

Planning and Environment Committee Report

The 15th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
October 5, 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: Councillors S. Hillier, S. Lewis and M. van Holst; G. Barrett, J. Bunn, M. Corby, S. Corman, G. Dales, M. Fabro, M. Feldberg, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, J. MacKay, L. Marshall, L. Morris, A. Pascual, L. Pompili, M. Schulthess, B. Somers, E. Skalski, B. Westlake-Power and P. Yeoman

The meeting is called to order at 4:00 PM, with Councillor M. Cassidy in the Chair; it being noted that the following Members were in remote attendance: Mayor E. Holder; Councillors A. Hopkins, J. Helmer, A. Kayabaga and S. Turner

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That Items 2.1 and 2.2 BE APPROVED.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2.1 Draft Environmental Management Guidelines Update

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 Environmental Management Guidelines Update:

a) the draft Environmental Management Guidelines (2020) appended to the staff report dated October 5, 2020 BE CIRCULATED for public review and comment; and,

b) the members of external resource groups including Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, First Nations communities, local Conservation Authorities (Upper Thames River, Lower Thames Valley and Kettle Creek Conservation Authorities), the London Home Builders Association, the London Development Institute, Nature London, and the Urban League BE THANKED for their work and comments during Pre-consultation and Phase 1 which helped guide the preparation of this initial draft.

Motion Passed

2.2 Building Division Monthly Report for August 2020

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

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

Motion Passed

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 101 Meadowlily Road South 39CD-20502 (OZ-9192)

Moved by: J. Helmer
Seconded by: S. Turner

That consideration of the application by 2690015 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 101 Meadowlily Road South, BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration to continue to work with the applicant and to report back at a future public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee:

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 27, 2020 from G. Smith, Friends of Meadowlily Woods Community Association;
- a communication dated September 22, 2020 from B. McCauley, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.;
- communications dated September 24 and October 1, 2020 from M. Muir, Project Planner, Dillon Consulting;
- a communication from A. Stolarski, by email;
- a communication dated September 28, 2020 from B. Lindsay by e-mail; and,
- a communication from D. Russo, by e-mail;

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: 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: 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)

4. Items for Direction

None.

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:48 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 101 Meadowlily Road South 39CD-20502 (OZ-9192)

- Councillor Cassidy: I'll go to Committee first to see if there are any technical questions about this deferral possibility. Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Thanks Madam Chair. My question would just be procedurally what's the best way to address this issue? Given that we have opened the public participation meeting and we do have people here to speak to it. I guess we also (1) have to determine whether we grant the deferral and (2) determine to hear from the public and (3) whether we hear the whole presentation with respect to the application and if we have to make any decisions on that application or whether it is a question of deferral or not at this point. Perhaps I could ask that through you to staff.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Corby, I don't know if you would answer that or somebody else. Hold on one second. The City Clerk is going to give us some answers here too.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Thank you Madam Chair. I'm going to answer from a procedural perspective only of course. Generally if the deferral is considered and granted because the public participation meeting was advertised, generally we would still give the public an option to, to speak acknowledging however that it appears that there would be a change to the, to the development proposal and there would be another public participation meeting so some of the comments from the public may change based on what is coming forward.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any, any follow up on that Councillor Turner before I go to Mr Corby?
- Councillor Turner: Thanks Madam Chair. It sounds appropriate. I think it would be appropriate that we have people here to hear from them. I think it might help inform the next phase if the applicant is taking it back, having heard the public submissions, we'll have the opportunity to hear those and that can be taken back. I think the next part is how we, we properly dispose of the item. If we just move to defer or refer back to staff, I guess, would probably be the most appropriate but yeah I just want to clear up the procedural stuff before we start moving forward and perhaps we hear more from Mr. Corby.
- Councillor Cassidy: Ok. Mr. Corby?
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Thank you Madam Chair. I think just reiterating what the City Clerk said, since the members of the public are here, I feel like that is the best way to proceed and, and listen to the concerns acknowledging that the plan may, may change but they can address those concerns at a later public meeting. I think, from my standpoint, I'm happy to get the presentation first and then we can go into the public comments and then you can decide how to deal with the matter after that.
- Councillor Cassidy: So Committee I'm looking to you. I'll go to, I see Councillor van Holst is, is visiting and he's got his hand up. I'll go to you in a bit Councillor. I'm going to go to Councillor Hopkins first so, we do have the option of having Mr Corby give us a presentation on the application that's on the agenda knowing that that application could change and we don't really know how much it could change at this point. So I'll go to Councillor Hopkins.

