will tower over the adjacent properties; adding that this particular rendition does not include the possibly eight foot elevation, this is without the elevation; showing people playing in their backyards looking up and the picture in the corner is a view from the second storey looking down on all of the adjacent properties and pools; indicating that all units are accessible through stairwells. (See attached presentation.)

- Ron McDougall – speaking to size and topography, although the developer has attempted to present this project as a reasonable land use and in keeping with the city plan and its mandate, it is in comparison to the homes surrounding it, a massive project that would tower over the surrounding homes; advising that the proposed buildings are to be put on the land that is to be raised in places by eight feet or more; noting that the land slopes eight feet to the back; believing that this adds almost another storey to the height; this will severely affect the right to privacy in the surrounding homes and in addition, it is unlikely that any type of sound barrier or fence can be high enough to control the noise or the night time parking illumination; noting that the illumination will be directed downwards from above directly into the surrounding homes; pointing out that car lights will be shining into the neighbours second storey windows; stating that Fanshawe Park Road is at all times a busy road and at various times of the day and during major holiday shopping seasons it is busy to an extreme; the added traffic from forty-two units trying to maneuver into this property from the east or out of the property heading west will be chaotic; advising that they have been told that a u-turn at a stoplight is not against the law but is it safe; adding to these issues, the problem of seeing oncoming traffic, bicycles, pedestrians when the cars are trying to exit the property; asking the Committee to consider also the added problems whenever Fanshawe Park Road has to be widened; thinking that, as serious as the other issues are, stormwater runoff is the most problematic; during heavy rains, many of the yards backing on to 307 Fanshawe Park Road East experience standing water for a considerable time following the storm; advising that currently this is tolerable because most of the runoff can be slowed and absorbed by the mature trees and grass; it will not be tolerable when roughly one acre of the land behind is covered in structures and pavement; with virtually no mature trees remaining or grass to absorb and slow the flow of water, there will be standing water, there will be mosquitos and potentially West Nile virus or Zika virus; believing there could be a high probability of leaking basements; there must be more trees, grassy areas left; as our weather patterns change we will see more frequent one hundred year storms; in 2011, indicating that this problem could not be solved and that was when a smaller project was proposed; reminding the Committee that 307 Fanshawe Park Road East does not fall within the transit village designate around Masonville Mall; consequently the increased density proposed under the R5-7 zoning from sixty units per hectare to seventy-five units per hectare is not warranted; suggesting a zoning change should be no more than R5-5 with a limit of up to twenty-five units, forty-five units per hectare and a height restriction of two storeys; assuming the added open space and trees with this density can help control stormwater runoff, this would be a more appropriate land use; feeling that this could help the developer find a solution to the drainage issues; believing there should be many alternatives that the developer can find that will give a reasonable return on an investment, satisfy the concerns of the community and satisfy the mandate of the City; within this R5-5 zoning, there should be no doubt that Royal Premier Homes can profitably build attractive quality homes; with this zoning, the City should satisfy its desire for infill and they expect a development should enhance their community and they feel this would be a fair compromise; requesting that the holding provisions that they will be providing to the Committee will ensure that their community is consulted on major issues such as drainage and grading, sanitary and stormwater serving. (See attached presentation.)
- Fred Cull, 33 Camden Place – indicating that it has been forty-two years since his wife Cathy and himself and their two young daughters moved into their home; noting that it was in 1977 that they bought their house that was only one year old; stating that it was beautiful and they liked the neighbourhood and it seemed like country living with corn fields to the west towards Richmond Street; advising that their backyard looked directly onto the old barn and yellow brick house that was situated on the 307 Fanshawe Park Road East property; stating their two daughters would be attending a good school, Stoneybrook Public School;

