

Planning and Environment Committee

Report

The 14th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
September 21, 2020

PRESENT: Councillor M. Cassidy (Chair), J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, Mayor E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: H. Lysynski, C. Saunders and J.W. Taylor

Remote Attendance: Councillor M. van Holst; J. Adema, A. Anderson, G. Barrett, J. Bunn, S. Corman, G. Dales, L. Dent, K. Dickins, M. Feldberg, D. Hahn, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, B. Lambert, T. Macbeth, D. MacRae, L. Maitland, C. Maton, H. McNeely, B. O'Hagan, C. Parker, M. Pease, A. Riley, M. Schulthess, B. Somers, E. Skalski, M. Tomazincic, B. Warner, B. Westlake-Power and P. Yeoman

The meeting is called to order at 4:02 PM, with Councillor M. Cassidy in the Chair, Councillors Hopkins and Turner present; it being noted that the following Members were in remote attendance: Mayor E. Holder; Councillors J. Helmer and A. Kayabaga

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

That Items 2.1 and 2.3 BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2.1 Application - 1284 and 1388 Sunningdale Road West - Kent Subdivision Phase 3B - Special Provisions 39T-04510 Ph 3B

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Foxhollow North Kent Development Inc., for the subdivision of land over Part of Lot 23, Concession 5, (Geographic Township of London), City of London, County of Middlesex, situated on the south side of Sunningdale Road West, between Wonderland Road North and Hyde Park Road, and on the north side of the Heard Drain, municipally known as 1284 and 1388 Sunningdale Road West:

- a) the Special Provisions, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Foxhollow North Kent Development Inc., for the Kent Subdivision, Phase 3B (39T-04510-3B)

appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "A"
BE APPROVED;

b) the Applicant BE ADVISED that Development Finance has summarized the claims and revenues appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "B"; and,

c) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions.

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2.3 Building Division Monthly Report for July 2020

That the Building Division Monthly Report for the month of July, 2020 BE RECEIVED for information. (2020-A23)

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2.2 Application - 556 Wellington Street - HAP20-011

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, in response to the recommendation of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, dated September 10, 2020, with respect to the staff report on the Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP20-011) relating to the property located at 556 Wellington Street, the staff report dated September 21, 2020 entitled "556 Wellington Street - HAP20-011" BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 Application - 733 Wellington Street (Z-9222)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, based on the application by McIver Holdings Inc., relating to the property located at 733 Wellington Street, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R2 (R2-6) Zone and TO Residential R3 Special Provision (R3-4 ()) Zone;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated from D. Deane Cummings, Co-Chair, Piccadilly Area Neighbourhood Association, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individual indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made an oral submission regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended Zoning Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, which encourages an appropriate range and mix of uses to meet projected requirements of current and future residents;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to, the Neighbourhood Area Place Type, Our City, Our Strategy, and all other applicable London Plan policies;
- the recommended amendment permits an appropriate range of residential uses that conform to the in-force policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the Main Street Commercial Corridor designation; and,
- the recommended Zoning By-law Amendment permits development that is appropriate for the site and compatible with the surrounding land.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins
Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: A. Hopkins
Seconded by: J. Helmer

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.2 Application - 666-670 Wonderland Road North (Z-9241)

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by JFK Holdings, relating to the property located at 666-670 Wonderland Road North, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property BY AMENDING the Highway Service Commercial Special Provision/Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision (HS(3)/RSC2(17)) Zone;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individual indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made an oral submission regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020;
- the proposed amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to, the Auto-Oriented Commercial Corridor; and,
- the proposed amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Transit Village Place Type.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.3 Application - 820 Cabell Street (Z-9196)

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: E. Holder

That the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Bruce Sworik, relating to the property located at 820 Cabell Street:

- a) the application BE REFERRED to a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting; and,
- b) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to work with the applicant and to report back with a draft by-law to permit ancillary commercial space permitted on the property to a maximum gross floor area of 400 m²;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individual indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made an oral submission regarding these matters.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.4 Application - 122 Base Line Road West (OZ-9200)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Housing Development Corporation London, relating to the property located at 122 Base Line Road West:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend The London Plan by ADDING a policy to Specific Policies for the Neighbourhoods Place Type to permit a low-rise apartment building on the subject site and by ADDING the subject lands to Map 7 – Specific Policy Areas – of the London Plan;

it being noted that the amendments will come into full force and effect concurrently with Map 1 and Map 7 of the London Plan;

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with The London Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R8 (R8-3) Zone TO a Holding Residential R8 Bonus (h-5*R8-3*B(_)) Zone;

the Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to provide for a low-rise apartment building with a maximum height of 4 storeys or 13.0 metres; an increased density of up to 100 units per hectare

(61 units total); a rear yard depth minimum of 15.0 metres; an interior side yard depth minimum of 3.0 metres for building walls containing no windows to habitable rooms or 8.0 metres for building walls containing windows to habitable rooms; a parking rate of 1 space per unit; and a bicycle parking rate of 1 space per 4 units, in return for the provision of the following facilities, services and matters:

- i) provision of Affordable Housing: A mix of unit types (by number of bedrooms) and a minimum of 30% of each unit type within the development will be provided at affordable rent (at approximately 70% of Average Market Rent). An agreements shall be entered into with the Corporation of the City of London to secure those units for a minimum affordability period of 20 years; and,
- ii) design Principles: Implementation of a site development concept, to be implemented through a future development agreement, which substantially achieves design principles that include:
 - A) building footprint and spatial orientation that: serves to activate the street; is pedestrian in scale; and establishes safe, direct, and barrier-free accessible pedestrian connections throughout the Site and from the Site to the public realm;
 - B) a principle building entrance that further serves to activate the streetscape and reinforce the “front facing” built form;
 - C) a building footprint that mitigates impacts, noting an enhanced rear yard setback and enhanced interior side yard setback are identified in the Bonus Zone;
 - D) a parking area that provides for safe, direct and barrier-free accessible pedestrian connections, is suitably sized to accommodate projected demand, and is strategically located to minimize impacts on the public realm;
 - E) an outdoor amenity area that is sufficiently sized and strategically located to provide for privacy and additional buffering opportunities and plantings, and also serves to mitigate overland flows and other potential stormwater management (SWM) impacts; and,
 - F) maintain, to the greatest extent possible, on-site green infrastructure in a manner consistent with the findings of the preliminary Tree Preservation Report;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020;
- the recommended amendment conforms with the 1989 Official Plan;
- the recommended amendment conforms with the policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions, Homelessness Prevention and Housing policies, and City Design policies;
- the recommended amendment facilitates infill and intensification of an underutilized urban site and encourages an appropriate form of development. Infill and intensification supports the City’s commitment to reducing and mitigating climate change by supporting efficient use of existing urban lands and infrastructure and regeneration of existing neighbourhoods;
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of up to 61 affordable housing units that will help in addressing the growing need for affordable housing in London. The recommended amendment is in alignment with the Housing Stability Action Plan 2019-2024 and Strategic

Area of Focus 2: Create More Housing Stock; and,

- the recommended bonus zone for the subject site will provide public benefits that include affordable housing units, barrier-free and accessible design, transit-supportive development, and a quality design standard to be implemented through a subsequent public site plan application.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.5 Application - 1093 Westdel Bourne (Z-9186)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Turner

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Norquay Developments, relating to a portion of the property located at 1093 Westdel Bourne, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of a portion of the subject property FROM a Residential R1 (R1-14) Zone TO a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individual indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made an oral submission regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the proposed development is consistent with the PPS, 2020 by promoting the efficient use of land;
- the proposed development conforms with the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to permitted single detached dwelling use within the Neighbourhood Place Type;

- the proposed development conforms with the in-force policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the permitted use of single detached dwellings in the Low Density Residential designation; and,
- the recommended Zoning By-law amendment will ensure that the zoning of these lands corresponds with the zoning of five(5) partial lots within the Eagle Ridge draft approved plan of subdivision (39T-17501).

