

From: Catherine Traill

Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 2:12 PM

To: van Holst, Michael <mvanholst@london.ca>; Lewis, Shawn <slewis@london.ca>; Salih, Mo Mohamed <msalih@london.ca>; Helmer, Jesse <jhelmer@london.ca>; Squire, Phil <psquire@london.ca>; Morgan, Josh <joshmorgan@london.ca>; Lehman, Steve <slehman@london.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>; Turner, Stephen <sturner@london.ca>; Pelosa, Elizabeth <epelosa@london.ca>; Kayabaga, Arielle <akayabaga@london.ca>; Hillier, Steven <shillier@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; Cassidy, Maureen <mcassidy@london.ca>

Cc: Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] 307 Fanshawe Park Road East

Dear Councillors,

I am a fairly new resident to North London. I attended Western University, moved away for a job, and moved back with my young family (I have children aged 1 and 3) when we wanted to start a family. We chose this area precisely because we wanted to live in a slightly older neighbourhood with mature trees. It's a defining feature of London.

I am really disheartened by what I perceive as a lack of consideration by the developer for the existing community in Old Stoneybrook with respect to the 307 development.

I fully support development at this site. I know affordable housing is a real challenge in London. I am not even particularly concerned about the density at this location. The proposed 42 units is fine.

I am, however, extremely concerned about what comes with those 42 units. The size of the parking lot on this development is too large! This is a problem for several reasons:

- So many trees will need to be cut down in a tree protection zone. I do not understand the purpose of a tree protection zone if the trees aren't actually protected. New trees take such a long time to come to maturity. Trees capture water run-on, absorb carbon, provide shade, and they provide privacy for the adjacent neighbours.
- There is no space for adequate buffering with the adjacent neighbours. This necessitates cutting down border trees, and given the high differences between the buildings, there is not even canopy for neighbours to have reasonable privacy in their own back yard. The development does not respect the by-law specified set-backs, which are there for good reason.
- The snow storage plan is non-sensical. As I understand it, it works only if the parking lot is empty, which is never going to happen (and if it is empty, why did we build such a big parking lot in the first place?). So where does the snow go, and what are the consequences on adjacent neighbours?
- I am also concerned at the lack of green space and amenities in the property. I just cannot conceive of replacing all this grass and tree space with a massive asphalt parking lot given the imminent danger of climate change.

There are two other issues that merit attention. I am concerned about traffic at the intersection, since u-turns are hazardous on Fanshawe Park Road. If you drive this road regularly, you know the going speed is much closer to 80 km/hour than the posted 60. I also do not fully understand the catch basins/swales around the property, but I want to note that I am very concerned about the potential for mosquito growth.

Despite this, I'd like to see a progressive solution here. It is my understanding that parking lots are reduced from the specified allotment all the time. Why not a 1-1 ratio? 42 units and 42 car spots? Or, why not put the parking lot underground as per the UDPRP suggestion? There has to be a way to reduce the footprint of the lot.

Reducing the parking lot and/or reducing the density allows for what I think is a no-brainer compromise:

- retain more trees
- maintain more privacy for neighbours - including light buffering and sound buffering
- provide more useful green space, including moving the swales further away from the adjacent properties
- allow for a different snow storage solution

I reject the notion that these are considerations best left for the site plan stage. This proposal has felt rushed from UDPRP back to PEC for the second time and now back to City Council. We should not have to take it as a matter of faith that our objections will be met at the site planning stage, when it seems fairly clear that the developer does not want to meet them now. If they do not want to make changes now, there is no reason to think they will make them later.

I do not think that the developer should get precedence over community residents that are already here. I believe we have shown our willingness to accept the development in modified terms, so I would like to see the developer make some concessions so that everyone is happy. In some situations, this is not possible - **but the compromise seems so very obvious here!** Keep the trees and increase the buffering and privacy between the development and the neighbours, and most of the objections disappear.

Thank you for your time,
Kate Traill
19 Camden Road