

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 307 Fanshawe Park Road East (SPA20-029)

- Councillor Turner: Thank you Ms. Sundercock. So I will look to the Committee for any questions of a technical nature. Ok, seeing none at this point, I will go to a representative of the applicant. I'm not sure which Committee Room we are looking to, perhaps Committee Room 1 I think. If you'd like to speak you have 5 minutes.

- Dave Hannam, Planning Consultant for Royal Premier Homes. Also speaking as part of our delegation is Mike Leonard who is the principal Landscape Architect for Leonard and Associates and also Kevin Moniz, principal Engineer with Strik Baldinelli Moniz, the majority of the time will be taken up by Mike talking about tree preservation and then Kevin will speak at the end with regards to the stormwater management. Obviously there is a bit to go through within five minutes so hopefully there is a little bit of flexibility in terms of timing while people come up and down. As you know, we provided, as part of the agenda package, as part of the agenda package, we provided some graphics that the delegates may be refer to on pages 201 to 203 of the agenda. In terms of the SPA, we acknowledge that this is a collaborative process and there are some refinements to make as we move forward to making our third submission. We hope that all parties that you hear from tonight will acknowledge that the applicant has been willing to work with and meet and listen to the comments raised by staff, by the Urban Design Peer Review Panel and particularly the local residents and we'll continue to do so as well. So, I'll hand it over to Mike who will talk about tree preservation.

- Mike Leonard, Leonard and Associates: Thank you and good evening. Being Irish Catholic three minutes usually doesn't even get me past hello, I'll try for better tonight. Once again an interesting file so to speak quickly, our guiding principles, not all trades are, are created equal, both within species and across species. They're like us, they are composed of an awful lot of water and an awful lot of actively divided tissues, like us they don't live forever. From time to time in fact they tend to develop characteristics and they can fall into the category of hazard trees and we have several on this site. Just a partial correction, in one of the reports before you from staff there was a figure cited that four trees are being kept, that's not the case. Of the forty-seven trees within the client's site we're keeping, we're keeping sixty percent of those and, of course, consistent with City site plan guidelines, adding twenty new ones. The matter at hand that I will dwell on in my remaining time, there were six trees of concern to the residents, the staff and, I'm sure, the Councillors. Of those six trees of concern we're keeping four of them, removing one of them and the fifth tree is still subject to a decision; the reason for that being when myself and our consulting Arborist who peer reviews all of our work disagree we usually bring in a third party, another consulting Arborist to cast the deciding vote. Very briefly, you will see, I think, in your graphics package the tree retention plan. There is a Sugar Maple, nice large sized Sugar Maple on a neighbouring property. We will be specifying a program of best practices and committed to protecting that tree. Further to the south and these are both on the east side of the property, there is a large Silver Maple, tree number fourteen in the old less politically correct age we used to call those widow makers. This tree is a hazard in our view and in the view of our consulting Arborist; however, the owner that our client shares ownership with does want to retain that tree. Consequently by law we're, we're bound to do that. I mean it is possible to litigate because of its hazards but our client has decided not to. We'll be accepting some risk, and in fact, I will say great risk. (*Councillor Turner: about thirty seconds left.*) There is two beautiful burls on the site, one on

the city road allowance, a beautiful one at the south end of the site, the special drainage techniques will be used and the only tree definitely for removal is a huge large old Silver Maple that has to be one hundred years old that met its best date decades ago, and actually has a huge limb extending fully over the neighboring property to the south that is an absolute catastrophe that is just waiting to happen; *(Councillor Turner: so that's about five minutes there; how much, we've got one more person speak, about how long are you speaking sir?)*