remembering back in 1977 when they moved into the house the trees along their street were pretty small but over the next forty-two years, those trees have grown to provide shade and beauty and coolness to their properties; indicating that over the years they have enjoyed the fellowship of their neighbours, they have had many social gatherings in their homes and on the Camden Place circle; many years have passed since they moved into their home on Camden Place; noting that their two daughters are now married and they now have three grandkids who enjoy coming over to their place and playing in the backyard; over the forty-two years, they have seen three different owners of the 307 Fanshawe Park Road East property; knowing that someday the property would be sold and maybe a developer might plan to build something but what; hoping to see a few nice one floor condos to be built there and maybe in their retirement years, they may actually look at moving into one of those condos themselves; believing they could downsize and at the same time live in their old Stoneybrook neighbourhood that they have enjoyed over the years; looking back to ten years ago, it was 2009 through 2011, a different developer had planned to build on the 307 Fanshawe Park Road East site; pointing out that that developer had applied to build one three storey building with sixteen units in it and to retain the old house with two units in it for a total of eighteen units with underground parking and the zoning would be R-1 bonus and he would be required to build exactly this; noting that that developer did not own the property although he had received permission to proceed with the development but after waiting for a few months, he decided not to proceed with this plan; believing the main reason was because he could not deal with the water and flooding onto adjacent backyards; indicating that for the next eight years the property from 2011 to 2019 has been either rented out or remained vacant; noting that when the latest developer demolished the old farmhouse and barn, that bonus on the zoning reverted back to R-1, the same as their homes; stating that he current developer has applied for two large buildings to be built with forty-two units, building one facing Fanshawe Park Road very close to the sidewalk which would have twenty-four units, three and a half storeys high; building two, in the middle back north-south would have eighteen units two and a half storeys high, parking for sixty-three cars; indicating that the property has a gradual slope being approximately eight feet lower in the south end; flooding, especially in the spring during snow melt and heavy rain is a problem for neighbours; advising that the proposed development site is too extensive and would create many problems of flooding and loss of privacy for the adjacent backyards of the property owners; expressing concern that the current plan is to plow all the snow and salt from the parking lot down onto their property line on the east side and this would kill their trees and the garden areas and would flood their backyards with snow melt and heavy rains; suggesting that all of the trees and hedges on the perimeter on the 307 Fanshawe Park Road East property be saved to provide privacy and to help control flooding onto their properties that back on to this site; outlining that their neighbourhood has been established for fifty years with one and two storey homes Low Density R-1 zoning and they would prefer to see a scaled down development that is more sensitive to the size and character of their surrounding homes.

- Katharina Clausius – speaking to the perspective of young Londoners who are looking to settle in our beautiful city and raise families for the future; indicating that, like many millennials, school and work obligations have taken her all around the globe and she has logged many thousands of miles with a specific goal in mind to make her way back to the London community; why London; pointing out that London stands apart because it promises a quality of life for her future, London prioritizes green space and the environment; noting that her kids will bike around the neighbourhood, they will play in parks, they will climb in the tree in the front yard like she used to; remembering that standing at the meeting faced with this forest that is the symbol of the City of London; outlining that London is a city whose neighbourhoods have a character; stating that the city is built on communities and each one has its own vibe; indicating that she is not existing on

an anonymous city block in a huge metropolis, she is living in and committing to a neighbourhood and to her community and it is a community, they carpool, they have a Neighbourhood Watch, neighbourhood barbeques, they organize clean up areas a couple of times a year and they support a neighbourhood ice rink and they represent precisely the kind of urban living that cities boast about frequently but that very few cities actually achieve; advising that her neighbourhood is very diverse, it has retirees, young professionals, school age children, new Canadians, students; noting that she was one of the school age children; believing it is a neighbourhood for all generations and it has room for her, for her parents, for her kids, for her friends, for her coworkers; stating that in London she does not feel like she is one person anonymously living among four million, she can participate in community meetings, today she has a voice in front of City Council; London is a city whose residents who are engaged, who are happy to invest their hopes and energies because there is confidence in the future and good will among residents; advising that the City by-laws repeatedly dictate that new development should not negatively impact the character of London's neighbourhoods, Old Stoneybrook has a green character, it has a social character, it has a diverse character; indicating that the proposed development does not prioritize the environment, it does not enhance the neighbourhood, it does not promote diversity; noting the proposed building replaces mature trees with cars, it separates itself from the rest of the community by elevating it above the rest of the community, by instituting cement parking and walls, the towering edifice will invade the green spaces that are their backyards and their social environment; asking the Municipal Council very humbly to aim higher, to encourage development that enhances quality of life, to cultivate community character, to work with and not against the environment; noting that nobody wins against Mother Nature; stating that it is her firm hope that Municipal Council will take pride in its by-laws, will take pride in its communities and will take pride in the residents; advising that she wants to settle in a London where her neighbourhood and the City can collaborate to build for the future in a way that is sustainable, that attracts new generations of Londoners who will share their passion for the city; expressing appreciation for this opportunity to speak in front of the Planning and Environment Committee and she hopes that what the Committee has heard is a community that shares your excitement for growth, that shares your desire to welcome newcomers and that really shares your ambition for the London community; they know that they can aim even higher, this proposal is a kind of starting point and it is worth the extra effort for the City, for the community and for the residents to take it that extra step and really make it worth all of the attention and effort that has been put in so far.

