

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Removing References to 1989 Official Plan from Zoning By-law Z.-1

- Councillor Cassidy: Are there any technical questions from the committee? Okay, then I see in committee room five that Mr. Wallace is at the microphone so I'll go to you, sir.
- Mike Wallace, Executive Director, London Development Institute: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of committee, Mr. Mayor. First of all let me say it's Mike Wallace from LDI and our office is at 562 Wellington Road here just up the street, suite 203. Let me start out with a number of thank you's - first of all I want to thank you for postponing the last public meeting until today so that it gave me an opportunity to meet with our planners and our lawyer, and talk about what was actually happening in this report. I want to also thank staff who, immediately after the last public meeting, contacted us about getting together and having a chat about what was actually involved in this report that had come forward in August. And finally, in terms of thank you's, I wanted to thank you for incorporating the minor suggestions that we came up with as an industry (from LDI) to improve the report. The final two comments I'll make are simple. We do really appreciate the communication that we had. I think, fundamentally, what happened was that the report...like this was a technical report as staff would tell you, it's making technical changes...and the report in front of it had other issues involved in it. I think, in part, to try to make sure that the committee members understood what was surrounding these changes in terms of where we were with the London Plan and so on. And so some of the comments were probably open to interpretation in the report, and the actual thing, the piece that staff were asking you to approve we really didn't have any issue with; we just had some wording changes. The final thing I want to say is that, related to what Mr. Macbeth had just said, I think the most feedback that I got from our members at LDI was that 'is this not, like, premature'? Could we not have done this all together when we do the Rethink, the zoning process? It makes them nervous that maybe they're taking little bits and pieces in coming forward, and I assured them that's not really the case here, and actually they don't disagree that it provides more flexibility with these changes, and we actually agree with staff on that. It's just that they felt that, you know, we've been working on this, we started the work before the Covid issue on the Rethink Zoning, and that possibly it could have all the been wrapped in together instead of what they consider a one off. But other than that, we want to thank you very much for holding this meeting, and for postponing the last one to this one so we had a chance to review it. Thank you to staff for meeting with us, and again thank you for implementing the very minor changes that we recommended you implement, and I'm happy to answer any questions if you have any.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Wallace. In committee room five, is there anybody else that wants to address the committee? Awesome. If they could come forward and state their name, and they have five minutes.
- Jennifer Hewitt: Hi, my name is Jennifer Hewitt and I live at 1857 Fanshawe Park Road. Just a few things – number one, I do not support these changes and oppose them as they affect our property rights. Number two, I did not receive sufficient notice of these changes, especially during Covid times. We received nothing in the mail even though three specific zoning terminology changes affect our property rights and our neighbours' property rights, specifically section 5.1, section 47.1 and section 48.1. And as far as sending a letter, there's only ten homes in these rural settlements, so it would have been really easy to send out

ten letters to us all. Number three, the purpose given for these changes is that it is going to help allow development. These changes will have the exact opposite effect. We require those references to rural settlement as it helps protect our property rights and our neighbours' property rights, as we live in an area designated rural settlement. These changes certainly do not provide clarity in our case, which is the second supposed reason for the change. Removing references to the rural settlement do not provide clarity; it makes things very unclear and cloudy. And the third reason given for the changes is to provide flexibility. How does it provide flexibility for a resident of the rural settlement when you remove reference to that rural settlement in the Zoning By-law? It doesn't make any sense. So, in conclusion: number one, again I oppose these changes, number two, I wasn't sufficiently notified, and number three, these changes are not going to help me and are affecting our zoning rights. Thank you.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you, Ms. Hewitt. Are there any others? Okay, state your name and you have 5 minutes, sir.
- Robert Hewitt: Hi, I'm Robert Hewitt, her husband. And if you look at section 47.1 where the changes are going in, where they're going to remove the reference to the rural settlement designation and references to the policies and the sections there, actually those are the things that prove our rights to have that ability to develop those lands that way. It's really...when you think of what my wife mentioned earlier about 'clarity' or that this is going to help for development or anything, there's been no explanation as to how that helps for anything in the rural settlement. Like, what is the specific issue of why this change is being done in the rural settlement commercial zone? And also, with reference to the other section where they're changing it at is...this one section, is .51, referring to R1-14, R1-15 and R1-16 zone variations, and how they're applied in rural settlement designations. Removing that from the zoning actually makes things hard. We found when the City annexed the area, we had Gregg Barrett, we dealt a lot with Gregg with our zoning, and we had the whole community come down and get certain zoning rights put into our properties. And since then, we've had nothing but trouble when we come to the City later - the residents in that area, they want to do this and they want to do that - they don't recognize any of the things that were done. They don't...if the terminology isn't there, they broaden it out in a way that you can't fit in the box anymore. For example, the London Plan talks about having, about supporting in-fill housing in the rural settlements. The old Plan talked about supporting housing, in-fill housing in the rural settlements. We currently have put forth a Plan to have some in-fill housing on our property and the City's not supporting it all. So even when it's in the London Plan, even when it's in the old Plan, we still don't win. So any changes to any references to any sort of zoning rate that we have in that area we strongly oppose, because we are not even getting the zoning rights we currently have. So currently we're zoned R-14 in rural settlement, which has specific lot sizes. The City agrees that we meet the lot sizes; the City says the London Plan supports in-fill housing; the old Plan supports in-fill housing; but of course they're not going to approve it in any way. So our whole rural settlement in our area actually has about forty acres of land that is completely undeveloped. It's right up, abuts right up to the sewers and the water lines, the Copps subdivision. We have traffic that is crazy there, but we have forty acres of land that's got maybe ten houses on it. It's totally unutilized, it's not agricultural land, it's not farms - but because it's set outside of that urban growth boundary, all these different things keep holding us back in that territory from having any sort of rights. We don't have sidewalks, we don't have high speed internet, we don't have street lights; we have an eighty mile...eighty kilometer per hour speed limit that goes past us that's dangerous, but we keep getting pigeonholed. And no one's looking at our exact experience that we have

there. I've sent emails, I've been fighting with the City I don't know how long. I had to fight to get the rights in the first place because they were actually going to zone us in the farms originally...so you're going to have a two acre farm or a four acre farm on Fanshawe Road right by Copps lumber. So, when we see changes happening again, in a very specific, small way, there's got to be a reason behind this change, and the reasons that are given for these changes don't match anything of our history and what development are they referring to they're going to make it easier for in the rural settlement. There's been no consultation with us in any way, shape or form. I'm perfectly willing to meet with Gregg Barrett, as I originally dealt with him in the first place, and the community is willing to meet with him as well. She wants to explain these things but I...we just don't understand why they would be changing –

- Councillor Cassidy: You're coming up on your five minutes, sir.
- Robert Hewitt: Okay, that's the best I can do in five minutes.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you, sir. So I do just want to mention that the Official Plan of the City of London is in transition, so the London Plan will be the new official plan of the City of London, and it has been approved by Council and by the Ministry. So I'll just go to Ms. Bunn to see if there's anybody else that would like to address this committee? No. So with no other members of the public, I will look to committee to close the public participation meeting.