- Kevin Moniz, Strik Baldinelli Moniz: I should be able to wrap this up in about thirty seconds I hope; *(Councillor Turner: That would be wonderful. Thank you.)*; Thank you Committee. I'm Kevin Moniz of Strik Baldinelli Moniz, the Site Servicing Engineer and Grading Engineer and Stormwater Manager Engineer for this project. Speaking specifically about the concerns related to stormwater management and snow storage as it relates, I think, to drainage and stormwater management. Firstly, stormwater management, I'll second Meg's comments there that and thank you Meg, we are currently meeting all of the City requirements for stormwater management, no it's not accepted yet because site plan approval is not accepted yet. We've received second submission SPA comments and we're down to two minor clarification items which we will be addressing with our third submission so we are conforming to City requirements on stormwater management and regarding the snow storage there are two areas on both the east and west sides of the property designated for snow storage. On the site plan there was concerns that runoff may melt and flood neighboring properties. The snow storage area on the west side of the property is located on top of a six inch deep conveyance swale with the intention of containing that drainage and directing it to a catch basin on property for stormwater management quantity controls. The area on the east was noted that snow storage is not on a surface swale and although that is correct it has about a five percent slope inwards towards our site onto the parking lot where again, so it will drain onto the parking, our internal parking surface and again to catch basins and to our stormwater management quantity and quality controls. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you Mr Moniz. I look to the committee for any questions of the applicants of a technical nature. Seeing none at this time so I will go to the community. There are members I believe in Committee Rooms five and one potentially right now. I'll start with Committee Room five. Just as a as a parameters for public participation we limit comments to five minutes. I will try to give you a one minute warning as you approach the five minutes edge there. Also a reminder that this is for comments specific to the site plan so the zoning itself has been approved and has moved forward so this is, this is, really if you can scope your comments specifically to that the site and the site plan that would be very helpful and then that would help us in providing directions to the Site Plan Approval Authority. So, also, as you come forward if you can give your name and address for the Committee and, and we'll go with that so I look to Committee Room five. I have a gentleman standing right in front of the camera ready to go. So over to you sir.

- Michael Crawford, Camden Place: *(Councillor Turner: We'll try that again, I guess. When you are ready Mr. Crawford, I don't hear any feedback at this point so you might be good.)*; Can you hear me now? *(Councillor Turner: Yes.)* Mr chair, your honor and Councillors thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. We have sequenced our presentations together to save some time and you can see the slides starting in your package on page 204. I'm going to be talking a little bit about the historical perspective just to remind you that the community is indeed very supportive of infill development and the opportunity to intensify particularly with regard to improving diversity and aging in place and, to this end, we were pleased when Council approved rezoning with

an amendment and the amendment was a critical consideration because the intensity proposed was extreme for the size and shape of the lot. There are some really difficult constraints not the least of which is that eighty-three percent of the perimeter of this property are embedded in R-1 single resident dwelling only seventeen percent on Fanshawe and what, what Council, City Council, requested was that the Planning Approval Authority work hard to preserve trees and hedges and privacy buffer essentially for the residents and in addition to send the plan to a UDPRP again for analysis. When this work came under debate in City Council, Councillor Turner, thank you very much, asked for clarification and asked if Planning staff would read the recommendation as a directive or as, as directive in nature, considerative of and the response from Paul Yeoman, Mr. Paul Yeoman, who's the Director of Development Services was that it would be considered as a requirement of Council. In further of clarification, Councillor Turner queried the parking lot maximum is the applicant compelled to use fifty-three parking spots and again Mr Yeoman responded that it was to, they were merely establishing maximum. In other words, to quote again it was a cap on the number of spaces. So on page 210 of your document there is a of picture of the revised site plan that sort of illustrates what the complexity of the situation is because the site plan has changed in a fundamental way in so far as a new storage shed has been added and a central amenity space has been added to what was already a very packed configuration and what this means is that it's hard to accommodate the buildings, the mass and form of which we approve, the size of the parking lot, fifty-three, which is really large and the Tree Preservation Plan, so basically something has to give. One of the things that has given in the first iteration of the plan submitted as part of this post City Council amendment was all the trees were being removed, nothing had changed. That's beginning to improve and we're grateful to Meg Sundercock for insisting on preservation of trees but another thing that has changed is that the snow storage space has been diminished and divided in two and one of them sits on top of an area that has no swale so for us the big problem is that there are these extras being added that occupy a footprint that is denigrating or degrading the capacity for adequate snow storage and also what we, what we consider to be appropriate, some tree preservation. So this, this involves the new storage shed, the central amenity area and the tree preservation. Let me just sort of encapsulate the issue here, it's been improved to a preservation of seventeen from fifteen trees originally. The majority of these are on neighbor's property okay, so the numbers sound impressive but really they're saying we're not going to damage neighbour's trees (*Councillor Turner: About a minute left.*) but in order to sort of fit all of the stuff in there have been issues with regarding, regarding encroachments so the setbacks not respecting the front building setback not respected with regard to the storage shed which I infer from comments just made may have been taken into account in previous issue with the zoning amendment and I'm going to stop there and hand over to the next speaker. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you. We'll take your name and address for the committee. Welcome.