- Mary Lacey, 37 Camden Place – speaking in reference to the notice that she received regarding the application for the zoning amendment change for the property at 307 Fanshawe Park Road East and the proposed building project being considered for this site; advising that she has been a resident in this lovely, well-established neighbourhood for the past thirty-three years and now needs to voice her concerns over the possible approval of such an amendment; advising that she is aware of the zoning approved in 2011 for the developer Dave Tenant who did not go forward with his plan; indicating that she totally understands the need for infill as opposed to urban sprawl; however, the by-law states in keeping with the neighbourhood; stating that the proposed development in its current state is not the right fit; indicating that this is not about not in my neighbourhood, she actually looks forward to seeing this lovely piece of property being developed in keeping with the city by-laws which are there for a reason hopefully to protect residents such as her; having attended the meeting at Masonville Library, she has a wide range of concerns which include, but are not limited to, size, noise, traffic, air pollution, lighting, garbage, water drainage, snow removal, loss of trees and green space and she is sure she does not need to reference all of the current by-laws; pointing out that this beautiful piece of property snuggled in amongst the trees and backyards of a well-established neighbourhood deserves

to be developed in a manner that will allow it to integrate within the Old Stoneybrook community not built in isolation; expressing appreciation for the ability of being able to voice her concerns.

- Carl Hallberg, 1262 Hastings Drive – indicating that their home is on the corner of Hastings Drive and Pinehurst; advising that one of their main concerns with the proposed development at 307 Fanshawe Park Road East is the increased traffic on Hastings Drive and the Pinehurst cul-de-sac; pointing out that access to 307 Fanshawe Park Road East by westbound vehicles will not be available; noting that vehicles wanting to enter 307 Fanshawe Park Road East when travelling westbound will have to make a left on Hastings Drive and either use driveways on Hastings Drive or the Pinehurst cul-de-sac to turn around and proceed to 307 Fanshawe Park Road East; outlining that the report to the Planning and Environment Committee advises that u-turns may be used on Hastings Drive; however, Hastings Drive is not wide enough for vehicles to make safe u-turns and the only options to turn around is by using people's driveways or the Pinehurst cul-de-sac; presently there are a number of vehicles doing these turn-around as vehicles leaving the shopping plaza and wanting to travel west are unable to turn left on Fanshawe Park Road and they go east and they use the driveways on Hastings Road and the cul-de-sac to turn around; the increased turn-around is a very small area and will impact the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and others using the roadway; advising that he has spoken with his neighbours on Pinehurst and while they are not able to attend tonight, they expressed significant concerns on increased traffic and for the children's safety; presently the cul-de-sac and green area provide a play area that they will no longer be able to use; indicating that the planning report to the Planning and Environment Committee outlines provincial policy of building strong and healthy communities and protecting public health and safety; stating that due to the large size of the project and resulting increased traffic turning around in a very short space it reduces safety and contravenes the provincial policy of public safety; indicating that it will put both residents and those using the roadway at excessive risk; pointing out that the proposed project at 307 Fanshawe Park Road East differs significantly from the project at 420 Fanshawe Park Road East which was approved by Council; noting that all of the homes backing onto 420 Fanshawe Park Road East have large backyards providing a buffer to the project and this is not the case for 307 Fanshawe Park Road East where nearly all of the adjacent homes have small backyards and have little buffering from the project; advising that they view the scale of the proposed 307 Fanshawe Park Road East as too large and it is not in a form that fits with the receiving neighbourhood; expressing opposition to the excessive traffic from the project and the resulting increased safety risk and the fact that the scale of the project does not fit with the existing neighbourhood.
- Kathy Cull, 33 Camden Place – advising that their backyard faces directly onto where the parking lot and proposed second building would be located at 307 Fanshawe Park Road; stating that she is not looking forward to experiencing sixty-three cars in and out of the parking lot, day or night, noise, fumes, lights, etc.; pointing out that 307 Fanshawe Park Road is a beautiful parcel of land and she is very saddened to see all the trees which have been so much of its character gone, as well as wild flowers, wildlife, the changing of the seasons and the gentle calmness to the neighbourhood; believing that yes, infill and urban growth are here; advising that the Old Stoneybrook Community Association is indicating that they realize that 307 Fanshawe Park Road will be developed; expressing concern with the size and extent as proposed; asking Council to please engage with your stakeholders, the London citizens, taking into consideration respect for all when evaluating continuous quality improvement, innovation, and advancement for London, and in particular for the Old Stoneybrook Association; presenting alternative ideas for 307 Fanshawe Park Road property, number one, a development of one-story condos according to the zoning with a design to accommodate the meeting needs of downsizing in our