- Councillor Hopkins: Yes, thank you Madam Chair and I would be prepared to receive the presentation from staff, we do have members in our committee rooms. I think we do need to hear from them and then we can also make a decision on the referral after that. I, I would think it would be helpful to the process just to have this engagement and this conversation knowing, and the community understands that this is not what it may look like moving forward.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Councillor. I'll go to you Mr Mayor.
- Mayor Holder: Thanks very much, Chair. The public is here and they always are supported of their appropriate right to make comments. I'm not sure if it helps to hear from the staff report because you're going to have, perhaps, in part the public trying to respond to the staff report which frankly may not well be the staff report, I suspect it won't be, assuming that the referral was through. So all that said I'm happy to hear from the public and, and defer the staff report until we, until the, again, presuming it's referred back by Council to do that, that we then get one set of facts that we're dealing with as opposed to hearing things that may not be the case that either may bias us and even if it doesn't, frankly here's my concern, we have talked more about it than the time it would take to give the report but that would be a my view is that we defer that.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor van Holst.
- Councillor van Holst: Thank you Madam Chair. I'd be pleased to hear the staff report. I think it might help us understand the changes that will have taken place and I'm also very happy to hear from the public on this. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Councillor. So, from Committee we have one member indicating that they would like to have a presentation, one member indicating that they would not. What if I ask Mr Corby I believe he had a somewhat substantial presentation prepared, we have the, the slides in our agenda packet. What if I go to Mr Corby and just have a two minute introduction to this our proposal and knowing that it could change I don't suspect it will be a substantive change but I'll go to Deputy Mayor Helmer.
- Deputy Mayor Helmer: I think we're in danger of spending way more time talking about the order of operations than we are in hearing the staff report so I, I think we should just go ahead with the full staff report and we're going to get another report when there's a different proposal and that's what happens at Planning Committee, we're going to have two public participation meetings.
- Councillor Cassidy: Absolutely. Knowing we are going to go ahead with two public participation meetings, not, I'd say the majority now has voted in favor of a full staff presentation and knowing that our presentations are anyway altered during the this virtual environment and we don't get the same full blown slide presentation that we would normally get I'll go to Mr. Corby without any further ado to give us his report verbally.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Corby. Are there technical questions from Committee for Mr. Corby? Deputy Mayor.
- Deputy Mayor Helmer: There's a couple references in the public correspondence and the response from the applicant around the Cultural Heritage Landscape and I wondered if Mr Corby could just clarify what the status of that is and speak to that directly.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Corby.

- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Sorry Councillor Helmer are, are you asking me to clarify what the cultural heritage of the area is, I'm just confused by the question. Sorry.
- Deputy Mayor Helmer: No problem. So there's some references to the fact that the sort of the roadway itself the lead into the park was almost designated as a Cultural Heritage Landscape and I just wondered if you could clarify what happened with that.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair I'm not aware of what happened with that. I don't think our Heritage Planners are here to speak to the matter but I'm not I'm not aware what happened to that. Sorry.
- Councillor Cassidy: Deputy Mayor.
- Deputy Mayor Helmer: That's fine.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Thank you Madam Chair. I know we're on technical questions so maybe this is the time to ask the question that I had about the permanent pumping station if, if staff could just give us a few more details I know it's mentioned here that the development can access water and the proposed development can access sanitary servicing which will be privately owned if staff can just expand a little bit more on, on that.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Corby.
- Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions): I'll take this one Madam Chair. It's Matt Feldberg speaking. So what the, through the condominium, what we would do is we would create a common elements pumping station and that would be installed somewhere on the site as we work through the details of the design and then what would happen is there will be a sewer that would be run up Meadowlily Road to where the outlet is and they would connect into the sewer at that point. They'd have to bring services, there's no water that actually connects down that far North to the site so they'll have to actually bring water service down Meadowlily Road so that they can connect when the development proceeds.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for that. In the pumping station would that be, who would be responsible for that?
- Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions): Through you Madam Chair, so the Condominium would actually be responsible for that, they would be required to operate and maintain that as per their common elements and they'd be, the residents will be paying a fee, their monthly fees into that, there would be a reserve fund and they would take care of maintenance and ensure that it is operating correctly.
- Councillor Hopkins: Would they also be responsible for any emergency or any problems with the pumping station?
- Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions): Through you Madam Chair, yes they would and then the connections themselves would be out and we'd be working with an operations agreement with our Wastewater staff to ensure that it's operating correctly.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Councillor. I will go to Councillor van Holst.
- Councillor van Holst: Thank you Madam Chair. So the Province has said now that any, any home can have a secondary unit installed by right and so my question through you to staff is if that had been considered in, in terms of the, the traffic and, and the utilities necessary for this for this area? There could be what a large expansion of the population if all the homeowners took advantage of that opportunity.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Corby or Mr. Feldberg.
- Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions): I'll take this one Madam Chair so that wasn't the application in front of us. The application was for a vacant land condominium.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Any other technical questions? So I will, oh, Councillor Lewis I see your hand up. Go ahead.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Madam Chair. Thank you for recognizing me, I guess, at your Committee. I do have two questions for our staff in regards to the presentation that we just heard. The first is that no significant traffic impact was expected from this. I wonder, I mean to me, if memory serves there are all fewer than twenty-four residences on this stretch of road already so we are talking about quadrupling the traffic and we are also talking about traffic that's going to be inside the thirty meter buffer zone of an ESA. So from an environmental perspective has the Traffic Impact Study taken into account the environmental impact of all those extra vehicles inside an ESA buffer? That's my first question and then my second question I'll just ask staff so that we can hear the response is we just heard that it's, the proposal is consistent with the character of the road. I'm just trying to square that circle in my head because I look at the road at all the setbacks are significant and they're all single family homes and we're talking about a fairly intense eighty plus unit development right now understanding that that might change a little as the footprint is altered but I'm not sure how, how to square that circle in terms of the comment that it is consistent with the character of the road. I just want to hear from staff to find a little more insight into those two issues.
- Councillor Cassidy: Mr. Corby or Mr. Feldberg.
- Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions): Thank you and through you Madam Chair, so with respect to the Traffic Impact Assessment it doesn't take into account necessarily the buffer limits of an ESA, what it's looking at is a traffic count for a particular road to determine the loading of that road and whether the development is appropriate. So in this case we have a local road and we have certain capacities that are able to function on that street and based on what we've seen thus far in the number of units that are being proposed we feel it's appropriate at this time. As far as the second question, perhaps Mr. Corby could address that one.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thanks. Mr. Corby.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Thank you Madam Chair. So in regards to kind of maintaining the character in the area as you mentioned there there's about five or six single family dwellings south of this property that all have fairly significant setbacks from the road and in terms of meeting that character these, this

development as well will be set back fairly significantly, they are required to give us about three to five meters depending on where it is located on the property of road widening dedication and then on top of that providing another eleven meter setback for those town homes and as mentioned through site plan they'll be able to use landscaping, there's recommendations they'll be using native trees or gates to help create that heritage character through this development.