- Claudia Clausius, 21 Camden Place: I think it's become clear that the trees are the issue about this development and it's obvious why. Privacy will be enhanced if the trees are preserved, invasive lighting will be mitigated, the danger of flooding will be significantly reduced; we don't want another wetter incident and there is an added bonus, the quality of life for the future residents of the development will be enhanced; they, too, will have the benefit from the privacy, coolness and fresher air that the trees will offer. We are very worried now with all the talk about which trees are suitable to save and which not. City Council's resolution regarding the Tree Preservation Plan does not specifically stipulate what kind of trees ought to be saved, in fact, we already have a caution

in the City's landscape comments that the developer's demolition of the old house did not respect trees or their roots. It's clear then that the trees are in danger of being destroyed if we do not put specific constraints in place. I would also like to challenge the invasive tree argument for the removal of trees such as, and I'm just taking this as an example, the Norway Maple. The Norway Maple was introduced in 1756; this is from Reforest London so it predates Confederation. "The trees were specifically selected by London and elsewhere because they are fast growing, provide good shade and survive well in the harsh city environments." This site is right beside Fanshawe Park Road so it's a very suitable tree for the site. For the urban resilience Norway Maples are also London's most popular boulevard and park tree. Other examples of invasive species are Spruce, Scotch Pine, Silver Birch, Weeping Willow, many of which people buy from nurseries. As a comic aside, tomatoes and garlic are also an invasive species. More seriously, fifty-two percent of London trees are native, forty-eight percent are invasive and no one would argue that we would want to cut down half of the London trees. London's urban forest affects model, otherwise known as UFOR, is an exhaustive report demonstrating how also invasive trees are critical to London's air quality, its carbon saturation and its water absorption. I'm going to quote from page two of the UFOR report "Management of the urban forest must establish green infrastructure as a primary step in urban design and development standards." So Council's requirement that the trees be preserved directly reflects this Policy. Here are statistics from the UFOR report with regard to the Norway Maple and again, I'm just taking this as an example, in a comparison of all London tree species the total structural value of Norway Maple is nine percent second only to the Silver Maple at twelve percent. Annual carbon storage of Northern Norway Maple is 7.8, second only to Sugar Maple at eight percent, another tree the developer wishes to cut down. Now here is a sobering statistic, a full one quarter of all carbon sequestration in London is accounted for by four species of large shade trees, Norway Maple is second on that list and perhaps more importantly Norway Maples are celebrated for soaking up excess amounts of water and in the case here of a very large parking lot, excess water and snow melt will be absorbed by these trees. The current plan preserves only three trees just within the sites boundary, the so called preserved trees belong to the neighbors, ten trees are on the neighbor's property (*Councillor Turner: Just about a minute.*) on this one tree and there are three trees that are shared. In short, Council's tree preservation resolution is not reflected in the current plan. I would just like to mention, very briefly, privacy and buffering. There's the plan, development uses eighteen foot poles with a maximum brightness of twilight, the fence around the property is seven feet high so there will be no proper darkness on and surrounding this site, not for the neighbours and not for the future residents. Twilight is not darkness and public health officials frequently discuss the importance of circadian rhythms and sleeping patterns as necessary for good health. Luckily there are many modern light options, waist high pole lights with LED lighting would be safe and only cast light where it is needed and not shine into people's residences. Thank you for your attention.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you. So I would look to see if and we do and now in Committee Room one if this is a continuation it seems that everybody is very well timed and so I might dispense with giving you the one minute warning so I don't interrupt you but I will flag it at five minutes. Welcome. Please state your name for the Committee and address and I will start your five minutes. Thank you.