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins
Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: E. Holder
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.6 Application - 799 Southdale Road West (OZ-9188)

Moved by: A. Hopkins
Seconded by: S. Turner

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Speyside East Corporation, relating to the property located at 799 Southdale Road West:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend the Official Plan for the City of London (1989):
 - i) by changing the land use designation FROM "Low Density Residential" TO "Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential",
 - ii) as it relates to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, by changing the land use designation of 20.5.17 Appendix 1 (Official Plan Extracts) FROM "Low Density Residential" TO "Medium Density Residential";
 - iii) as it relates to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, by changing the land use designation of 20.5.3.4 - Schedule 2 (Multi-Use Pathways and Parks) FROM "Low Density Residential" TO "Medium Density Residential";
 - iv) as it relates to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, by changing the land use designation of 20.5.5 - Schedule 4 (Southwest Area Land Use Plan) FROM "Low Density Residential" TO "Medium Density Residential";

- v) as it relates to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, by changing the land use designation of Schedule 6 (Lambeth Residential Neighbourhood Land Use Designations) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;
- vi) as it relates to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, by changing the land use designation of Schedule 9 (North Lambeth Residential Neighbourhood Land Use Designations) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”; and,
- vii) as it relates to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, by changing the land use designation of Schedule 12 (North Talbot Residential Neighbourhood Land Use Designations) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend the Official Plan for the City of London (1989) to ADD a policy to Section 10.1.3 – “Policies for Specific Areas” to allow the site to develop with reduced setbacks, building heights of 6-storeys, a maximum density of 100 units per hectare, that the front lot line is deemed to be Southdale Road West to permit a 6-storey continuum-of-care facility; 5-storey apartment buildings; and townhouse units;

c) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend The London Plan to change Policy 1565_5 (List of Secondary Plans) Southwest Area Secondary Plan, Section 20.5 (Southwest Area Secondary Plan):

- i) by changing the land use designation of 20.5.17 Appendix 1 (Official Plan Extracts) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;
- ii) by changing the land use designation of 20.5.3.4 - Schedule 2 (Multi-Use Pathways and Parks) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;
- iii) by changing the land use designation of 20.5.5 - Schedule 4 (Southwest Area Land Use Plan) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;
- iv) by changing the land use designation of Schedule 6 (Lambeth Residential Neighbourhood Land Use Designations) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;
- v) by changing the land use designation of Schedule 9 (North Lambeth Residential Neighbourhood Land Use Designations) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”; and,
- vi) by changing the land use designation of Schedule 12 (North Talbot Residential Neighbourhood Land Use Designations) FROM “Low Density Residential” TO “Medium Density Residential”;

d) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "D" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan for the City of London (1989), Southwest Area Secondary Plan and The London Plan, as amended in parts a) through c) above):

i) to change the zoning of the subject property FROM an Urban Reserve (UR1) Zone and a holding Residential R4 Special Provision (h-56*h-84*R4-6(6) Zone TO a Residential R7 Special Provision (R7()*H20*D100) zone on the western portion of the lands to permit a minimum front yard setback of 0.5 metres, a minimum exterior side yard setback of 9.2 metres, a front lot line that is deemed to be Southdale Road West, and to permit Continuum-of-Care Facilities to be owned and/or

operated by a for-profit entity;

ii) to change the zoning of the subject property FROM an Urban Reserve (UR1) Zone and a holding Residential R4 Special Provision (h-56*h-84*R4-6(6) Zone TO a Residential R5 Special Provision/Residential R9 Special Provision ((R5-7())/(R9-3()) Zone on the eastern portion of the lands to permit a maximum density of 100 units per hectare, minimum front yard setback of 0.5 metres, a minimum west side yard setback of 4.8m, a minimum east side yard setback of 6.0m, a maximum building height of 17m, a maximum density of 100 units per hectare, a front lot line that is deemed to be Southdale Road West, and buildings oriented to the Southdale Road frontage; and,

iii) to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R2 Special Provision/Residential R4 Special Provision (R2-1(13)/R4-3(1) Zone TO a Residential R5 Special Provision/Residential R9 Special Provision ((R5-7())/(R9-3()) Zone on the eastern portion of the lands to permit a maximum density of 100 units per hectare, minimum front yard setback of 0.5 metres, a minimum west side yard setback of 4.8m, a minimum east side yard setback of 6.0m, a maximum building height of 17m, a maximum density of 100 units per hectare, a front lot line that is deemed to be Southdale Road West, and buildings oriented to the Southdale Road frontage.

e) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment as:

i) the changes represent technical amendments to the 1989 Official Plan and The London Plan to facilitate amendments to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, and Zoning Bylaw; and,

ii) the recommended Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment have the same effect as the proposed Official Plan amendment circulated in the Notice of Application and the Public Meeting Notice;

it being further noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated September 4, 2020 from G. Versteegh, 804 Southdale Road, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendments are consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) which direct municipalities to ensure development provides healthy, liveable and safe communities, and that provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities;
- the recommended amendments conform to the in-force policies of the (1989) Official Plan including, but not limited to, the policies of Chapter 10 which list the necessary condition(s) for approval of Policies for Specific Areas to facilitate the development of the subject lands to a Multi-family, Medium Density Residential development, supporting Southwest Area Plan policies and the recommended Multi-family Medium Density Residential designation;
- the recommended amendments conform to the in-force policies of The London Plan including, but not limited to, the Southwest Area Secondary Plan. Overall, the proposed residential uses will serve the intended function of the Neighbourhoods Place Type while providing for a manner which respects the intended form and character of the area through conformity with the Southwest Area Plan's Urban Design

Guidelines;

- the recommended amendments conform to the policies of the Southwest Area Secondary Plan (SWAP);
- the recommended amendments would provide the necessary guidance for the developer and staff, and would direct the most intense residential uses along Southdale Road West, an arterial road, with a transition to less intensive forms adjacent to the low density residential to the south. The overall height and density of this proposal would be in keeping with the proposed Multi-family, Medium Density Residential density target for these lands. This marginal increase in height and density for this development will not cause serious adverse impacts for surrounding residential land uses;
- the recommended amendments to Zoning By-law Z.-1 will conform to the (1989) Official Plan, Southwest Area Secondary Plan and The London Plan as recommended to be amended. The recommended amendments to the Zoning By-law with special provisions will provide for an appropriate development of the site; and,
- the holding provisions on the subject site are recommended to be removed as all conditions have been satisfied.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.7 Application - Demolition Request for Heritage Designated Property - 120 York Street

That it BE NOTED that the Planning and Environment Committee was unable to reach a majority decision with respect to the application by Farhi Holdings Corporation, relating to the property located at 120 York Street and pursuant to Section 19.3 of the Council Procedure By-law, the matter is hereby submitted to the Municipal Council for its disposition;

it being further pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters.

Additional Votes:

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the request to demolish the building on the heritage designated property at 120 York Street, within the Downtown Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED, and the following actions BE TAKEN:

a) the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED of Municipal Council's intention in this matter; and,

b) the applicant BE REQUIRED to obtain final Site Plan Approval for the property.

Yeas: (3): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, and E. Holder

Nays: (3): A. Hopkins, S. Turner, and A. Kayabaga

Motion Failed (3 to 3)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.8 Application - Request to Remove from the Register, Heritage Listed Property - 1455 Oxford Street East

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, that the property at 1455 Oxford Street East BE REMOVED from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga,
and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

- 3.9 Application - Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan (O-9223) and 124 Colborne Street and the Block Bounded by Hill Street, Colborne Street, South Street and Waterloo Street (Z-9224)

Moved by: J. Helmer
Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the applications by The Corporation of the City of London relating to The Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan Area and the properties located at 124 Colborne Street and the Block Bounded by Hill Street, Colborne Street, South Street, and Waterloo Street:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 by changing Section 20.6 – Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan by DELETING Section 20.6.3.3 – Bonusing Policies and DELETE and REPLACE Sections 20.6.4.1 iv) a), b), c), and d); 20.6.4.2 v) a), b), and c); 20.6.4.3.1 iii) a), b), and c); 20.6.4.3.2 iii) a), b), and c); and 20.6.4.3.3 iii) a), b), and c);
- b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend The London Plan by changing policy 1565_3 – List of Secondary Plans – Old Victoria Hospital Secondary Plan, by DELETING Section 20.6.3.3 – Bonusing Policies and DELETE and REPLACE Sections 20.6.4.1 iv) a), b), c), and d); 20.6.4.2 v) a), b), and c); 20.6.4.3.1 iii) a), b), and c); 20.6.4.3.2 iii) a), b), and c); and 20.6.4.3.3 iii) a), b), and c);
- c) the Urban Design Guidelines for the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Phase II appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "C" BE ADOPTED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 by resolution of City Council;
- d) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "D" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend section 19.2.2 of the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 by ADDING the Urban Design Guidelines for the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Phase II to the list of Council approved guideline documents;

e) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "E" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Section 20.6 (Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan) of the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 by ADDING a policy to Section 20.6.5.8 "Guideline Documents";

f) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "F" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Section 1716_ of The London Plan by ADDING the Urban Design Guidelines for the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Phase II to the list of Council approved guideline documents;

g) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "G" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Section 1565_3 of The London Plan (Old Victoria Hospital Secondary Plan), by ADDING a policy to Section 20.6.5.8 "Guideline Documents";

h) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 21, 2020 as Appendix "H" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 29, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the 1989 Official Plan, The London Plan, and the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan as amended in parts a) and b) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R3/Residential R7/Residential R9 (R3-1/R7•D150•H24/R9-7•H24) Zone and Holding Residential R7/Residential R9/Regional Facility (h-5•R-7•D150•H12/R9-3•H12/RF) Zone TO a Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h•h-5•R8-4(*)) Zone, Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h•h-5•R8-4(**)) Zone, Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h•h-5•R8-4(***)) Zone, a Holding Residential R4 Special Provision/Residential R8 Special Provision (h•h-5•R4-6(_)/R8-4(***)) Zone, and an Open Space Special Provision (OS1(*)) Zone;

i) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed Official Plan amendment as:

