

**From:** Michael J Crawford

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 25, 2019 7:31 PM

**To:** City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Developer unwilling to compromise to community, to City Council, to UDPRP

Dear Mayor Holder,

I am writing as a neighbour fated to reside beside a prospective development at 307 Fanshawe. The lot has a footprint with only 17% of its border on Fanshawe. It is long and narrow, and the remaining 83% is enclosed by single family residential homes of one third to half the proposed height. The narrowness of the lot makes its development a challenge. The community endorses development, but not the complete stripping of trees to make way for a big parking lot.

The developer wants higher density than normally approved in high density/commercial centres (60 units per hectare), and has asked for a density of 75. Ours is not a high density designated area. This equates to 42 units in stacked townhouses, and 63 parking spaces.

As a community, the parking lot is driving most other concerns - it necessitates the removal of ALL TREES from the lot, despite it being a designated tree protection zone. Council sent the application back to Staff, and also requested UDPRP input. UDPRP made preliminary points and asked for a return with more fulsome plans. This has not occurred. In the words of the UDPRP Chair "this is a lot of parking lot!" The developer is unwilling to put parking underground, and rejected a suggestion by Councillor Helmer to install only as many parking spots as there are units (42). Apparently this is a common restriction elsewhere. This too was rejected. Councillor Squire voted against the motion to approve, we suspect for this unwillingness to accommodate or modify plans. Indeed, almost all suggestion from UDPRP have been ignored, deferred, or - one concession, better building materials and elevations - degrade privacy for neighbours further. In some respects, the developer's modified plans are worse now than in the original application rejected by Council (more trees removed, less privacy for neighbours from windows in building elevations).

At risk, the privacy, noise, sound, and visual buffering of all neighbours. In addition, there is no central green amenity space for prospective residents of the proposed complex despite recommendations by UDPRP.

I am hopeful you will either reject, or at the very least limit this application.

Many thanks for your consideration and time,

Michael Crawford  
21 Camden Place