- Deborah Beverley, 25 Camden Place: I'd like to begin my portion just by saying thank you very much for allowing us to speak and for the open dialogue, both with the City and the developer and all the people working on this development site. I want to begin by just talking about some of the

inconsistencies and changes that have repeatedly been occurring that make it very difficult to debate - let alone consider approving - this plan. Starting with something that was already addressed earlier tonight, which we are grateful to hear about but is still concerning that it had to come to light in this way, and that is the original setback for Building 'A', which was four point nine meters. It was supposed to have been six meters but was approved for four point nine during a re-zoning phase, and I promise I'm not discussing re-zoning. The issue though was that the building that was submitted for site plan actually had an encroachment - not at the main level where it did adhere to the four point nine meters, but at subsequent levels of the building. It is concerning to watch the City and/or residents having to point these things out as opposed to them just being adhered to. It may be an oversight, and we appreciate there's lots of details, but it's concerning to us to have to notice these things. The same building - Building 'A', which fronts on Fanshawe Street - is very close to the Western property line of the neighbours that surround it, and the original submission during zoning - the October 1st, 2019 minutes - the submission that was considered for zoning showed transom windows at the three and a half story level, and this would have protected privacy for the residents on the Western side - something that they deserve to have. The submission that's now before you with the site plan actually shows full size windows, and these rooms that the full size windows exist on at this level are living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens. The rooms are going to be very frequently occupied and therefore afford no privacy for the residents on the Western edge who might want to enjoy their backyards in the summertime. Continuing on the theme of privacy and another inconsistency, the plan...there is a fence that runs along the West or the Easterly edge of the property from Fanshawe, and it goes across two properties on the Southern edge. That's shown in the City submission documents on the website, but when you look for that same board-on-board privacy fence in your submission - I believe it's in your agenda package - it appears that it goes all the way around the property, so we're just wondering, which is it? And we urge you and ask you to mandate that it be the board-on-board property fence around the entire circumference of the development. We talked a little bit about the snow storage and the lack of swale, so it sounds like that's already open for me to discuss. Snow storage, if that's to remain on-site in these two small spaces where it has gone from, previously, a twenty-two foot by thirteen foot area space to, now, a small space on the inside of the driveway, the incoming driveway of the property and on the Westerly edge of the property right by the amenity space - this is very, very small. We're concerned that meters high of snow, or anything like this past snowstorm winter - it's going to be excessive. Even with the five percent grade, there is still a slope - not just into the parking lot as we've been told, but there's also one going down into the neighbours' Easterly side. Water is going to run off; it is going to impact and flood basements; and as much as we're grateful for assurances, assurances aren't going to help us when peoples' basements, pools, and vegetation are all damaged and there's higher insurance premiums and repairs that need to be made. If snow is to be removed, which we know is something that was actually discussed informally, we would be grateful for that to happen, we would appreciate that happening. But because of the history and the changes and the inconsistencies, we would be concerned to understand how this would be enforced. How do we ensure that future owners would be accountable for the same requirements? What are the repercussions for neighbours if it's not removed regularly? And what does a regular basis look like - snow build up for one day, five days, three weeks? Again, the same kind of issues can happen with runoff and snowmelt if we have inconsistent weather patterns, so all of these things need to be discussed, and we urge that they be very clearly detailed, outlined and mandated, and the ability to address any lack of adherence to this, that we have a very formal, strict process for addressing it and protecting the neighbourhoods. And when I say neighbourhood, we're including the residents of the site that's being developed, not just the people

