

From: Claudia Clausius
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 2:43 PM
To: Lysynski, Heather <hlysynsk@London.ca>
Subject: 307 Fanshawe Park East Development Z - 9006

Dear Ms. Lysynski,

I am writing today in regards to the 307 Fanshawe Park Road East development that is being proposed by Premier Homes.

This process has been to PEC once before; PEC had concerns with the proposal and sent it to City Council, who also had questions, and asked that it be reviewed by the Urban Design Peer Review Panel who voiced almost identical concerns as the other two committees.

On Monday this proposal will once again appear before PEC, again with the endorsement of the City Planners. What I find surprising and not a little discouraging is the fact that the "new" proposal is almost identical to the earlier proposal.

What is even more alarming is that the specific concerns voiced by all three committees, but specially also the UDPRP, have not only not been addressed, but in some cases are now worse!

Please allow me to be specific:

1. One of the main issues with PEC, City Council, and UDPRP was the loss of trees and the total lack of green space. The new plan preserves FEWER trees than the original plan. Indeed, laughably, the trees that are designated to be preserved are those of neighbouring properties. There is still no landscape plan. And there is no plan to replace the mature trees that will be removed. I would like to underline the fact that the 307 lot is an officially designated TREE PRESERVATION ZONE. In view of all the global talk of preserving trees in order to keep cities healthy, it seems an obsolete and short-sighted move to remove all the mature trees on this lot for the sole purpose of installing a large parking lot.
2. The density that the City Planners are recommending reflect an R8 zoning. Premier Homes' FIRST proposal was for an R5. In view of the many violations to the two City Plans that the R5 required, the City Planner suggested the developer ask for an R8 zone. This R8 rezoning request did not go through and the proposal returned to R5. However, the density that is now being recommended **openly** refers to an R8 rezoning to justify the hyper intensification that an R5 would not permit. We are discussing an R5 rezoning and the density therefore must be commensurate with R5 and not R8.
3. The proposal also has makes no provision for sensible snow removal. It would seem that snow removal cannot be accomplished to the designated areas along the periphery if there are cars in the parking lot!
4. Several speakers on both PEC and City Council - as well as two arms-length experts speaking at UDPRP - expressed strong concerns regarding the size of the parking lot: 63 spots. In order to accommodate this many parking spots, the trees must go, there cannot be any green space for the future residents; the noise and light buffering that trees would ensure is now also destroyed. One option expressed at UDPRP was to put the parking underground. This would solve many problems: save the trees, provide more green space, create set backs that reflect the By-Laws. The developer has refused to consider the underground parking option.
5. The set backs are still notably less than those required by the By-Laws. The very narrow set backs currently in place push the buildings close to the neighbours, invading their privacy, and making noise and light pollution inevitable. In fact, one of the changes in the current proposal is to replace a wall of valance with full

height windows! This only exacerbates the loss of privacy. This is neither fair nor respectful.

We have said from the start that we are keen to see this empty lot developed. We have been active in making suggestions; we have agreed to the footprint of the buildings; we have met with the City Planners on numerous occasions and been assured that we are being 'heard.' Indeed, some of the red flags we alerted people to regarding drainage problems have now also been noted by the City Planners.

It is completely bewildering - not to mention rude and a waste of everyone's time - that the proposal before us now seems to have willfully ignored the specific issues that PEC, City Council, and the UDPRP have pointed out. It is no longer just the neighbourhood association whose concerns are being ignored, but the very voices in City Hall.

I fervently request that this version of the proposal be denied and that Premier Homes be asked to resubmit plans that address the specific problems that have already been noted.

With sincere respect,

C. Clausius

Dr. Claudia Clausius
Associate Professor
Department of English, French, and Writing
Coordinator: Foundations/King's Scholar
King's University College at Western University
<https://www.kings.uwo.ca/academics/english/people/dr-claudia-clausius/>