greater community with compatibility; number two, a community park for the neighbourhood, including green spaces with tree-shaded resting areas and a playground, etc, for the children would be a welcoming addition to the surrounding area; asking that they work together as a participant in the next phase, site plan, towards the development and plan that fits and is sensitive to the character of our neighbourhood with respect for one another in harmony and with listening ears; requesting to our City Councillors on the Planning and Environment Committee Anna Hopkins, Jesse Helmer, Phil Squire, and Steven Turner, our neighbourhood is relying upon the goodwill of Council to accept and implement whatever measures are acceptable for the Old Stoneybrook Community Association; expressing appreciation for your consideration.

- Gerry Croxall, 17 Camden Road – advising that, to kindly respect your request, he will try not to be redundant; noting that his neighbours have succinctly and more eloquently expressed their concerns better than he probably could, but he does have a report here and he will leave copies with the Committee; focusing on two concerns, although he has more than two of course, but the elevation which will cause definitely more flooding; advising that he had a reputable drainage company come out; noting that he has their report with him; they said that definitely, to their knowledge, there is no engineering feat that they know that is going to properly displace adequately any kind of storm that is over moderate, and even right now he has a sump pump that comes on fairly frequently, but it can handle the overflow quite well; stating that the University of Berkeley, lighting that is elevated on adjacent properties, neighbourhood properties, definitely can affect peoples' mental health; noting that he is not saying it is going to send me over to the sanatorium or something, but it definitely can affect peoples' mental health maybe not to the point where you are depressed everyday but it does have a subconscious influence on peoples' health; noting that he also brought their report; believing that for sixty-three cars, he just does not see how the required lighting for safety purposes could actually be facilitated that it is not going to have some adverse effect on neighbouring houses; pointing out that those are his two primary concerns, water, and lighting; expressing agreement with the other constituents of my neighbourhood, we definitely realize that there is going to be intensification, they realize that, they realize if it is done in a proper fashion that respects and he thinks that is the keyword, be respectful to the developer, they are a business, they want to make a profit on their investment and they understand that but be respectful if they were raising their kids or had their families over for a visit, they would want their backyards to be something that they have worked hard all their lives; advising that he is a Marine Scientist, he is not a PhD guy, but he is a Marine Scientist; noting that he has spent twenty-four years filming documentaries in the ocean, and he has been to a lot of countries and he has talked to a lot of people that do have intensification; stating that when intensification gets to the point where it can affect your mental health, he would just suggest that maybe that is something to reflect on, that if it was your families living in the same situation, what considerations would you give; hoping that maybe we can come to terms with the developer with something that they feel content with and that we feel is fair too; thanking the Committee for their time and advising that he really appreciates it.
- Jean-Ann Goldrick, 1261 Hastings Drive – expressing appreciation to the time the Committee has given the tonight; advising that they are not against infill, they are not against the City planning to use areas within the community to achieve this infill; indicating that they are for the preservation of trees, they are for the regulation of traffic flow and pedestrian safety, they are for the proper diversion of run off and appropriate landscaping; having said that, her comments will not quote by-law numbers or Official Plans, per se; advising that when she and her husband moved into this area forty years ago from the Egerton-Hamilton Road area, they were looking for a larger home that needed less maintenance and a neighbourhood with accessible, reputable schools; stating that they found this in the Stoneybrook community; indicating that it is an area zoned for single family