- i) the changes represent technical amendments to the 1989 Official Plan and The London Plan to facilitate amendments to the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan; and,
- ii) the recommended Official Plan amendments has the same effect as the proposed Official Plan amendment circulated in the Notice of Application and the Public Meeting Notice;

it being noted that no individuals spoke at the public participation meeting associated with this matter;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the PPS, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan, including but not limited

to The Four Corners, Transit-Oriented Mainstreet, Low-Rise Residential, Mid-Rise Residential, and High-Rise Residential Policy Areas; and,

- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.10 Public Participation Meeting- Not to be heard before 5:30 PM - Application - 556 Wellington Street

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: J. Helmer

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of GWL Realty Advisors, relating to the property located at 556 Wellington Street:

a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public participation meeting with respect to the application for Site Plan Approval to permit the construction of two buildings containing a total of 405 units:

- i) the impact of the heritage aspect of the neighbourhood;
- ii) the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District indicates that new buildings should respect the heritage character of West Woodfield through attention to height, built form, setback, massing, material and other architectural elements;
- iii) the proposed new development should be consistent with neighbourhood facades;
- iv) the streetscape should be preserved;
- v) the north facade should be in line with the general line of the buildings on Wolfe Street;
- vi) there is no outdoor amenity space;
- vii) a wind study was not prepared;
- viii) there is no consideration given for snow removal;

- ix) Wellington Street is closed for festivals almost every weekend in the summer and wondering where the traffic from the building would go;
- x) there is no consideration provided for deliveries;
- xi) there are no environmental considerations for the building, such as, green roofs and car charging stations;
- xii) Wolfe Street should not be widened;
- xiii) there will be a significant increase in traffic on Wolfe Street which is a narrow street;
- ix) request for a pedestrian crosswalk on Wolfe Street at Wellington Street;
- xv) the main floor be residential instead of commercial; and,
- xvi) the shadow studies show that in March and September there will be no sunlight for the neighbouring properties up to Waterloo Street; and,

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council raised the following issues with respect to the Site Plan Application to permit the construction of two buildings containing a total of 405 units:

- i) continue to work with the Applicant to amend the proposed buildings design that would best to assist in achieving appropriate transitioning between the proposal, the existing neighbourhood and Victoria Park; and,
- ii) consider potential access off of Princess Avenue and Wellington Street including narrower design;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications with respect to this matter:

- a communication dated September 6, 2020 from B. Rich, 54 Palace Street;
- a communication dated September 15, 2020 from M. A. Hodge and T. Okanski, 310 Wolfe Street;
- a communication dated September 3, 2020 from J. Petrie, 543 Dufferin Avenue;
- a communication dated September 16, 2020 from E. Kane, 24 McGill Place;
- a communication dated September 3, 2020 from G. James, 101-295 Wolfe Street;
- a communication dated September 16, 2020 from L. Harrison, by email;
- a communication dated September 16, 2020 from G. Priamo, Principal Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd; and,
- a communication dated September 17, 2020 from K. McKeating, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.11 Silverleaf Subdivision - Transportation Mobility and Safety

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: J. Helmer

That, the following actions be taken with respect to transportation mobility and safety in the Silverleaf subdivision:

a) the staff report dated September 21, 2020, entitled "Silverleaf Subdivision - Transportation Mobility and Safety" BE RECEIVED for information;

b) the delegation from R. Galizia, Silverleaf Community, with respect to road safety BE RECEIVED for information; and,

c) the communication from Councillor M. van Holst Notice of Motion to request reconsideration of Municipal Council's decision regarding the installation of sidewalks in a portion of the Silverleaf community BE RECEIVED.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 6th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 6th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on September 10, 2020:

a) on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act to construct two high-rise buildings on the property

located at 556 Wellington Street, within the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, BE REFUSED; it being noted that the concerns raised by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH), on their report dated December 11, 2019, regarding the Heritage Impact Assessment for the above-noted matter, have not been addressed to the satisfaction of the LACH;

b) on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the property at 1455 Oxford Street East BE REMOVED from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources;

c) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* seeking approval for the proposed alterations to the property located at 562 Maitland Street, within the East Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED with terms and conditions:

- all exposed wood be painted;
- the previously installed 6"x6" wood posts be finished with wood materials in the design submitted as part of the Heritage Alteration Permit application;
- the previously removed rails and spindles be conserved and re-installed; and,
- the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed;

d) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* seeking approval for the proposed alterations to the property at 91 Bruce Street, within the Wortley Village-Old South Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED with terms and conditions:

- the rear addition results in a new building height to reflect no more than a 3' increase;
- the new exterior cladding to consist of tongue-and-groove wood siding;
- the new windows on the rear addition to consist of double-hung, aluminium clad wood windows consistent with the style and proportions of the existing windows on the dwelling;
- the roof materials on the addition to consist of asphalt shingles;
- all the exposed wood be painted;
- the existing conditions of the property and dwelling be photographed for documentation purposes prior to the construction of the addition; and,
- the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed; and,

e) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* seeking approval for alterations to property at 59 Wortley Road, within the Wortley Village-Old South Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED with the following terms and conditions:

- the replacement railing on the steps be constructed of wood, with a top and bottom rail and wood spindles set between;
- all the exposed wood of the steps and railings be painted; and,
- the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed; and,

f) clauses 1.1, 3.1 to 3.3, inclusive, BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (6): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to approve part a), which reads as follows:

a) on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* to construct two high-rise buildings on the property located at 556 Wellington Street, within the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, BE REFUSED; it being noted that the concerns raised by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH), on their report dated December 11, 2019, regarding the Heritage Impact Assessment for the above-noted matter, have not been addressed to the satisfaction of the LACH;

Yeas: (5): M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, and A. Kayabaga

