

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 25, 2019 8:03 PM

**To:** van Holst, Michael <[mvanholst@london.ca](mailto:mvanholst@london.ca)>; Salih, Mo Mohamed <[msalih@london.ca](mailto:msalih@london.ca)>; Helmer, Jesse <[jhelmer@london.ca](mailto:jhelmer@london.ca)>; Squire, Phil <[psquire@london.ca](mailto:psquire@london.ca)>; Morgan, Josh <[joshmorgan@london.ca](mailto:joshmorgan@london.ca)>; Lehman, Steve <[slehman@london.ca](mailto:slehman@london.ca)>; Hopkins, Anna <[ahopkins@london.ca](mailto:ahopkins@london.ca)>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <[pvanmeerbergen@london.ca](mailto:pvanmeerbergen@london.ca)>; Turner, Stephen <[sturner@london.ca](mailto:sturner@london.ca)>; Peloza, Elizabeth <[epeloza@london.ca](mailto:epeloza@london.ca)>; Kayabaga, Arielle <[akayabaga@london.ca](mailto:akayabaga@london.ca)>; Hillier, Steven <[shillier@london.ca](mailto:shillier@london.ca)>; City of London, Mayor <[mayor@london.ca](mailto:mayor@london.ca)>; Lewis, Shawn <[slewis@london.ca](mailto:slewis@london.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] re: DEVELOPMENT of 307 Fanshawe Park Road East.

Dear City Councillors and Mr. Ed Holder, Mayor,

Before you vote Tuesday October 1<sup>st</sup> on the newest proposal regarding the development of 307 Fanshawe Park E, please know that I, and others in the neighbourhood, still have concerns about the presented plan based on the following components, and we certainly hope these concerns (itemized below) will be addressed in detail by both the developer in any new application they submit as well as sincerely taken into consideration by the city before approval at your upcoming meeting:

1. Based on submissions at a meeting mediated by the city, the developer presented a tree plan that reveals an intention to build swales around most of the lot; however, now even fewer mature trees and buffering will exist than presented at the last PEC meeting in May.
2. The "revised" proposal exhibits no changes that reflect ANY of the UDPRP recommendations including
  - a. no modification to reduce the footprint of the parking lot (ie: put it underground)
  - b. no provision of useful green amenity space for development residents
  - c. no change of parking plan to facilitate garbage pickup and ameliorate parking traffic issues
  - d. no change of building block 2 position
  - e. no provision of a full and revised tree plan and landscaping despite buffering being deemed sensitive and critical by UDPRP
3. The snow storage plan would necessitate the parking lot be empty for snow to be piled where proposed—a difficult proposition given the spaces will indeed need to be used for parking.
4. Traffic issues have not been satisfactorily addressed. The developer's consultant recommended U-turns on Fanshawe, but during rush hour, these actions could lead to seriously negative consequences as drivers get impatient. U-Turns may not be illegal, but they are also not safe in large numbers.
5. While the city (and an impartial engineering advisor) deemed the sanitary and waste water flow rates proposed to be adequate, they are based upon calculations and flow rates established at the time of construction in 1972 - 47 years ago. We in the neighbourhood still request the City for more recent assessment of viability—and given climate change and the now common occurrence of mass rainfall events, this request could not be more timely and serious.

In conclusion, City Planning seems to support the provisions for maximum density allowable by the London and Official Plans and bylaws, but conversely seems to ignore suggestions and directives in those same documents regarding buffering, parking lot design, privacy, green amenity space, accessibility, and sensitivity to adverse impacts to the property, neighbourhood, and city as a whole. At best, this seems like a lack of due diligence, and at worst, a sad instance of cherry picking to suit various ends.

Additionally—and most alarmingly—I am told that the above concerns are a matter for the Site Planning process once rezoning has been accomplished; however, this seems like a case of the “the cart before

the horse”: once rezoning (and maximum density) is permitted, all the other Site Planning issues are rendered moot, and residents must take it as an article of faith that City Planning will enforce bylaws and UDPRP recommendations---essentially addressing the main concerns in this letter at a later date. This \*may\* prove true, but residents of this neighbourhood—myself included—would rather these very legitimate urban planning concerns be met—logically and legally—at the preliminary stage before ground is broken, as opposed to later as a matter of good faith.

Sincerely,

Robert Muhlbock  
64 Robinson Lane.