- Councillor Cassidy: Alright. Any other technical questions? So I wonder if the applicant is here and if the applicant would like to address the Committee? Just come to the microphone, state your name and you will have five minutes.
- Hi my name's Jason Johnson, I'm with Dillon Consulting representing the applicant. Based on what you've heard, that we have received some comments from the City and the public in the last week and so that's why the deferral was requested. As a result the plans originally presented will be modified, specifically the townhome blocks or units which will require an additional public meeting to provide the public and the Committee with a chance to comment on the new layout. The information that has been provided tonight will not change regarding the applicable policies and the justification provided in the planning justification report. All modifications will be regarding the townhome blocks and the zoning provisions regarding them. As you've heard from Mike's Corby's report the proposed development consists of the following: a mix of single detached dwellings and townhome units, private sanitary sewers and storm sewers including a private sanitary pump station and force main, a private public water main, buffers from the Highbury Woods Park and the Meadowlily ESA in accordance with provincial and municipal requirements and landscaping and heritage compensation features complimentary to the natural existing landscape. As noted earlier, the application as submitted to amend the City by-law is from a holding Urban Reserve to a Site Specific Residential R-6 Zone that would permit the development of single detached, semi-detached and town home dwellings with the following provisions, and that was provided in the report, the proposed zoning provisions for the single detached will remain the same and then as I said noted before it should be noted that with the change in the lay out to the town home units within the development the zoning provisions may be modified from the ones originally requested. If anything the setbacks will increase providing additional buffering and landscaped areas. Based on the Provincial Policy Statement the proposed development will meet the intent of the policies in the Provincial Policy Statement by providing additional multi price point housing units with a range and mix of housing types and tenures that will be connected to existing infrastructure located in the vicinity of the development. The proposed private housing development is consistent with these policies by encouraging the use of under-utilized lands by proposing a land use that can exist in harmony with the surrounding land uses and by creating opportunities for increased municipal taxes. Located near commercial uses, parks and schools as well as along transit routes, the proposed development will also provide opportunities for residents of all abilities to access other areas for the City of London. The proposed development observes the existing ESA boundary and provides a significant size buffer to allow for the protection enhancement, enhancement of Highbury Woods and the Meadowlily ESA surrounding the property. This allows for the redevelopment of the already residential land for a mix of housing types. Just based on, based on, The London Plan the subject site is located within the Urban Growth Boundary for the City of London and is designated Neighbourhood's Place type which permits a mix of residential uses on the site as proposed. The proposed development will consist of low rise, low coverage buildings that minimize problems of shadowing, view obstruction and loss of privacy. The applicant is requesting an amendment to the City of London Zoning by-law Z.-1 for a site specific Residential R-6 Zone that would permit the

proposed dwellings with the site specific setbacks and lot coverage provisions. The required parking for this type of development would be a minimum of two spaces for the single detached and townhouse units. All lots are units which will be able to support at least the required two spaces with most being able to provide more. A minimum of ten additional proposed business or parking spaces for the townhome blocks will also be provided. Further details will be provided upon the completion of the revised Zoning By-law Amendment, Site Plan and Draft Plan submissions.

- Councillor Cassidy: You have about 30 seconds left.
- Jason Johnson, Dillon Consulting: Ok. Sounds good. So just quickly to summarize the key benefits and features. So the proposed development is significantly scaled down, eighty nine units plus or minus compared to a maximum allowed density of more than two hundred and fifty units, generous front yard setbacks compared to the minimum required for units facing Meadowlily Road South, there is generous buffers provided as part of the development to protect Highbury Woods and the Meadowlily ESA, approximately four hundred and thirty meters of new public multi-use pathway will be created by the City within the generous buffers provided as part of the development, more trees and plants are to be planted than what would be removed during construction.
- Councillor Cassidy: Okay, Mr. Johnson you're, you're past your five minutes and knowing that we will be going through this again when the application comes back to us you'll have an opportunity to speak again at that time. So what I'm going to do now is go to committee room one and two where I see there are a number of members of the public present and if anybody would like to address the Committee there's a microphone in the room. You can come to the microphone and, and you'll each have five minutes. Come to the microphone, state your name and you'll have five minutes.
- Hi. My name is Gary Smith. I live at 141 Meadowlily Road South. I am a member of The Friends of Meadowlily Woods Community Association. I would like to address a few key items with regard to how it is our residents in our community feel about this proposal. First of all I've got to get some reassurance with regard to the fact that with regard to this deferral that it be stated definitely that if the deferral is allowed at the public process around this and everything be deferred and we get that opportunity for another public meeting when that the deferral comes, that's the first concern. Our next concern is our members and our residents would like to know what the wording is for that meeting with regard to making sure that correspondences and communications that are sent to the Planner and to the Clerks be attached to the agenda and not necessarily relegated to the staff report. I'd like to know what that wording is and thirdly while it is the case, sorry about my breath, that we have strived to find some way to be a cooperative and a part of the overall discussion with this that would it not be a matter that just because we want to defend our neighborhood, our community and our natural areas that we necessarily need to be uncooperative or aggressive in any way. In terms of further remarks I have some, some concerns about the definition of buffers and setbacks in this particular application with regard to two important issues if not three. Number one is that the existing conditions on Meadowlily Road South are such that most of the houses and most of the areas along our road have setbacks of somewhere between twenty-one to sixty meters off the road. The presentation by Mr. Corby suggests that the fewest a buffer with regard to this particular setback and buffer is somewhere between three and five meters. We consider that unacceptable if these structures are too close to the road. Number two, no, I was distracted. That's