Nays: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 1)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:23 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 733 Wellington Street (Z-9222)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Barrett. Any technical questions for Mr. Barrett from Committee? Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair, and through you to staff, just a question around the parking, if you can explain the parking and the requirements that reading the report are exceeding the by-law requirement, I just need a little bit more clarification there.
- Gregg Barrett, Director, City Planning and City Planner: Through the Chair, in fact the parking requirement is one space per unit and there are, I believe, six spaces required in tandem at the rear.
- Councillor Cassidy: Councillor?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yeah, thank you for that. So, it does meet the parking requirements then?
- Gregg Barrett, Director, City Planning and City Planner: Yes, it is my understanding that yes, the requirement is one space per unit, there are going to be six provided.
- Councillor Cassidy: Ok. Is the applicant here? Would the applicant like to address the Committee?
- Can everyone hear me ok?
- Councillor Cassidy: Yes. If you just want to state your name and then you will have five minutes.
- Wonderful. Thank you very much. My name is Matt Campbell, I am here from Zelinka Priamo on behalf of Mclver Holdings for 733 Wellington Street. We have reviewed the staff report and the recommendation and the implementing by-law and we are very happy to see the recommendation. We have worked well with staff on this project. Like Mr. Barrett said, this is an existing situation that we are attempting to alleviate some of the operational and leasing issues associated with a seven bedroom unit. There is a reduction in the net number of bedrooms from eleven down to ten and the parking situation is existing at the rear as well. Well exceeding the three parking spaces that are required. If there are any questions regarding this I'm happy to answer them and I would encourage the Committee to approve staff's recommendation for approval. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Campbell. I will go to the committee rooms to see if there are any members of the public that would like to comment on this application. I'll call the Committee's attention to the Added Agenda. There is an added communication from Ms. Delilah Deane Cummings representing the Piccadilly Area Neighbourhood Association so I would just bring that to the Committee's attention and check one more time to see if there is any member of the public in the committee rooms who would like to address the Committee. Ok. I'm not seeing any action from the committee rooms, so I will look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 666-670 Wonderland Road North (Z-9241)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Hahn. Any technical questions for Mr. Hahn? No. So I will check to see if the applicant is here and if the applicant would like to address the Committee? Just state your name and you will have five minutes.
- Good afternoon members of Planning Committee and members of the staff and public. My name is Casey Kulchycki, I a Planner with Zelinka Priamo Limited representing JFK Holdnigs. We have reviewed the staff report and are in agreement with the recommendation. Just, I will note that some of you may recognize this property as we did a recent ZBA requesting medical/dental offices. There was a bit of a miscommunication between us and our clients on exactly the robustness of the proposed tenant and we discovered that clinic was a better use that was needed which triggered the need for this Zoning By-law Amendment so just, we had to kick the can twice on this one but we are happy to answer any questions.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. I just want to check with the Clerk, if there is a Clerk in Committee Room 4, I wonder if either the microphone or the camera could be moved because when a speaker is. Yeah. To the, yeah. Because we can't see the speaker when, based on the camera placement or something. Great. Thank you so much. Are there are any members of the public who would like to speak to this application? I'll ask one more time. In any of the committee rooms are there any members of the public who would like to speak to the Wonderland Road North application. Seeing none, I will look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 820 Cabell Street (Z-9196)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Parker. Any technical questions for Mr. Parker? Seeing none, is the applicant here? Would the applicant - ?
- Councillor van Holst: Madam Chair?
- Councillor Cassidy: I'm sorry Councillor van Holst. I did not see your virtual hand. Go ahead.
- Councillor van Holst: Thank you Madam Chair. I had a couple questions, through staff, this is a fairly large building 3,000 square meters. I wanted to ask that if that is large for an L1 or and now I'm wondering LI2.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Parker?
- Chuck Parker, Senior Planner: LI1 and LI2 zones can apply to a wide range in sizes of industrial buildings. It depends on the uses that are in them. As I said they are 17 different uses allowed in the LI1 zone, an additional 6 uses in the LI2 so the property can be small, it can be large there's a wide range, there's no minimum size on either of those zones.
- Councillor van Holst: Okay thanks. I asked that because we do have a maximum of 100 square meters which is about a 10 by 10 area for ancillary retail space. Now I'm going to ask how you arrived at the conclusion that it was 25 percent or 40 percent was too big and we're sticking with the 10 because this is a place where they've had some interest by manufacturers and in 3,000 square feet or 3,000 square meters you can build some very large things but you wouldn't be able to show them in a 10 by 10 meter room for instance it'd be a great place for building furniture; however, the show room would be completely inadequate at this new maximum.
- Councillor Cassidy: We're doing technical questions Councillor.
- Councillor van Holst: Okay then so have we in the past been able to drop the maximum for ancillary space and lift it to the say the 25 percent because of a bigger space.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Parker.
- Chuck Parker, Senior Planner: Not aware of any cases where that has occurred. Typically when we have retail outlets associated with an industrial use they're quite large. I can't think of a specific example where that has been the case where we waived the 100 square meters. That 10 by 10 meter space is actually 35 feet by 35 feet which is somewhat large depending on the industrial use you have and the goods you sell so it may be adequate for selling furniture but I can't give you a specific example of where we've allowed that to change.
- Councillor van Holst: Okay thank you Madam Chair. I'll be asking for change like that; however, that would be part of the debate so I don't know that I have further technical question. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Councillor. And just lower your virtual hand so I'll know next time when you're asking because I did miss it but I'll keep an eye now. Is the applicant here and would the applicant care to address the Committee? Go ahead sir. State your name and you'll have five minutes.

- Thank you Madam Chair and members of Council. My name is Bruce Sworik. I'm the owner of the building and have owned this building for over 30 years and it's a, it was a Heavy Industrial 1 Zone when I first purchased the building and then the City de-zoned it to an LI1. My request for an LI2, I'm happy with that. it just gets compliance. My main issue with this is, in the 30 years that I've owned those building I have had a lot of leasing issues because of the small amount of ancillary retail space that would be allowed and the 10 percent even though Mr. Parker has commented is it is a decent size room it's not when you can compare it to a hundred meters is very little out of a 3,000 square foot meter building. I would ask the Council maybe if they could just for clarification in my zoning proposal maybe if the maximum from 100 square meters was raised to I think I could live with a 300 to 400 square meters and drop the 25 to 40 percent. Again I've lost a number of large manufacturing type tenants that require 5,000 to 15,000 square feet but the ability for them to show them off to the members of the general public who are interested of the process or manufacturer of purchasing that good they just all walked away and said you know what you don't have enough space for us. So I only ask the Council to change the, I could live with dropping the 25 to 40 percent right out of it and just change the maximum from 100 square meters to say maybe 300 to 400 square meters and I could live with that and be able to, I've been suffering with some bad vacancies because of this and I don't have divisions, there's four divisions in that building and none are less than 5,000 feet so it makes it very difficult to you know to rent it to the appropriate type of manufacturer which would also create some more business and some more jobs. I rest my case on that.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Sworik. Are there any members of the public who are here to speak to this item? In any of the committee rooms that I see on screen, I'm looking for members of the public would like to comment on this application. And there's nobody in the gallery. I see none so I will look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 122 Base Line Road West (OZ-9200)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Macbeth. Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Macbeth. I do have a technical question regarding the thirty percent affordable units, there is sixty-one units. Do we know the make-up or the mix of these units at this time?
- Travis Macbeth, Planner II: Thank you. Through the Chair, I believe it is forty-seven one bedroom and then there was two or three two bedroom, sorry, two or three three bedroom and then the remainder being two bedroom. Mr. Giustizia can correct me if I am wrong but the thirty percent applied would be thirty percent minimum for each unit type.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other technical questions? Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Thanks Madam Chair, I had an opportunity to discuss with Mr. Giustizia earlier but I am just curious about the bicycle parking and how that has changed so it's one per four units, what would normally be required?
- Travis Macbeth, Planner II: Through the Chair, I believe it is one per two but I would have to double check that. The rationale there being that generally people are inclined to keep them in their own units or that the storage that is available doesn't, in the same way that car parking isn't maximized, bicycle storage facilities aren't generally maximized so the one per four is, was deemed to be acceptable in other comparable buildings that the HDC have their affordable housing providers see.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you. I'll comment more later.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other technical questions? Wonder, Mr. Giustizia, if you were needing or wanting to add anything to Mr. Macbeth's presentation?
- Steve Giustizia, CEO, Housing Development Corporation: Through you Madam Chair, I just want to, those two comments just maybe quickly, I think the numbers were forty-seven, ten and four. I just want to confirm that and then .75 is the normal for bicycle but overall I just want to acknowledge and thank Committee and City staff. I think what you're seeing in front of you and Mr. Macbeth just did a fabulous job summarizing it, is our work that preceded our, our acquisition of this property last year by, by a couple of years. There was a couple of years of policy work that went into this and I think what you're seeing today is the, is the result of what can be done very consistent within both the existing land use plans and also providing for best use and intensity in form. So, with that Madam Chair I, I have my Development Managers, Kim Wood, the Project Lead and Brian Turcotte, the Development Manager who took the planning lead on this and we're here to answer questions should you need.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Giustizia. So now I will go to members of the public if there are any members of the public here for this application. Just check to see if you would like to address the Committee? I see somebody in Committee Room 5. If you just state your name and then you will have five minutes.

