

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 3557 Colonel Talbot Road (Z-9003)

- Councillor Cassidy: Any technical questions? Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Yes, just really quickly – on the concept plan it shows the delineation on 3.2, the requested amendment shows the lands to be zoned open space OS-4. those are rather rectangular lines for typically what's used to delineate a natural hazard. So is that rectilinear delineation one that's supported by UTRCA?
- Councillor Cassidy: Ms. Vivian.
- Melanie Vivian, Site Development Planner, Development Services: Through you, Madam Chair - through the rezoning process, the UTRCA was involved with this quite closely, and I can get James MacKay to speak more directly on how that line came to be, but essentially it was almost the limit of that flood line. And, James, please correct me if I'm wrong on that one, but UTRCA has agreed to that OS-4 special provision zone boundary line along with that development limit.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you. As Mr. MacKay chimes in here, it's just...if it's supposed to be a flood limit, water tends to follow a little bit more of a curvilinear pattern rather than straight lines, so that's the only thing that concerns me with this, is that it might not actually accurately reflect what that potential flood limit might be.
- James MacKay, Ecologist, Development Services: Through you, Madam Chair - to address that issue, probably the UTRCA is best to answer it since they worked on that flood plain issue. But I can speak to the fact that it is a cut-and-fill procedure here, so those rectangular lines will represent what the flood plain is in that area based on the works that will be required to address that issue. So it should be satisfactory, and the UTRCA was on board with this overall layout and what's happened here.
- Councillor Turner: That makes sense, thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you, Councillor. Any other technical questions, or did you have something to add, Mr. MacKay?
- James MacKay: Through you, Madam Chair – no, that's great, thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. I'm not seeing any other technical questions, so are the applicants present and would they like to address the committee? Please state your name and you have five minutes.
- Matt Campbell, Senior Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Thank you very much and good afternoon, Madam Chair, committee members. My name is Matt Campbell, I'm here with Zelinka Priamo. We have the whole crew here with us today; so myself, I'm the planner on the file from the private consultants side; we have Farhad Noory from Royal Premier Homes; we have development engineering; and Mike and Carolyn, the landscape architects that worked on this file. So everyone's here to answer any questions that may come up. Just to back up a little bit - there's been quite a lot of history with this file. We started off on this project way back in 2018. The original proposal has changed quite a bit as a result of the flood lines that were set out as part of the Dingman Creek

environmental assessment, so there were some issues with the original plan. As James mentioned, there is a cut-fill analysis that was done that has been accepted by the conservation authority, and to Councillor Turner's comment - that's why we have that kind of odd angle in there. You're absolutely right - that's not representative of a natural flood line; that is an engineered solution to this problem here, so that's exactly why you see that. So the proposal is twenty-one townhouse units arranged perpendicular to Colonel Talbot Road. There are some improvements to Colonel Talbot Road that are going to be required, and we have submitted for site plan approval right now, and we're working through a lot of the technical issues. We worked very well with staff on this application to come to the zone that we're all satisfied with. I understand that there are a number of concerns from the public; we've done our best to address those right off the bat. I'm happy to answer any questions that may arise at this meeting and again, as I mentioned, we have everyone from our development team here that may be able to answer any questions. A couple of things I would like to point out: when we're looking at the zoning for this site, the density kind of jumps out a little bit as fifty one units per hectare, and there's been some commentary from the public to that effect. I just want to point out that that number is a little bit misleading, just because of the zone boundaries that we're working with on this site. The density is taken by the zone - the area that is zoned - and not the property. So the density is actually numerically a little bit higher than you would normally expect on this site, but it's nothing to cause anyone any sort of alarm, it's just the results of where these zone lines are lying. Just another item - there was some comments about stormwater management. We are proposing what's called a 'bioswale' on this site, so stormwater that's coming off of the driveway and parking area would flow to the rear of the site and enter what's called the bioswale - that is a depressed area that has some vegetation coming up into it, so that provides some quality and quantity control for the water before it goes into the Dingman Creek sub-watershed. So I think that's a good summary of what we're dealing with here in front of us today. Again, my name's Matt Campbell with Zelinka Priamo. If anyone has any questions, again we have everyone from the development team here to answer any questions that may come up. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Now I understand there are members of the public in committee room number five that may wish to address the committee. So I'll go to committee room number five, and if you could come to the microphone and state your name, you will have five minutes to address the committee.
- Ian Campbell: Hello, my name is Ian Campbell. I'm at 3637 Colonel Talbot Road, the property directly south of the property we're looking at today. I had actually sent some information into Melanie Vivian on March 29th; I'm not sure if that's made its way into the committee's hands or not, I know that was in the middle of a lot of commotion. So I just wanted to address that email that I sent with a number of items on it. Three items that are of specific concern both to me and I think to some other folks that are here in the room as well. The first one, understanding that there is a fair slope on that land from north to south moving down into the creek...I couldn't hear, Matt, what you were saying with regard to how you're going to be managing some of the water that hits impervious surfaces, but as it goes down to the creek it actually passes over about twenty meters of my property. So all well and good, but the plan is that it's going to go off your property into the 'OR' whatever it was, I don't know, OR-4 zone. But then from the OR-4 zone, it then has to pass another twenty feet across my property to actually get to the creek, and that is of some concern to me. The second item is that I don't believe anybody has really contemplated any kind of elevation to take decks into account. If you put decks on the backs of the North

