

**From:** bill brock  
**To:** Bill Brock  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 4, 2019, 4:27:16 p.m. EDT  
**Subject:** Stoneybrook Neighbourhood

To: Cathy Saunders, City Clerk  
Letter to City Council Agenda for meeting of June 11, 2019.  
Re: Planning and Environment Meeting of May 27, 2019 Item #3.6  
307 Fanshawe Park Road East

Request this communication be referred to matching agenda item on Council meeting as noted.

To City Council

This letter is to indicate an appropriate action different than coming out of Planning Committee meeting as noted above. The London Plan is a guide as to how city will handle future growth to save costs and farm land by building in and up! This is not an enforcement tool unless Council passes motion to take an action. The system provides tools as to how city will deal with all 43 neighbourhoods.

The agenda item #3.6 covered in pages 29-52 raise many of the issues or concerns with standards and exceptions approved by staff. The factors have been well covered by the Stoneybrook Community Association and speakers at meeting. However I would like you to consider the following:

City Council; with the Mayor and 14 councillors have control of the process and someone in a neighbourhood like Stoneybrook neighbourhood; which is in one ward, is at their mercy! If you examine the process the ward councillor can raise issues to support concerns leaving 14 others to either agree or vote to proceed not withstanding community concern! Where is the fairness?

In a letter from J. Fleming; Managing Director on Sept. 4, 2018 the indication is that no development is exempt from the plan including W5 or any other suburban development. However the "London Plan encourages inward and upward growth, but also allows for growth and development in suburban locations. Where the detailed policies of a secondary plan differ from the more general policies of the parent plan (London Plan) the secondary plan policies prevail."

Please note that the data indicates thousands of homes and businesses and a process that gives them priority over the London Plan as a secondary plan! In the neighbourhoods as noted above the indication appears to be maximum use of land; exceptions to rules for benefit of developer and generation of major development charges for city to use as decided. It should be noted city has the right to change any policies or budgetary matters at any time with 8 votes!

As a foot note to London Plan (save farm land etc.) London changes position depending on project which has been covered in many correspondence to get intercity downtown and positions taken by surrounding communities.

Recommendation: Using Stoneybrook; as the model, I would recommend the establishment of priorities that design building in and and up with lower numbers to

ensure the increases reflect the characteristics of that community! If you reflect on ridership data the emphasis on transit use would appear to be service to the thousands as opposed to adding 50-100 people and getting 20 people which is 3x ridership data from 2016 I.B.I and 2x census of 2016.

The conflict with neighbourhoods lies in the fact Ali Soufan of York Development is quoted in Free Press " Our plans will continue whether BRT is there or not and John Fleming during Investing in Canada Infrastructure debate also indicated outward growth would continue even without rapid transit!

In closing please consider favouring less intensive decisions to these neighbourhoods given the overall processes on far larger numbers!

Bill Brock