- My name is Mr. Oleg Kodolov and I am the owner of the units at 95 Base Line Road West which is in close proximity to the building and I have heard an overwhelmingly negative response from anyone I talked to about this proposed development and I notice the reason overwhelmingly negative response even in the document that I have read. There are many reasons for that but the main reason would be density and I'm not sure this can be addressed by making any minor changes to this project. Densities are too high already in this area and there is much emphasis on intensification but intensification is actually hurting residents by harming the ecology. It substantially reduces space between the buildings in the area where there's already very little space between the building and it increases the number of residents at a time when we need to think about more space even when the residents go for a walk during the time of Covid. I just suggest to the Council to find a less congested place for this kind of a project. I also ask the Councillors, if possible, to make sure that this area is not developed in future because there was already a project to develop this area several years ago. There was another different application and, at that time, it did not go through so I suggest to rezone it in such a way that nothing other than really tree planting is allowed in this area because it's a relatively, relatively narrow space in between the buildings which would definitely need for ecological reasons and I did read the application and I don't think congestion density concerns are addressed or even can be addressed in this kind of application and I really ask the Council to think about reasons other than intensification or issues other than intensification for the purposes of this project. For example, the application refers to a couple of small parks in the neighbourhood but in fact you have to walk quite a bit one little small parks and they're very small for the number of residents who live in this in this area and it's really an area of many apartments buildings, it's apartment building after apartment building, condo buildings, apartment buildings, various long-term care buildings, at least one long-term care building and really different residents including many retired residents who reside in this area do not have an opportunity to use a lot of open space. You really have to use your vehicle to drive to get to a good park and I would ask Council to think about issues other than intensification, no matter what the benefits of intensification might be. One issue certainly might be Covid-19 and necessity to have more distance between people even when they go for a walk as well as general, general issues of fresh air, regular ecological reasons. There are other reasons, by the way, presented against this project. You may refer to other submissions on this issue but this density issue and the ecological issue, I think, is the one that would be addressed and that's why I request to abandon, to abandon this project. Of course we all love the environment we can agree that we should reject the type of development that hurts both people and environment. It is very poorly allocated, that's the main reason, it really has to be somewhere else in a different part of the city, not where we have already so many different buildings and so I make recommendations to the full Council and to consider all the relevant reasons relating to density and environment cannot be addressed all relating to the health and wellbeing of people including many retired individuals living in this area relating to density as well as various other concerns being raised but those other concerns, even those, if those other concerns are addressed, for example, about potential changes in property values or crime rates in the area and various other comments that in fact you have online and I also heard about, from many residents, even if you address those concerns you cannot really address the issue of density and the damage to ecology that is being done and I strongly recommend to abandon the whole project altogether rather than, rather than make various changes to it. So I hope you will decide positively on this on the 29th. Thank you very much for attention.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you sir. Are there any other members of the public who would like to speak to this application? Looking in the committee rooms that I see on my screen and I'm not seeing anybody standing up, coming forward. Doesn't look there's any like there's anybody else who would like to comment from the members of the public so I will go to the Committee and ask for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1093 Westdel Bourne (OZ-9186)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Riley. Any technical questions? Seeing none. Is the applicant here and would the applicant like to address the Committee?
- Hello. My name is Colin McClure. I work for West Kains Land Corp, the applicant. I'd just like to say thank you to staff for the report and that we agree with their recommendation. Any questions I am happy to answer them. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you sir. I'll go to the committee rooms to see if there are any members of the public who would like to comment on this application? I'll go again, any members of the public in any of the committee rooms who have questions or comments on the application at 1093 Westdel Bourne? Seeing none I will look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 799 Southdale Road West (OZ-9188)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Riley. Any technical questions for Ms. Riley? Seeing none I'm wondering if the applicant is present and would the applicant care to address the Committee? State your name and you have five minutes.
- Good afternoon Committee. Again my name is Matt Campbell and I'm with Zelinka Priamo on behalf of Southside the applicant on this application. We're very excited to be here tonight. We worked quite a while with staff and we've reviewed the staff report and I will acknowledge there is quite of a lot of amendment material to go through. We have gone through that in detail and we're quite satisfied so thank you to staff for, for putting forward those draft by-laws and draft policies. One of the questions that has come up a number of times that I would just like to point out for the Committee's information is that the continuum of care facility, this is a model of care that we're really seeing across the board and it's quite a positive thing that we're seeing. It is the facility that combines a nursing home element, which referred to in our report as assisted living, as well as independent living which is under the Zoning By-law it's defined as a senior citizens apartment building so we are actually combining those two elements together to create a facility where members of the community can age in place. We're very excited about that. Again we're, we've had the benefit of speaking to the community. We did hold a community open house. Normally we like to do those in person but thanks to Covid we, we were able to do that online and it was quite, it was quite an active response that we received with that and we thank members of the community for coming out and sharing their thoughts. Again we're, we're happy with staff's recommendation and we're here to answer any questions that the Committee or the public may have. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Campbell. So I'll go to the committee rooms now and just see if there are any members of the public who would like to address the Committee? Come forward and state your name and you have five minutes.
- Hi. Good evening everyone. My name is Becky Williams, a resident in the Talbot Village community and I just wanted to discuss in regards to the rezoning of 799 Southdale Road some of that negative impacts that it will have not only for Talbot Village but surrounding communities. As we purchased our home in Talbot Village we did thorough research in regards to the zoning that was going to be going on the Southdale Road as we back on to Raleigh with the hills behind us that are there currently. It was zoned for low density and that's why we chose our home and invested our savings into that house rather than where the high density was going to be with the Pomeroy building and the new apartments there. We knew that was going to be high density therefore we chose where we did for the purpose of low density along with other neighbors and residents there. The traffic calming area that we currently have in Talbot Village will be severely disrupted with the amount of housing. I believe now with a total of six hundred and ninety three units between the continuum care facility, two apartments and thirty-three townhomes. That will disrupt the calming, like I said, neighbourhood we have existing now. My thoughts and ideas are similar to retirement home village of Glendale Crossing Andover and Southdale, it would be a better purpose to use those lands for facilities such as that, where it's a three level building with some green space around it and it's not impeding in the neighbourhood nor is it taking over and consuming the neighbourhood and the residents there however having the impact of the three large buildings, five and six story, and thirty-three town homes in such a small space is very congested, is going to increase traffic problems and with the current infrastructure on

Southdale, Tillmann Road and Colonel Talbot, it can't handle the traffic that's currently there.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Demolition Request for Heritage Designated Property – 120 York Street

- Councillor Cassidy: Any technical questions? Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner. Thank you Madam Chair. Through you, with respect to this application, the, there's kind of two parts to it. There's the demolition application and then there's the future of the site and often we contemplate the two of those in, in tandem. The future of the site question ends up getting left. My concern is in granting this. Then we, we leave a vacant site I think it's outlined in the report that the intent is set to create parking on that site so it just becomes another parking lot. Is there another part of this process where I think it would probably require a temporary parking permit to be able to operate that site as such and, and, are, what are the options available to Council at this time?
- Councillor Cassidy: Is that Ms. Dent that will answer that?
- Laura Dent, Heritage Planner: I'm going to refer this to one of my colleagues in Development Services.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Dent.
- I can speak up. Sorry Madam Chair. It's Michael Pease from the site plan group. I was trying to find the hand up button so I decided to speak up.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Go ahead.
- Michael Pease, I can provide some clarity. So the application here through a site plan is for parking which is an association with another commercial property for the owner and within a hundred fifty meters under the regulations of the Zoning By-law so that's, I wouldn't necessarily call it a commercial parking lot, expansion of the lot to the east is in association with a commercial use within a hundred fifty meters of the property.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other a technical questions? I wonder if there is a representative for the applicant who's here who would like to speak to this? Do you want to state your name and you have five minutes?
- Hi. My name is Jim Bujouves, the President for Farhi Developments and thank you Madam Chair. In fact it was two weeks ago when I was here and you mentioned you met this gentleman from Farhi back, I believe, January, February, so I just thought I'd say hello now that you've met me again. With regard to the London Advisory Heritage Committee report dated August 12th I just like to acknowledge the recommendation of the Director with the advice of the Heritage Planner specifically on the Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan it does note in the language that it provides policies and guidelines to manage change for approximately three hundred seventy properties within its boundaries. The HDC Plan is to establish a framework by which the heritage attributes of the downtown can be protected, managed and enhanced as this area continues to evolve and change over time. The reason I bring this forward is that Farhi Holding Corporation owns approximately fifty-eight buildings in the downtown district. The commitment to maintaining and revitalizing heritage assets is evidenced in building such as the Capitol Theatre restoration at 204 Dundas, TD

bank building at 220, former Scott's building at 229-231, the Richmond block, Duffield building at 215 Dundas and the historical Idlewyld as a reference point. The restoration of heritage buildings to preserve and bring history to life ensure that they enhance the fabric of the community is evidence in over twenty projects alone London, Ontario. Specifically referring to the Downtown Parking Study that is referred to in section 2.5 of the report I note the following: the 2015 Downtown London Parking Study and the more recent 2017 Downtown Parking Strategy do identify the need for further parking. The problem is it does not address some underlying realities that we are experiencing in the downtown core as follows: London has the lowest rate of commutes outside of the central census subdivisions which means more demand is placed upon its parking facilities; seventy-five percent drive to work, only eleven percent commute. CBRE and Cushman Wakefield analysis non-heritage properties have a twenty-one percent vacancy whereas heritage properties have thirty-four percent vacancy. The respective stalls is two hundred and nine versus sixty-seven per building. Class A building's have a thirteen percent vacancy rate whereas Class B and Class C have thirty-six percent vacancy. The respective stalls is two hundred eighty-one versus fifty-five per building. It is city versus suburb in impact on office has already had, has also had, a significant effect. In Q3 of 2019 alone over one hundred forty-five square feet, thousand square feet, of office space was under construction in the suburbs, none in the downtown. Downtown vacancy is at eighteen point four percent pre-Covid compared to twelve point six in the suburbs. Downtown parking per month is two hundred forty-one dollars versus zero in the suburbs. Overall vacancy attrition through moves to repurposed industrial or urban malls has exceeded one point five million square feet. How does this proposal assist both the City and Farhi? I referred to a couple items. Item number one, the Bell building, specifically within a hundred fifty meter radius. We have successfully revitalized the 100 Dundas properties since its' acquisition with a further one thousand eight hundred fifty employees in the building since its acquisition. Every one hundred thousand square feet results in approximately five hundred thousand in incremental property tax revenue and activates the core with people on the streets. We have no capacity to provide any further parking to increase occupancy. The proposed parking provides incrementally only fifteen parking spots for the submission made on March 13, 2020. We have lost a number of potential office tenants recently due to not having the parking ratios asking for by the leading brokers including Carfax and Compass totaling seven hundred employees. The building itself has the structural capacity and integrity to increase the number of floors and add a further five hundred thousand square feet. In addition we are proceeding with the submission on the Ridout residential development. The community information, the community meeting is pending. The demolition will reduce the existing parking deficiency we're currently have with existing Bell tenants we are contractually obligated to, to provide parking. I have brought that forward to your head of Development Services back in February and a few months ago as well. Item number two, future development: subject to market absorption we have every intention of initiating a redevelopment at 120 York on September 1, 2020, I forwarded the details of initiative, initiatives in concert with CBRE to the head of Planning and Development Services. The initiative incorporates all aspects of The London Plan, creates a mixed use residential and retail development to enhance the recreational, dining, shopping and service district. This will supply over five hundred additional units with approximately six hundred parking stalls.