homes and they chose to invest in the neighbourhood; pointing out that they chose to live in Stoneybrook because they wanted the character of that neighbourhood, but we were not naïve, they saw the area develop over the years with the widening of Fanshawe Park Road from two lanes with ditches to a four lane thoroughfare with left turn lanes included; pointing out that they watched the commercialization of Masonville; believing that if you choose to move into a new area such as the Upper Richmond Village or West Five, you are moving in with the planning of that area in mind; noting that there will be single family homes, townhouses, condos, high-rise apartments but if you choose to move into that area, you understand that that is the character of that neighbourhood; stating that when taxpayers move into these areas they know what type of buildings will be next door and they still choose to move there; noting it is the same in heritage areas such as Old East and Old Woodfield; outlining that when they moved into the area, there were no such guidelines in place other than the existing by-laws to protect their neighbourhood; believing that, as a result, the builders are taking advantage of the Planning and Environment Committee, along with the City's need for housing, to create intense infill by changing the Zoning By-laws and not keeping the character of the neighbourhood; indicating that the building of subdivisions, during which the planning phases include high-rise buildings, condos, townhouses, and single family dwellings, do not fit the character of this neighbourhood; outlining that at a meeting in April, 2019, she heard Deputy Mayor Helmer speak with pride about the home where he lives as having ten inches of space on one of the side yards and less than five meters frontage on to the street; believing it was the character of that neighbourhood that drew him to make his purchase, he chose to buy a home there; pointing out that while there are few locations in Old East where new buildings are likely to be constructed, given the relatively narrow lots and the fact that there are few opportunities for infill development, new or replacement buildings may be constructed in some cases possibly as a result of a fire or structural instability; pointing out that in such situations new buildings must be designed to be compatible with the heritage characteristics of Old East and Old Woodfield to help retain the overall character of that neighbourhood; indicating that they knew the property at 307 Fanshawe Park Road could not sit as it was forever; stating that the builder is asking the Planning and Environment Committee to change the character of our neighbourhood to achieve extremely intense infill goals and that the zoning be changed to allow the build to take place to the builder's advantage; thinking that the option is not fitting with the character of the neighbourhood as they do not have a heritage designation so they have no protection other than the existing by-laws; advising that if the Planning and Environment Committee decided to approve a request to demolish a house or two in Deputy Mayor Helmers' neighbourhood to build stacked townhouses that would tower over the existing building and would sit closer to the property lines causing the loss of mature trees, creating runoff, traffic, pedestrian and elevation concerns, and the request was granted, she is sure there would be some pushback from the neighbours and the Heritage Committee on the type of infill that would result in changes to the character of their neighbourhood; reiterating that they are not against infill; asking Council not to rezone to the degree proposed and to please just make it fit the character of the neighbourhood; asking Council to consider the fact that you are our heritage committee; thanking the Committee for their time.

- John Howitt, 1281 Hastings Drive - sitting up here tonight, he is thinking about that eight foot elevation that the developer is going to put at the end of the lot; perhaps he is ten feet up and he would just like you to think about how high eight feet is, especially if it is at your backyard.
- Deena Lincoln, 7 Camden Road – advising that their family has enjoyed our home and this beautiful neighbourhood and community for 36 years, and hopefully a few more; stating that the proposed development on 307 Fanshawe Park Road is about to change all of that; advising that they have major concerns that should be recognized; providing examples, seventy percent of the property