surrounding. We're all going to be neighbours together and we're all looking to have a good strong community together. One other thing I wanted to point out that helps to outline why we want to be so diligent and to ask for the strictness in adherence to whatever is decided here today, and that is that earlier this week, some of the members, the developer and an arborist I believe, came out to one of our neighbour's sites to discuss this tree you've already heard about - this beautiful boundary tree that the neighbours do not want to have removed. During that discussion, the neighbour said, "I do not want to have it cut down", and I'm paraphrasing but, "I do not want to have the tree cut down, but I need to have assurance that you're going to protect the roots of this tree so that it will stay strong as it has for many, many years". The response to that, instead of, "We will do our best" or "We will ensure..." was "Whatever happens after we finish construction, we are not accountable for, and it comes down to you as a neighbor - you are liable and you may be subject to lawsuits". This was very likely not intended the way it came across, but it did sound like a scare tactic and bullying, and was not well-received or something that neighbours ought to have encountered. So again, it just makes us very fearful and nervous about strict guidance on this development and any decisions that are made. *(Councillor Turner: Great – I've given you about a minute extra there...are you pretty much done?);* I would just love to wrap up by reminding you, as my colleagues pointed out, that, you know, staff have been echoing many of our concerns about the tree preservations. And we do appreciate the discussion that's been happening back and forth, and look forward to continuing to be involved because the plan does not seem to be final at this point, so we ask and urge that all parties - neighbours included - be involved in discussions until it is final.

- Councillor Turner: Thanks very much. Are there further speakers? Back to committee room 5 as someone approaches. Good day, sir, and welcome - just need your name for the committee and your five minutes starts now, sir.

- Ron McDougall, 41 Camden Place: I'm addressing the needs for a minor variance to the zoning because Building 'B' is not in compliance. The zoning granted allows only two units to be stacked; the building has three units stacked. And as it stands under the current zoning, this would mean that six of the eighteen units would need to be eliminated. *(Councillor Turner: Sir, if I could just pause you there for a second. Specific to the minor variance itself, this committee has already granted leave for the applicant to go to the Committee of Adjustment, and that's where that would be heard so we won't be able to influence that process at this point. So if your comments are of another nature please focus there, but with respect to the minor variance, that won't be the purview of this committee – just...if that helps you with your time, sir.);* Well, I'll try to be very brief but does that mean that we will have an opportunity to speak? *(Councillor Turner: Yes, sir – the Committee of Adjustment has a public process, and you're able, when those go forward...there's a notification process similar to the zoning process, as well as the ability to submit comments or present to the Committee of Adjustment.);* Well, I'll just bring up one other point then - that we have some great concerns about the sewage line that is proposed that would empty into Camden Place. This is a very, very old line and it could very easily be overwhelmed if the project finishes with considerably more occupants than they projected. We feel the sewage lines must be directed to Fanshawe Park Road, and this should be done at the time of construction - not when an existing line fails. I know that this is still under study, but I would just like to make the point that we consider it a serious issue that has to be...it just...an old line like that cannot withstand, and the hundred and one occupants is, I think, somewhat lighter than what might end up in this property. That's all I have to say, thank you very much.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you, Mr. McDougall. I'll look for any further comments. Committee room 5 - we have another. Welcome, sir - don't worry, the sanitization process does not encroach into your time.