- Councillor Cassidy: You've just passed your five minute mark and now, sir. I wonder if you could take about ten seconds and wrap it up.

- Jim Bujouves, the President for Farhi Developments: Heritage properties need parking as well and that's what's causing the problem in addition to the one hundred fifty meter proximity and I appreciate the time. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. So I'll go to the committee rooms to see if there are other if there are any members of the public who have come to comment on this. Anyone at all would like to make a comment or ask a question about this application for demolition request? I'm seeing none so all of a motion to close the PPM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.8 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1455 Oxford Street East

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Dent. Any technical questions from the Committee? Seeing none I will go to the committee rooms to see if there is anyone here to speak to this matter. Anybody looking to provide comment or with questions on this application? Go ahead, state your name and you have five minutes.
- Good evening, my name is Casey Kulchycki. I'm a Planner with Zelinka Priamo Limited representing the applicant, Red Maple Properties. Just wanted to say that we have reviewed the staff report and are in agreement with the delisting of this property and we are looking forward to bringing the OPA/ZBA applications for this property and its neighbours forward at a future Planning Committee. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Kulchycki and my apologies for not inviting you to speak as the agent for the applicant. Are there any members of the public who would like to comment on this? One last chance for members of the public to come forward with questions or comments on 1455 Oxford Street East. Seeing none I'll look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 556 Wellington Street

- Councillor Cassidy: so Mr. Yeoman I wonder if you could, you know, and that sort of everybody has sort of talked around this so I wonder if you could just explain clearly why we're not talking about rezoning why there isn't a rezoning or Official Plan Amendment application before us tonight.
- Paul Yeoman, Director, Development Services: Thank you Madam Chair. So the proposal that's before you tonight for the site plan, public site plan meeting, is consistent with the zoning that's provided and so we're looking right now to refine the site plan related matters that are contained in the Site Plan Control By-law so the zoning is in place for it and so it's the other matters that are under consideration tonight.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Yeoman. I wonder if that's it or if Ms. Dent is also going to weigh in here or should we just we go straight to the public now? Okay the silence is giving me the answer I need so I will go to the committee rooms and I understand there are a number of people that are here for this matter so just let the clerks in the room know that you would like to speak and make your way to the microphone and you'll have five minutes please provide your name and you'll have five minutes to address the Committee. Go ahead.
- Mary Anne Hodge: I'm a resident on Wolfe Street and also a member of the Friends of Victoria Park. There are many competing pressures in the world today and as you all know I am deeply concerned about the climate emergency and increasing density in the core is important to that issue but I don't support density at any cost. I understand that this proposal or this meeting is the last tick the last of approval that they need for this development to proceed and I'm very concerned about the heritage aspect of this proposal you can see in the few remaining heritage homes on Wellington Street that the grandeur has already been lost due to zoning changes that happened before the West Woodfield Conservation Plan was established. So I ask myself what is the purpose of a heritage conservation designation and so to get answers I read the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation Plan which this property is located in and this Plan says that its purpose is to offer long term protection to areas that have important or identifiable historic and architectural resources and I think we would all agree that the Victoria Park in the surrounding neighbourhood are important reminders of London's expansion in the mid-1800s when the civic and industrial leaders of London created this Park and built their mansions around it. Generally it is the streetscape that is the focus of a Heritage Conservation District and that is also true in the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation Plan as the Plan so eloquently articulates street trees on boulevards are often linking elements extending like ribbons throughout the neighborhood to tie it all together. So streetscapes recognize that a building is intimately connected to its site and to its neighbors and an individual building is perceived as part of a group and requires all the neighbourhood all the all of its neighbors to conform to create the full effect so this Plan emphasizes that when buildings need to changes it's in this connection between the buildings that needs to be maintained. So the heritage plan states that as well existing road right of ways and width should not be increased unless required for public health and safety or bike lanes and so widening roads also goes against any climate change emergency recommendations so we keep that lens on it as well. The heritage conservation plan also asks that new buildings respect the heritage character of West Woodfield through attention to height, built form, setback, massing, material, other architectural elements which the Heritage Planners have agreed that this it does not conform to. It also notes that a building that would otherwise be consistent with its neighbors in former massing which this doesn't but even if it did it can have a disturbing effect on this consistency in the neighbourhood if it sticks out in front of the general line of building façade which this plan this proposal would stick out severely. So inherent in the heritage conservation plan is the mandate to preserve the streetscape it is not just the value of each individual

building but in the collective. 556 Wellington Street it's a highly coveted development site why because it overlooks our beautiful and historic Victoria Park and it terminates at Wolfe Street which is also a very desirable location due to its well preserved heritage homes and a very picturesque tree lined streetscape. 556 Wellington gains some of its value from its proximity to Wolfe Street. Being in a Heritage Conservation District has its advantages and disadvantages, ask any of the property owners on Wolfe Street and they will tell you that conforming to the heritage conservation requirements has meant higher renovation costs and building restrictions but the benefits are cohesive streetscape and the preservation of the architectural details that make this street treasured in the city. We only ask the same standards apply for all of the property owners along Wolfe Street. The report from the Heritage Planners emphasizes that this proposal does not integrate well with existing buildings on Wolfe Street and they see no evidence of trying to transition to the lower density of the street. The London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) have listed the many requirements the heritage conservation plan does not fulfill and we have not seen much movement on this by the developer. So aside from the scale and massing the biggest ask that I have is for the developer to respect the streetscape, having a consistent build edge something that is urged by planners on the Wellington Street side and we also ask that this be the case on the Wolfe Street side. We ask that they move the north façade of the building so it is in line with the general line of building facade on Wolfe Street. This would result in a better integration with the existing streetscape so I urge you to heed the advice of the Planning staff and LACH and reject this proposal.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Hodge. Are there others who would like to comment on this? Come to the microphone, don't be shy. I have someone in Committee Room 5? Okay no Committee Room 1 and 2? Go ahead yes go ahead state your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Danya Walker, 570 Wellington Street – See attached submission.
- Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent – See attached submission.
- Councillor Cassidy: Ma'am, you are past your five minutes. I wonder if you could wrap it up soon.
- Well, did you include Danya Walker's stuff?
- Councillor Cassidy: Yes, ma'am. You, you get five minutes to speak. If other people want to come and have five minutes they can come and have five minutes.
- Alright, so, lastly I am asking Canada Life the ultimate owner of the project to walk the talk. Proudly displayed on its webpages under the banner Community and Social Responsibility their commitment includes supporting our communities and committing ourselves to sustainability. This project is exactly what the community of London does not want in the neighbourhood of the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District which is supported by The London Plan. It may meet zoning but it certainly does not meet heritage and I hope I have illustrated a number of other shortcomings. Furthermore there is nothing to suggest that this project is committed to sustainability. Where are the ecar charging stations?
- Councillor Cassidy: Ma'am, you are well past six minutes.
- What are the plans for waste reduction? And I could go on but I guess I am cut off.
- Councillor Cassidy: I wonder if you could provide your name ma'am?
- Sorry?
- Councillor Cassidy: Could we have your name for the public record?