will be concrete and asphalt, virtually all trees will be removed, forty-two units, sixty-three parking spaces with only one main entrance to Fanshawe Park Road, minimal buffer zones and serious concerns about stormwater management and snow removal; pointing out that when questions were asked about this, the response is that this is a grey area; indicating that when in touch with SPM Limited and Zelinka and City planning earlier in this process, they were told not to worry, that is a site plan issue, it will all work out; indicating that this is a very serious concern for the and they feel it should be resolved before the zoning change is approved; outlining that there are safety and security concerns, parking and turnaround on side streets, loss of privacy day and night, to name but a few; believing that this appears to be an example of over-intensification; hoping the Committee will take the time to walk the property and streets to visualize the impact of the proposed plan on the neighbourhood; expressing that, in their opinion, it just does not fit, and will have a severe detrimental impact on our neighbourhood; realizing and think it is reasonable to expect an infill project on 307 Fanshawe Park Road East, and they have no problem with appropriate development that will not totally disrupt the nature of their neighbourhood; asking the Committee to reconsider the number of units and parking spaces in order to reasonably maintain the character.

- Rick Giroux, 1269 Hastings Drive – indicating that their property backs onto the west side of the property at 307 Fanshawe Park Road East; advising that his comments this evening address their opposition to the rezoning application submitted by Royal Premier Homes, and the long term implications that will affect them and the community if the rezoning application is approved; outlining that 307 Fanshawe Park Road is a property that has existed as a single family dwelling since the community was developed some forty to fifty years ago; pointing out that current residents, many of whom have resided in the community since it was constructed, face a proposal to construct two stacked townhouses, structured with forty-two residential units, more than twice the sixteen to seventeen single family homes that currently surround the property; advising that neither his family nor their neighbours oppose the concept of infill or intensification, but they agree that the development should complement, not diminish, the existing community's enjoyment of our homes; advising that the current proposal as structured has far too many residential units, will detract significantly from the employment or enjoyment of our backyards, living space, and create many unfavourable implications for future home maintenance and traffic safety; stating that he is not an expert in Zoning By-laws and procedures and will restrict my comments to fair play, common sense and a need to consider all the facts when making decisions that will affect the daily lives of everyone in the community for many years to come; advising that in recent months they have received a presentation from the developer on their conceptual plans and layouts, very little detail relative to the impact on tree removal, re-grading, drainage or traffic flows; advising that when questions were presented, the common response received was that these were site plan details that would be addressed during site plan approval; noting that in his estimation deficient and ineffective, this is an inefficient and ineffective planning process as zoning as the driving force behind the site plan development; pointing out that if the zoning application for R5-7 status is requested, we should understand the implications on traffic, parking, drainage and so on, before the suitability of the zoning request is approved; providing specifics on the site factors and how they will impact the surrounding community; speaking to the proposal currently under review, sixty-three parking spaces will be provided to accommodate forty-two dwelling units with twenty-two of them running east-west across the central portion of the property and the balance running north-south along the eastern boundary; pointing out that in his particular case, he has a pergola on the north-east corner of my rear yard, and will face exposure to a parking lot with lighting, constant car door closures, and headlights facing into my backyard every night with slamming doors in the parking lot; asking the Committee to please consider how your family