properties, those decks, which I presume would be at least four feet in width, would literally look down on the properties that are directly north of this property. There's a number of residents here who actually own houses that actually back up to this property, and I think certainly some kind of privacy or some kind of a setback to make sure that people sitting on their decks are not staring into peoples' pools or bedrooms or living rooms is something that everyone should have some level of concern about. Third item - you talked a little bit about 'the math isn't really right' - I have to disagree with that. The math isn't right simply because you have a setback because you have the OR zone, the flood zone...that doesn't mean you can just sort of take that out of the math equation and say the math isn't right. When you look at the by-laws or the City Plan that was not put together by me, it was put together by your predecessors putting together best practices for the City of London and development – the zone as it currently stands, which is an R5-6, goes all the way from twenty five units all the way to sixty units, which is a big window. But the nice thing is that your predecessors put some language in there - if you have twenty five units, that is specifically for areas adjoining or adjacent to low density areas, which is what this is - twenty five. When you go to the other stream, sixty one - that is specifically for inner city areas and locations near major activity centers, which this is not. So now you've gone from twenty five to sixty one – you would imagine that this proposal is maybe twenty five or twenty seven or twenty eight? No, it's at fifty one, which is all the way to the other end of the scale which is in and around the inner city areas and locations near major activity centers, which this development is not. So frankly I am shocked this committee is recommending an approval of this application.

- Councillor Cassidy: Are there other members of the public in committee room five? Please state your name, sir, and you have five minutes.
- Ibrahim Semhat: My name is Ibrahim Semhat, I'm living at 6961 Clayton Walk just north of the property, and I wanted to say that what Ian mentioned represents a bunch of us here in the room that you can't probably see on the camera. So maybe we can raise our hands and agree on that, but there's a bunch of us here, so I just wanted to make that known. Thank you.
- Councilor Cassidy: Thank you, sir. And just so the community knows, we have received emails and correspondence from members of the community on this file. I'll just check one last time with the clerk to see if there are other members of the public who would like to comment? Okay great, come to the microphone, state your name, and you have five minutes.
- Heidi Smith: Hi, I'm Heidi Smith and I am at 3600 Isaac Court, so my property borders on the West side; this is on the East side of my property. We've had quite a lot of rain lately and what my husband and I have noticed is the water that runs along the swale on the back of our property and stays away from the cedar hedge – about a forty or fifty year old cedar hedge that borders between the back of our property and the property being developed. And we don't...we're not experts, but we were concerned about looking at the diagram, the snow kind of looks like it's being piled right up at the end of their driveway against the cedar hedge and how that was going to affect that hedge and whether it would survive or whether it would drown from the melting snow and water flow there. That was a big concern of ours. It's about...I don't know how high it is, but without the cedar hedge we have absolutely no privacy between the back of our property and the property being developed. So I just wanted to express our concerns; were not here with a group and I'm not familiar with the people in room four – hello.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you, Ms. Smith. Anyone else in committee room four? I'm not seeing any speakers from the public coming forward, so I will go to the committee to close the public participation meeting.