the first issue was those buffers and a buffer on the back of the property isn't the issue, the buffer is between the most front buildings on this proposal and the edge of Meadowlily Road South on the West, that's the objection. Number two, there is the issue of the setbacks and buffers with regard to the protection of the ecological and environmental features of Meadowlily ESA especially as it borders on the East boundary of Meadowlily Road South as that was the original part of the ESA that was given to the City by the Frasier family in 1991. As far as how I understand the setbacks and buffers policy of the City as was given to me by Mr. Corby and other people that those buffers would in fact overhang or exceed the width of the road with regard to where the situation is right now and that numerous policies both provincial and also municipal suggested infrastructure not be installed or put in areas of such an important buffer. The third piece is that not only is the ESA there but there is also a matter there's a water course and a creek not just on the West side of the property but also on the East side of the property that comes off of Park Farm and goes all the way down to the river on the East side road and that too would suggest that there would be a buffer that would not only go a considerable length towards the other side of the road as well as the fact that trees along the ESA also overhang at numerous points the East side of the road and their ten meter buffer would also be on the other side, the West side, of Meadowlily Road South so we object. Appreciate your time. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr Smith. The questions that you asked at the beginning we will get to those when the public participation meeting is finished and staff will answer all of the questions that are raised. Is there anybody else that would like to address the Committee in committee room one or two or three?
- My name is Bruce Richardson. I live at 25 Meadowlily Road South. The only concern we have is the mention of ESA and setbacks and there is mention of the Highbury Woods setbacks and there is no mention whatsoever of the Meadowlily Nature Preserve which is directly to the North of 101 Meadowlily and we ask why or if it could be included. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Richardson. Any other members of the public that would like to speak?
- Carol Richardson, my address is 1200 Riverside Drive. I'm a friend, I'm not a member of the Friends of Meadowlily Woods and donor of the Meadowlily Nature Preserve, my husband and I donated back to the City of London. My question basically is this, when I heard that they applied for only eighty-nine units when you could have gone for more, I understand right now its Urban Reserve and maybe the Planning people can answer this. If it's Urban Reserve and it's rezoned, they're asking for an R-6, which I think allows a very high density it, are there any other options in rezoning, for instance, can it be R-2 or I just don't understand this zoning situation and so will our Councillors have any option to R-6 when they finally vote? Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mrs. Richardson. Anybody else care to speak to the Planning Committee?
- My name is Susan Smith, I live at 141 Meadowlily Road South. I have lived in that house, sorry, I am a nineteen year resident of Meadowlily Road. I moved to this area because of its natural features. This area gives us space to live in joy and enjoy its beauty. This area of Meadowlily is a gem in Southeast London although I've heard some people say that they wanted to live here as part of this process and I agree that the people are entitled to live in this area but the reason they want to live here is because of its natural beauty, the, the water features,