and friends would enjoy sitting in a similar environment; indicating that his neighbours on the eastern side of 307 Fanshawe Park Road East will face similar environments in their backyards; pointing out that the next consideration is the grade changes that are anticipated for the development; advising that the property at 307 Fanshawe Park Road East drops eight feet from Fanshawe Park Road East to the south end of the property, necessitating considerable re-grading; stating that when you add pavement for the property roadway and parking, plus the footprint of two large buildings and removal of a considerable number of trees, there is significant probability of flooding in the spring runoff on the surrounding properties; advising that he does not have a sump pump in his house, and in 11 years he has never had a flooding or a basement water situation, so the drainage has been excellent; noting that a reduction in the density of units to be constructed minimizes parking, reduces the footprint of the building, makes room for proper snow removal and provides greater assurance that I and my neighbours will not experience future drainage implications; outlining that the most severe implication of the proposal as presented is the laneway leading into the property; stating that access/egress will only be permitted to and from the eastbound lane of Fanshawe Park Road East; thinking that given the close proximity to the Hastings Drive traffic light, a bus stop just west of the property, a proposed widening of Fanshawe Park Road, and a minimal front setback, there is considerable potential for an increased incidence of traffic violations and accidents; living three houses from the lights at Hastings Drive and Fanshawe Park Road East, he can attest to the frequent occurrence of accidents at the traffic lights; advising that there are hundreds of homes using Hastings Drive and cars accelerate to catch the green light; combining this with the heavy traffic on Fanshawe Park Road, the right turn access/egress restriction will undoubtedly impede smooth traffic flow as it inherently mandates U-turns or next-street turns into residential properties; a zoning that permits fewer units will, again, reduce the potential for traffic accidents and injuries; indicating that the community is mature, with significant forestation throughout the area; noting that this 307 Fanshawe Park Road property in particular has a significant number of trees; advising that there are two trees in the proposed parking lot that have trunks in excess of two feet in diameter, and in all likelihood are over 100 years old; noting that some sections of the property have cedar hedges over fifteen feet in height; indicating that the rear of his property, fortunately, has some of those hedges and it is believed that these will be removed as part of the development process; advising that these trees and hedges are homes to a variety of animals and birds, facilitates soil drainage and provides protection from the heat in summer months; believing that every effort should be pursued to retain as many trees as possible; reiterating that a zoning dictates the size of a development, and hence the impact on forestation; (*Deputy Mayor J. Helmer asking him to please wrap up.*); summarizing that, as a former businessman and accountant, he is very confident with the concepts of maximized profit margin and return on investment; no business can succeed; however, without a solid business plan that takes into account all variables associated with the product-project; the makeup of the Stoneybrook area has evolved over many decades, as have other communities such as Old South, Wortley Village, Byron and Hamilton Road area; stating that each has evolved with its own character and community residents that endeavour to enhance the daily lives of its residents; pointing out that they are not a collection of bricks and mortar, but a community of homes, friends, family, and neighbours that come together to relax after a hard day's work; communities such as ours collectively form what is called the City of London, a municipality that is envied in many parts of the province; stating that he, as well as his neighbours, tend to relax in their backyards, and in his case he spent considerable funds and time and effort to make his backyard an oasis; noting that his neighbours have done the same, modifying their property to match their individual tastes and lifestyles; stating that he does not believe any of them will complain about our backyards backing onto other backyards, but they do not

accept having to look at parking lots with significant car traffic and towering structures devoid of trees; asking the Committee to decline the request; expressing appreciation for listening to his comments.

- Ron McKnight, 1402 Hastings Drive – wanting to add a few more comments, nothing elaborate, he is not going to spend a lot of time, but Carl did a great job of addressing an issue of access to Fanshawe Park Road, and our gentleman here just addressed that same issue; taking a little different perspective here, and it has not been spoken or shared this evening yet; advising that he is here to represent the children, many, many, many, many children that access their neighbourhood; indicating that they do not have a voice so they are not here to speak to what is happening; noting that they back onto Hastings Park and they have four beautiful soccer fields there, sixty meters long and they are for children three and a half to age four, up to about age seven; indicating that his wife and him both coach soccer, they love soccer, he sits out there in his lawn chair and watch them play; noting that they just wrapped up about fifteen minutes ago and they play three nights a week starting at 6:00 PM, finish at 8:00 PM, and quite often on a weekend they will play, and who comes with them, grandparents, parents, and they all arrive in their SUVs and their vans, nine out of ten are these large vehicles; advising that they park on Hastings Drive, all the way up past our house from the Hastings Park entrance, on our side and on the other side, there is room for one vehicle to get down between them, and it is dangerous and the kids are excited, they have had a great game, they have scored a goal or whatever, and they run in between the vehicles and it is really, really dangerous; the other point is Stoneybrook elementary school is on the corner of Hastings Gate and Stoneybrook, and all these young kids are walking to school, crossing the road, many of them on rainy days are driven by their parents in their SUVs and their vans, and the roads are jammed; advising that the key here is the timeframe; pointing out that they have lived in Old Stoneybrook for thirty years, they have seen it grow and develop; advising that after breakfast every morning Monday through Friday, he drives over to Masonville Mall and walks for an hour between 7:30 AM and 9:00 AM so he sees traffic flow coming through the lights, the many cars that run the red lights, and he is very sensitive to that; another time of the day, 3:00 PM until 6:00 PM, it is terrible, bumper to bumper, cars all over the place, they have the kids coming out of school at 3:30 PM and the vans again coming to pick them up and there is all kinds of stuff going on; advising that he likes riding a motorcycle; noting that he has a nice motorcycle, but he will not go on the road before 9:00 AM and he is off the road before 3:00 PM; pointing out that today he took a nice ride, he came in at 3:30 PM and he had to go down to 5 km/h, watching for kids, traffic, it was a zoo; expressing concern that if we are going to have all these people living in this complex, he is sure most of them will work, they have got to get to work either before 8:00 AM or 9:00 AM, so you are going to have a tremendous influx of traffic trying to access Fanshawe Park Road, and we know and he knows, Fanshawe Park Road, four lanes, traffic is really moving at that time in the morning, people are going to work, it is busy, and it is tough to break into the traffic, never mind do a u-turn, it just will not work; wondering what is going to happen; if someone lives there and they have to go west, they are going to have to turn right, come out of the parking lot, they can take Hastings but there is no light at Hastings east so they can turn in the drive and come out but they are going to sit there and wait trying to get into the traffic flow; wondering what they can do, they can go half a kilometer down Hastings east, make a left into Hastings Gate, drive one hundred metres and come to the corner of Stoneybrook and Hastings Gate, Stoneybrook school, with all these vehicles and everything at 8:30 AM when they are getting their kids to school; you are going to have people trying to access, to come out to the set of lights at Fanshawe and Stoneybrook, then they can turn left; (*Deputy Mayor J. Helmer asking him to please wrap up.*); or you just stay on Hastings, and you come out Hastings west at a set of lights; expressing concern with the welfare of these kids; advising that he is very passionate about this.