- Sorry. Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. So I'm sorry and I also neglected to ask if the applicant is here and would the applicant care to address the Committee? You can go ahead sir. State your name and you have your five minutes.
- Greg Priamo: Since the rest of the public has already gone forward I'm wondering whether it would be appropriate to let them finish their comments and then I would have the benefit of being able to comment on those too and sort of close the loop on some of these issues.
- Councillor Cassidy: I think that's fine. Thank you. So back to Committee Room 1 and 2. I see you there sir standing, come to the microphone, state your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Garth Webster: I live at 320 Wolfe Street. I just want to finish what this lady was reading. Zero lot lines allowed looking at footprint on page SPA 004 we note that the building extends beyond the sight lines of the houses on Wolfe Street and beyond sight lines of Centennial Hall to City Hall. This is disappointing as these sight lines were considered very important in the decision making process for Victoria Park Secondary Plan proposals. Involving sight lines was one of the areas of agreement by many of this stakeholders in that proposal. Zero lot line will also limit the utility of retail portion so that any restaurants would not be able to have viable patio areas. Outdoor amenity space is nonexistent being limited to terraces or balconies tied to units. Unfortunately fourteen of these units will face the solid cement wall building. I think you read this. Sorry I think it's a bit repeating but outdoor amenity space is nonexistent being limited to terraces or balconies tied to units. Unfortunately fourteen of these units will face the solid cement wall of Building 2. This will also significantly affect the amount of light in these units. Furthermore another 24 units will be looking directly into the lovely windows of the units of Building 2 or rather 16 Building 2 units will have a very nice view of Building 1 balconies. I understand that a wind study was not required because this development is not in the downtown area that requires one. This is a bit ironic as it is in the downtown when it comes to zoning but not when climate is an issue. Because the study was not required I was told by city staff at the last LACH meeting that it was not asked for. The wind study would not provide, was not provided, that much useful information not only for Victoria Park but on the probable wind tunnel effect of Building 2 on 34 units of Building 1 with balconies facing Building 2. A balcony is not much use if it's too windy to use. I also note that floor 5 of Building 2 will not have walls CSPA 806 SPA 155 this is the top floor of the parking levels in Building 2. I wonder what effect wind will have here and how they will manage the snow in the winter. The traffic study does not address three important facts Wolfe Street is narrower than local roads in the neighborhood. Wolfe Street has no boulevard to accommodate snow removal. Wellington Street is closed almost every other weekend between Dufferin and Central between June and September this summer notwithstanding. Furthermore we're in the beginnings of the new age of online commerce, there does not appear to be any consideration given to package delivery on other than Canada Post. Will Wellington Street be subject to constant lane blockage because deliveries are made to the door facing Wellington? That is where GPS will direct all the drivers. Lastly I'm asking Canada Life the ultimate owner of the project to walk the talk. Proudly displayed on this web pages under the banner, Community and Social Responsibility. Their commitments include supporting our communities and committed ourselves to sustainability. This project is exactly what the community of London does not want in the neighborhood of West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District which is supported by the London Plan. It may meet zoning but it certainly does not meet heritage and I hope I have illustrated a number of other shortcomings. Furthermore there is nothing to suggest that this project is committed to sustainability. Where are the e-car charging stations? Could there have been green roofs? What are the plans for waste reduction specially recycling and composting? What is included in the project that is above and beyond what is required by-law? I view that as a minimum standard Canada Life and previous Great West Life have promised more than minimum standards. I therefore

request that PEC support in WHCD, volunteers of LACH and the recommendation of very skilled in decades city staff and reject this proposal. It could have been built twenty-five years ago but it does not belong the third decade of the 21st century.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Webster. Any other members of the public who wish to comment? State your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Thank you. My name is Kate Rapson and I'm the Chair of the Woodfield Community Association. I sent a letter to PEC last week and we ask that you support the decision made by LACH regarding the Canada Life application at 556 Wellington Street and refuse the heritage alteration application. The Woodfield Community Association supports all the points made by LACH. A few key items. There's a few things I would like to highlight. In policy 4.3 of the West Woodfield HDC the plan states new buildings shall respect and be compatible with the heritage character of the West Woodfield Area through attention to height, built form, setback, massing, material and other elements. We don't believe this application reflects many of these characteristics, design does show brick and other materials but it does not in character in terms of set back and heights. The recommendation also in the Woodfield HDC is that the buildings be no more than 8 to 10 stories; however, and then 3 stories for buildings adjacent to houses on Wolfe Street, specifically in Princess Ave; however, this is obviously up to 18 stories. The application shows, also shows, a widening of Wolfe Street which is not supported by the HDC, HCD sorry. Wolfe should not be widened, the green boulevards are recognized and should be protected as stated in the Heritage Conservation District guidelines. I recognize, we recognize, that this site is, the zoning is an extreme conflict with the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District and it also the Downtown Area Zone also sort of flies in the face of HCD. So with that we believe the Downtown Area Zoning is a mistake and the new London Plan, is a mistake in the new London Plan for the south end of the Park and should be revised to closer respect the policies and guidelines as outlined in the West Woodfield HCD. In addition, just referencing the traffic study, note that's not part of this application, but it states that there be no more than a hundred cars added to the local traffic on Wolfe Street. However should be noted that there will be 328 residential parking spots and 204 Canada Life employees spaces so that's kind of odd I don't see how it could just be limited to a hundred cars on that street so maybe we could ask for clarification from the developer on that. I have a few suggestions in just specific to traffic. Can the City respond to, with, traffic calming suggestions for Wolfe Street? It is a lovely little tree lined heritage street right now. Could Wolfe be made into a one way street, is that an option? Can there be pedestrian walk, crosswalks be installed at the end of Wolfe Street crossing Wellington? That's already pretty dangerous I can only imagine to be worse with this building and also how will traffic be managed during festivals? This application will set a precedent for lands abutting to the Park so it bears high significance to future public asset access and overall health of this small urban park. It would be far better if this application could be considered once the Victoria Secondary Plan is complete. Collectively we need to protect the green space for our future and focus intensification where it's allowed and logical. That's it. Thank you very much for your time. Appreciate your listening. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Rapson. Any other members of the public who would like to speak? Come to the mic. You'll have 5 minutes. Please state your name.
- Soon as I stand on the dot. My name is Kelly McKeating. I live at 329 Victoria Street and I am speaking on behalf of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. I'd like to start by saying that I think it's a little bit unfortunate that staff in their introductory remarks didn't mention that the staff recommendation regarding refusal of the heritage alteration permit, which was endorsed by LACH just last week. The timing of this application I think is unfortunate. Approval of the site plan application would give the impression that the public feedback and the concern regarding building heights around Victoria Park that was voiced at the PPM in front of PEC earlier this year hasn't been heard. It seems to me that the current zoning is an error or perhaps an oversight, it is a shame that the zoning of this particular area wasn't

changed when the HCD plan was finalized twelve years ago. Regardless of that hiccup, the view of the ACO is that the HCD plans recommended maximums should be respected. We all want intensification in the core and we all want buildings instead of parking lots as a couple of the Councillors mentioned earlier this evening but this building is too high and has too large of a footprint for this particular parking lot. There's an Ontario Municipal Board decision from 2015 that's supportive of this perspective. That decision, which was in Toronto the OMB determined that respectful separation district was critical to conserving the heritage attributes of the neighboring designated and listed properties and we believe that that precedent does apply here. We also agree with other comments that you've received that it would be preferable that the main floor of whatever building is eventually built should be residential and not commercial. And then finally I would not like to make a comment about the shadow studies in the site plan application package. I was appalled and aghast to see that at least in March and September the shadows of this building will extend all the way to Waterloo Street and that several of the houses on Princess and Wolfe would be in shadow for the entire afternoon during those times of the year. It seems to me that this is just incredibly unfair to the people who live on those streets to lose their sunshine to lose their privacy and this is a building that just should not be built in this particular location. I thank you for your attention.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. McKeating. Any other members of the public who wish to speak? Anybody in Committee Room 1 and 2 who are looking to speak to this application?
- Committee Room Staff: We don't have any more speakers in this room.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thanks very much. So I'll go to Committee Room number five, the agent for the applicant is there. If you would like to come forward, state your name and address the Committee. You have five minutes.
- Thank you Madam Chair. My name is Greg Priamo and we're the Planning Consultants for Canada Life and Great West Realty Advisors on this project. There's certainly a lot to unpack in the comments. There are two matters that the Planning Committee, excuse me that the Planning Committee is being asked to deal with tonight. One is consideration of this site plan by way of a public site plan meeting and it's largely colored by the heritage aspects if, if we weren't in a heritage district and there wasn't a requirement for statutory site plan meeting we'd be moving through the site plan approval process with staff and trying to address their concerns as has been catalogued by Planning staff where we're you know notwithstanding the heritage issues we're very close to completing what would ordinarily be deemed an acceptable response to the zoning and an acceptable response to the City's planning tools otherwise. That being said and as you know we've provided some correspondence particularly with respect to the heritage report and the recommendation from LACH where we were asking Planning Committee to reconsider their recommendation and support of the issuance of a heritage alteration permit. We appreciate that there was the content of the report prepared by staff it was certainly comprehensive. We did feel that it was unbalanced and that it focused a great deal on what they felt were the shortcomings of the project with very little consideration given to the matters that we brought forward to try to make this project a better project. There was assertions in the report that we didn't address, heritage issues. We provided a lengthy and comprehensive heritage alteration or heritage impact assessment prepared by a qualified heritage consultant and we provided several comprehensive responses to concerns raised through the various site plan steps that we've taken over the last few years. We never did receive any response from heritage staff as to our impression of, or, our response to their concerns. They've just continued to go back to their original position notwithstanding the fact that we provided responses but that being said. In short, we are in disagreement, we think that this building and the design approach that we've evolved with in working with staff has the ability to fit in this neighborhood particularly because it's at the edge of the neighbourhood, the built form of the neighborhood, I appreciate the park is part of the HDC but the built form in the neighbourhood, we're in a portion of the Woodfield neighbourhood that has seen some conversion and intensification