- Rick Giroux: I and my wife are the property owners of 1269 Hastings Drive, backing onto the subject property of 307 (Fanshawe). The original concern was my apprehension about the applicant electing to pursue removal of the hedges at the back of our property, replacing them with six-foot-high wooden fences. We've now been informed, after meeting with the applicant a few days ago, that the hedges will be retained and, after completion of the project, lightly trimmed to promote growth along the sides of the hedges. This eliminates my concern relative to hedge removal but does not address the East/West parking lot that will be adjacent to the backyard of 1269 Hastings or 1265 Hastings - my neighbour to the North - and about ten feet of the Northeast corner of my lot. Based on the latest site and landscape plan, the area in question will include a common area, the snow storage area, and a parking lot for approximately seventeen cars and trucks. The ten-foot section of the back of my yard is the location of a pergola which we use to relax in the evenings and entertain family and friends. Please envision a daily traffic of vehicles entering and exiting the parking lot, the glare of headlights, the slamming of car doors, the potential of noise emanating from the common area, and the backup signal of trucks pushing snow, notwithstanding the possible moisture problems with the snow storage area. Even with retention of hedges, this section is somewhat thin at the lower level, and it's my belief that the benefit of the hedges should be supplemented by a fence along the parking lot area which is structured to provide both light and noise abatement characteristics. I urge you to take this into consideration as it will retain the shelter and integrity of my backyard and negate the effects of backing onto a parking lot. Thank you for the opportunity to address you.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you, Mr. Giroux. I'll look for further speakers. We'll go to committee room one – welcome, sir.

- Piotr Nowakowski, 1273 Hastings Drive: Hello, good evening. Thank you for allowing me to speak. (*Councillor Turner: Mr. Nowakowski, could you speak a little bit louder? It's a little quiet, maybe a step forward or two. Wonderful, thank you.*); I live at 1273 Hastings Drive, together with my wife and my son. I would like to bring another issue that I've been thinking about - and I addressed it at the previous meeting where we had the opportunity to speak - and that is safety of Fanshawe Park Road and safety of the future neighbours of that development. What I'm speaking about is how limited the access to that property is from Fanshawe Park Road. It's proposed that it is going to be a 'right in, right out' access. Also, the proposal mentioned that it will be allowed - or currently it is not illegal - to take a U-turn on Fanshawe and Hastings Drive, and then make a right turn into that property. Now, I've done some studies and calculations, and it appears to me that you have about four seconds time to make the U-turn, after which you accelerate fast to make sure that you don't create a hazard for the oncoming traffic, and then you have to brake immediately so you've got to slow down to access 307 Fanshawe Park Road. So, what to me seems necessary is another lane being built beside Fanshawe Park Road for those people that choose to turn, to access the property, to turn on Fanshawe and slow down and get out of the way of oncoming traffic - to slow down and then access the property. So it seems like a third lane would be necessary to build, in my opinion. And I realize this even more now, after driving from church last week on Richmond Street where I pass by 12- I believe it's 1235 Richmond Street. This is that tall apartment building that was built there, and somehow city staffers missed the necessity of having an area of the street widened there to allow for service trucks and taxis to be able to park in front of the building. I'm not sure if people here are aware of this, but right now there's construction going on to correct that

unsafe situation there, and I believe it will be the same scenario with this property where something will need to be done along Fanshawe Park Road to provide a safe access, and I would like just to make a point here, on the record, that perhaps something of that nature should be reflected on the site plan. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you, sir. And looking into the committee rooms, I'm not seeing many people moving right now...are there any further speakers on this matter? I'll make a second call – to the staff members in committee rooms, does it seem that there's anyone else that wishes to speak at this time?

- Jeannie Raycroft, Manager, Licensing and Elections: Nobody in committee room 5 wishes to speak at this time.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you very much.

- Bridgette Somers, Manager, Corporate Records: No one in committee room 1.

- Councillor Turner: Wonderful, thank you. I'm seeing no further speakers; I will take a motion to close the public participation meeting.