- Piotr Nowakowski, 1273 Hastings Drive – advising that he and his family have lived at this residence for twenty-three years; commenting on the document that he noticed yesterday on the City’s website that says that Traffic Impact Assessment statement; pointing out that on page two there is a quote from a Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) handbook, and he quotes it says “Never make a u-turn unless you can see at least 150 meters in both directions.”; pointing out that this document actually claims that there is that visibility available when making a u-turn going east or west and perhaps there is, but I thought the intent of the MTO remark here is to make sure that there is no cars for the 150 meter distance on the road that is 60 km/h traffic; pointing out that in the Appendix, there is some data available for the traffic character of that intersection, Fanshawe and Hastings and Jennifer; noting that this is page 3 of the Appendix; according to the numbers we have 1,313 cars travelling eastbound on Fanshawe Park Road alone, and this is not counting people that are trying to turn right from Hastings; outlining that 1,313 cars, if you do the math that equates to a car every 2.7 seconds, let us say it is 3 seconds, if you do some more math, it turns out that you have about 48 or 50 meters space between the cars; understanding traffic does not move steady and evenly, but still that is only 50 meters between cars so the u-turn that this document claims is possible is actually not possible at all during the peak hours; wanting to point that out; thinking it is important and this document actually proves that the turning and making the u-turns as this property or people that would be living in that property would be forced to do is not possible in the peak hours, because you only have less than 50 meters distance between cars and MTO suggests or claims that you have to have 150 meters distance between cars.
- Lindsey Bradshaw, 35 Camden Place – indicating that they have this driveway being put in eighty-two centimeters from her property line at a four foot level which is about her height and it is definitely the height of all of her kids; stating that, to her, the traffic report says it has no impact to her, city planning says it has no impact to her; advising that she currently backs onto a backyard, not a street, so it’s very safe for her kids to play and she thinks that having sixty-three cars coming in and out at a four foot elevation, shining into her house is roughly about 880 cars a week that will be putting their lights into her backyard and into her house; thinking that this is excessive and she also would like to say that she agrees with everything that everybody has said; thinking that they have done a good job, and she agrees with the density being too large.
- John Goldrick, 1261 Hastings Drive – advising that he has lived there for a long time and in that amount of time, he will say thirty-five to forty years, he has seen four people killed at a controlled stop light; indicating that they are one hundred maybe 150 feet from the stoplight to where these people are all going to try to get in or get out of this property if this is put forward; hoping that we do not kill any more people, much less one of those that some of the people have already talked about; seeing them every day running by me, he sees school buses that actually go through the orange light; imagining what could happen.