because of its proximity to the downtown and park so not all parts of the Woodfield neighbourhood are identical and when we're looking at the heritage district policies I think we have to have regard for that and in this particular instance I think we've done that. We've established what we believe to be an iconic building working within the parameters of the zoning that's on the site. I appreciate some of the comments and we've indicated to the public and to staff in the fullness of time it would be our preference for instance to have the ground floor of this building be residential but the zoning as it currently exists right now requires that the main floor be commercial. As we move forward if we get support for this application we would certainly entertain the prospect of looking at the necessary variances to allow for the main floor to be used for residential purposes. Since we've made the application we worked with staff to make considered improvements. The primary concern raised by staff was the rear portion of our development and in particular the parking garage. We've moved from an open concept parking garage to a fully enclosed garage with architectural features and building materials that match the rest of the building as staff have indicated more recently through discussions with the city we've agreed notwithstanding the fact that the zoning doesn't require it, we've agreed to move the building. We did lose some parking spaces and it does change some of the dynamics of the ramp system and the parking garage but we felt it was it was worth addressing given the concerns raised by staff. And so we did move the building off of the east property line three meters to allow for a planted garden which is ample space to allow for trees to grow and provide a buffer from those from that wall along the property line that you know the building sides on to our building it doesn't front and it's backyard has largely been converted to a commercial parking so it's not a particularly sensitive interface but nonetheless one worthy of consideration.

- Councillor Cassidy: You're past your five minutes Mr. Priamo. I'll give you a couple of seconds to wrap it up.
- Greg Priamo: So essentially in in this particular instance we think that we have we have met the tests of the of the heritage district plan we have met the tests of good planning and urban design and we certainly encourage Planning Committee to have regard for this submission that we made in that regard particularly the heritage impact assessment and the subsequent responses and support our application.
- Councillor Cassidy: Okay, thank you Sir. Thank you. I'll go back to Committee Room 1 and 2 just to make sure there are no other members of the public who would like to speak. I see one last person coming forward, if you could state your name, sir, you have five minutes.
- I'm Brian Evans: My wife and I own 297 Wolfe Street so we're in the crotch of the "L" formed by these buildings and it's been said already but I just want to emphasize that the back building butts fairly close to our backyards and it's a tall building so we will not see daylight which I guess is great from the standpoint of skin cancer but in terms of mental health it's nice to see some sunshine once in a while and they've show no regard for the neighbors. They have beautiful balconies built on this building for their people but for the rest of us will be without sunshine and it's I think it's a consideration. Thanks.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much Dr. Evans for coming out. Thanks for your perspective. Any other members of the public would like to speak? I'm seeing none so I'm about to close the public participation meeting; this will close the portion of the meeting where the, where you can provide comment so I just want to make sure everybody has spoken who would like to speak and I'll look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

Walker

My name is Danya and I live at 570 Wellington Street.

I do not support this current application.

I do not think that the proposed structure:

Is consistent with the heritage of the existing buildings surrounding Victoria Park

Is consistent with the height of the buildings immediately surrounding Victoria Park

Contributes to the atmosphere that currently exists in the immediate area around the Park

556 Wellington St, proposal of GWLRA

I support the decision of planning staff and LACH to deny a Heritage Alteration Permit for this development. I agree with all the reasons that it does not adhere to West Woodfield HCD guidelines for redevelopment.

With respect to Heritage my major concern is that an HIA was not completed to show how this development will impact Victoria Park. Although Victoria Park is included in WWHCD, it has its own Heritage Designation and this has not been addressed at all in the current HAP application. I feel that a significant portion of the HIA should have discussed Victoria Park and this discussion is missing from the decision making progress. As the City of London feels that Victoria Park is a significant asset to the City, enough to require its own secondary plan, I think this oversight must be addressed. I am particularly concerned with the effects of increased wind due to climate change and taller buildings around the park. A wind study might have provided some answers to my concerns.

I have many concerns with the overall design of the building as it relates to the concept of providing comfortable living space. My comments will relate to pages in the Site Plan Approval Documents, dated April 15, 2020.

It is interesting to note that the larger units have been designated as "saleable" (pg SPA001). This is disappointing, as I originally understood that this would be a 100% rental property owned by GWL. What the city needs is more pure rental units and fewer condo units rented out by absentee owners, that have no stake in the condo or the City, other than their cash flow.

While the proposal meets all planning requirements appropriate to the zoning, it could be improved by being more people friendly, and not so overpowering in its presence. It is unfortunate that the zoning does not reflect the long term goals for this area, as recognized in the 1989 Official Plan and the London Plan. I hope that there are no more anomalies in the City's zoning. If so I hope they have been identified and proposals are in place to realign zoning to match the goals of the London Plan.

— Zero lot line is allowed. Looking at the foot print on pg SPA004, we note that the building extends beyond the site lines of the houses on Wolfe St and beyond the site lines of Centennial Hall to City Hall. This is disappointing, as these site lines were considered very important in the decision making process of the Victoria Park Secondary plan proposals. Improving site lines was one of the areas of agreement by many of the stakeholders in that proposal. Zero lot line will also limit the utility of the retail portion, so that any restaurants would not be able to have viable patio areas.

Outdoor amenity space is non-existent, being limited to terraces or balconies tied to units. Unfortunately 14 of these units will face the solid cement wall of building 2. This will significantly affect the amount of light in these units. Furthermore another 24 units will be looking directly into the lovely windows of the units in building 2. Or rather 16 building 2 units will have a very nice view of building 1 balconies.

I understand that a wind study was not required because this development is not in the downtown area that requires one. This is a bit ironic, as it is in the "downtown" when it comes to zoning, but not when climate is an issue. Because a study was not required, I was told by City staff at the last LACH meeting that it was not asked for. A wind study would have provided much useful information not only for Victoria Park, but on the probable "wind tunnel" effect of building 2 on the 34 units in building 1, with balconies facing building 2. A balcony is not much use if it is too windy to use. I also note that floor 5 of building 2 will not have walls (see SPA 806 & SPA 155). This is the top floor of the parking levels in building 2. I wonder what effect wind will have here, and how they will manage the snow in the winter.

The traffic study does not address 3 important facts:

Wolfe St. is narrower than the "local roads" in the neighborhood.

Wolfe St. has no boulevard to accommodate snow removal.

Wellington St. is closed almost every other weekend between Dufferin and Central between June and September, this summer notwithstanding.

Furthermore, we are in the beginnings of the new age of online commerce. There does not appear to be any consideration given to package delivery, other than by Canada Post. Will Wellington Street be subject to constant lane blockage because deliveries are made to the door facing Wellington? That is where GPS will direct all the drivers!

Lastly I am asking Canada Life, the ultimate owner of the project, to "walk the talk" proudly displayed on its web pages under the banner: Community and Social Responsibility. Their commitments include "supporting our communities" and "committing ourselves to sustainability". This project is exactly what the community of London does not want, in the neighborhood of the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, which is supported by the London Plan. It may meet zoning but it certainly does not meet Heritage, and I hope I have illustrated a number of other shortcomings. Furthermore there is nothing to suggest that this project is committed to sustainability. Where are the e-car charging stations? Could there have been green roofs? What are the plans for waste reduction, especially recycling and composting? What is included in this project that is above and beyond what is required by law. I view that as a minimum standard. Canada Life and previously Great West Life have promised more than the minimum standard.

I therefore request that PEC support the WWHCD, the volunteers of LACH, and the recommendation of very skilled and dedicated City staff and reject this proposal. It could have been built 25 years ago, but it does not belong in third decade of the 21st century.

Hazel Elmslie
63 Arcadia Crescent
London, ON, N5W 1P5