

From: Michael J Crawford

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 1:37 PM

To: Smith, Craig <crsmith@London.ca>

Cc: Yeoman, Paul <pyeoman@london.ca>; Tomazincic, Michael <mtomazin@London.ca>; Kotsifas, George <gkotsifa@London.ca>; Deb Beverley; Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>; Lysynski, Heather <hlysynsk@London.ca>

Subject: 307 Fanshawe E Z-9006

Dear Mr. Smith,

I am writing to register my disappointment and bewilderment regarding the decision and reason given by City Planning for the support of the development at 307 Fanshawe. It is sad to be put in the position of once again having to respond to ask minute changes to the posted plans and the recommendation of City Planning. Please ensure that my comments are registered on record.

It is clear that there were fundamental doubts regarding the fit and advisability of the proposal last May, and City Council overwhelmingly referred the application back to City Staff with a specific remit:

1. Urban Planning Peer Review Panel assessment
2. Tree Protection
3. Elevation
4. Density
5. Site Grading

With regard to the above:

1. UDPRP asked for the applicants to return with more fulsome designs, and this has not happened.
2. The Tree Protection Plan now preserves fewer trees than before (14 versus 20, and none within the exclusive jurisdiction of the developer). Re-planting and landscaping have been deferred to the Site Plan stage.
3. The elevations now demonstrate LESS privacy for the neighbour west of the main block (full sized windows all the way up despite a set-back reduction).
4. Density is acknowledged in your document normally to be a maximum of 60 units per hectare for R5, but a former application of R8 is used to justify a density of R8: in point of fact the applicant had originally applied for R5 in May, City Planning briefly advised a change to R8, but what was brought to PEC and City Council was R5. I interpret this to mean that City Planning seems set on pushing a maximum intensity without regard for the parts of the City Plan and Bylaws that would dictate greater respect for adverse consequences for neighbours. If suburban expansion has put the City in the position of having to max out intensity in infill intensification, is it fair that infill neighbours pay the cost for prior bad priorities and decisions on the part of City Planning?
5. Site grading, formerly endorsed by City Planning to slough water off to the periphery (and potentially neighbours), now seems to collect much of the water centrally for controlled release via swales to a single catch basin easement. Not addressed practically is the thorny issue of snow storage: the area proposed would only be accessible if no cars were in the parking lot. As a consequence, the only spaces left for plows to deposit snow will be at the ends of the two parking lots where stored snow will inevitably threaten neighbouring properties.

The recommendations and analysis of UDPRP did indeed accept the general mass and density of the proposal, but there were CRITICAL qualifying issues they raised that are now being ignored in the endorsement by City Planning. In the open words by one of the architects at UDPRP: "That's a lot of parking lot". Sensitivity to buffering, the lack of a landscaping plan, the poor elaboration of a tree plan, the lack of common green amenity space for future residents, and a suggestion to put parking underground have not been adequately addressed. The developer counters that amenity space meets requirements (swales qualify as usable space?), and that underground parking is too expensive to install. Landscaping etc is deferred to Site Planning phase. The City's own panel of arm's length experts seem to be siding with the Community Association, nevertheless City Planning is endorsing this contextually inappropriate and insensitive re-zoning application. If the City Plan and Bylaws were to be respected in a context-specific manner, the developer would have only two options: bury the parking, or reduce the number of parking spots and thereby reduce density. Why is City Planning not suggesting either? City Planning's support for re-zoning at 420 Fanshawe included underground parking

and generous set backs. Why is that not being pursued here where the size and shape of the lot is particularly awkward and the adverse impact on neighbours is likely to be more extreme?

In addition, I note that the plan offers no accessible housing, no electrical outlets for electric cars, no bicycle parking, and improper parking lot design (three areas impinge into the bylaw-required 3 m buffer zone, and headlights for many cars will be directed onto neighbours' properties).

Given that the neighbourhood has been explicit in its support of intensification (20 units), voiced acceptance of the footprint size of the buildings, this recommendation with its even worse acknowledgement and address of buffering is both disappointing and disturbing.

Sincerely,

Michael Crawford
21 Camden Place