the, the trees, the plants, the birds, the deer, the wide open spaces. If we put this development there it is being taken away. The reason for wanting to be in this area doesn't make sense if they're going to build all these houses. My church says preserve the integrity of Meadowlily Road South, keep it green, the back growing responsibility environmentally ecologically and now I do not want this large development in my neighborhood. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mrs. Smith. Anyone else care to speak to the Committee?
- My name is Zander Stolarksi, my mother lives on 147 Meadowlily Road South. We've lived there almost fifty years. I knew the Fraser family, the Kemps, everybody that was in that area originally and Mr Fraser gave us a gift, he gave the City a beautiful gift in which is so important not just to the City but to visitors that we can maintain a forest city and preserve it in ways that we can embrace and touch our past at the same time as grow in appropriate areas. My question is can Urban Reserve still be designated as a green space and kept as a green space? That's, that's all I have to say. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Any other members of the public? I see someone in committee room three, if you would care to state your name, Sir, and then you'll have five minutes.
- Yes, Dennis Weir. I'm here today to speak against this proposal. I would urge Council to deny the application totally. It is very much inappropriate it's one of the few beautiful historic areas in the City of London and this would be a travesty if this development is allowed to proceed. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Weir. Did I see someone in a number five ready to come? Okay, there we are, committee room five. State your name. Five minutes.
- My name's Ron Hicks. I live in London for thirty-four, thirty-five, years now. We, my wife and I, especially in Covid, have done a lot of walking around different parts of the city. We discovered Meadowlily this year although we've heard about it before and right now it's one of our go to places. It's, it's just a breath of fresh air in there and somebody else mentioned the wildlife, it's the river running through it, even when we first went down there we saw the Meadowlily Feed Farm and I think he was saying, don't quote me, but if this whole development grows in that's going to destroy a lot of that. It's going to have all this machinery going on and things like that. I think it's just way too big for that particular area but the thing that's got me lately is in London there seems to be a lot of development and I'm not against development but I'm against development that takes up valuable, valuable ecological space and I feel Meadowlily is one those, there's other areas around, we go to Dorchester ponds as well but it's just a personal feeling I don't have a lot of facts about it but it's some place that we enjoy and I know a lot of people who we see on the trail enjoy it as well. I just don't see, I'd, I'd ask the Committee to really think about before they accept this application. It sounds reasonable in some ways now but I think in the future just like out on Southdale Road, past Wonderland, it's growing so huge now that is just unbelievable. We first moved out there, there was nothing but farm land so just to just to get a good consideration. I know the public appreciate it. Ok. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr Hicks. Any other members? Ok. I see you in number, in committee room three, go ahead. State your name.

- Hi there. It is Kelley McKeating, I live at 329 Victoria Street and I'm speaking on behalf of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. This development proposal in my view is the antithesis of The London Plan's desire to build inward and upward. Meadowlily Road is an idyllic little country laneway that has not changed substantially since the farmhouses on that street were first built almost two hundred years ago. It, as other people have mentioned, there is ESA and nature preserve land on three sides of the proposed development and also there's a designated property on Park Farm on the Southeast, adjacent to the property on the Southeast corner. With respect to Mr. Corby's comments, I think like most members of the public we're only seeing a proposed buffer on two sides, on the North and on the West and I think that arguably a buffer on the East side is at least as important both for the ESA and for Park Farm and driveways and front lawns, in my world, they're not buffers. What we would propose is that the development be required to have a significantly larger setback from Meadowlily Road and that there be a single access road rather than driveways for fifty-two townhouse units directly onto Meadowlily Road. One of the things that I noticed as I was plowing through the ninety-three page planning report was the comments from the Transportation department about site lines and it appeared to be saying that trimming and removing of trees from the ESA was going to be required in order to allow the two hundred seventy-three people in this development to access their homes safely. One thing that I and, and I just, it concerns me that that's not really well thought through because to just widely say we had to cut some trees down, I just don't think that that should ever be done lightly particularly not in a protected area like this and one thing that I fear is that after these two hundred and seventy-three people are living in this subdivision they will start to understand how tiny the laneway is that is Meadowlily Road, they'll start to realize how narrow and difficult to navigate it is in the winter time and they're going to be lobbying to have it widened and widened and made more car friendly and that pressure if it succeeds could irreversibly alter the character of the neighborhood in a way that I don't think anyone who lives there wants. The ACO's recommendations are again to have a significant buffer on the East side of the property that involves native trees, like real forests so that the homes are not visible or very visible from the road, a single access road off Meadowlily Road and a design for the town homes and the single family homes that is more in keeping with the rural character of the area. It seems to me that the comments of the Heritage Planners in the planning report dated May 5 of their comments are it's not clear to me that their suggestions for the recommendations of Mr. Dingman in the Heritage Impact Assessment have been addressed and to close I have one small question is it doesn't appear that LACH has been involved in this and was not asked to provide comments and I'm curious about why that is, why that didn't happen. Thanks.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Thank you Ms. McKeating. Any other members of the public who would like to speak? There you are, go ahead, state your name. Five minutes.
- Resident: I am also a resident of the City of London and I'm also here to speak against the proposal. I'm a mother of three, an Environmentalist and I'm also completing my Masters currently at Western in Sustainability and I agree entirely that this is a terrible idea. I know that it's an emotional topic for some. The avid trail users that use this area are not being taken into account. Twenty four residents? What about all the people that use these trails on a daily basis. I bring my children hiking there every day they're learning about the natural world in their area, in their hometown. If we continue to build more property, more homes in this area it is going to affect the biodiversity in this area. I'm sorry to be a little bit emotional but like this place is close to my heart as it is many residents of London. I was just there last weekend and it was happening, not last weekend

but the weekend before. It was unbelievable the amount of cars and the amount of people that were using the trail if we continue to develop there is, the exact area, I don't know how many of you keep up, how many of the people sitting on this Committee have ever used this trail and appreciated its natural beauty but there is plenty of wildlife and large animals, mammals, coyotes, deer, that regularly frequent the place, the exact place where they want to built so in keeping with the City of London's Climate Action Plan which should be more ambitious, we're looking, you know, in comparison with other cities, the City of Vancouver, they want to be known as the greenest city; we want to be known as the Forest City, if we want to be the Forest City, we have to keep our, our forest with trees, forested, we can't just replant trees, these are mature trees. Planting new trees is not going to have the same impact. If we, I'm just going to go to the City website, I'm going to use this time because this is important and I urge all of you sitting here today to go for a hike at Meadowlily. I'm not kidding, this is really important before we are going to start learning habitat's and putting in new homes you guys need to know what you're agreeing to. This examples of topics under review include: Thames River, river and flood impacts on infrastructure, this area is right on the water. It's on a hill, if you guys are familiar with this land, get to Meadowlily like, like this, this lady was saying, you have to drive down hill in the winter. I'm a trail runner and I have to park at the top because the road is that dangerous to drive down in the winter months when it snows. Okay so the Thames River that's a huge part of the Climate Action Plan the City of London is claiming to care about. Energy and greenhouse gas emissions these trees, this area needs to be protected. I implore with all of you tonight to seriously consider this. Slope Stability Study, Emergency Management preparations, do the residents, the future residents of this development know they're going to be responsible for the cost that, that, that they were saying that they're going to have to be held responsible for emergency storm sewer operation costs. I mean there are so many things I could go on and I don't want to waste everybody's time because I know that this meeting is probably going longer than already expected but please, for homework, all of you go and go for a hike in there and then come back with your decision. Please the Climate Action Plan is a real scenario that needs to be worked on yesterday, we're already late and we should be a leader. The Forest City should be a leader for all of Canada and if we do that development it's shameful. I want to live there, too. I love that area, I love that area with all my heart but if we continue putting homes there that areas not going to be anything to love. It's time to not only mitigate climate change, adaptation we need to not only not ruin more green spaces we need to plant more green spaces in the city. There are so many wonderful places all over the city that could use development. This area is not one of them. Thank you for your time.

- Councillor Cassidy: Okay. Is there anybody else who would like to address the Committee? I'll ask one more time in any of the committee rooms, do we have members of the public who would like to speak before we close the public participation portion of this meeting? All right. I'm not seeing anyone and I have one last comment the City Clerk is going to read a comment that was received by a member of the public who is quite ill and could not attend the meeting
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Thank you Madam Chair. This is from Nancy Tausky, from 107 Western Road. (See attached communication.)
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Madam Clerk and if you are in communication with Ms. Tausky please give our regards and hope that she has a quick recovery. Also I look for a motion from Committee to close the public participation meeting.

NANCY Z. TAUSKY
Heritage Consultant

Grosvenor Lodge
1017 Western Road
London, ON N6G 1G5

October 5, 2020

City Clerk
PEC@london.ca

RE: DEVELOPMENT AT 101 MEADOWLILY ROAD

To Members of the Planning and Environment Committee:

I want to thank Staff and the Developer for making several adjustments in keeping with heritage requirements: e.g., sympathetic gates, setbacks of townhouses facing Meadowlily Rd., “lighting that controls and prevents lighting bleed and glare” from Park Farm.

I do have two further requests, however, which seem to me crucial in preserving something of the character of Meadowlily Road and the view from Park Farm that plays an essential role in defining its character (see the HIA):

1. **Deeper Screening between Meadowlily Road and the Development.** Especially with driveways leading directly on to Meadowlily Road, the proposed boulevard plantings will not be adequate.
2. **A Public Participation Meeting to discuss proposed building design within the development.** As the HIA points out, the models shown in the tentative proposal are too urban and sharp-edged for their natural and heritage-related context. We look forward to more appropriate designs.

Thank you for considering these requests.

Sincerely,

Nancy Tausky