

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Implementing Additional Residential Units requirements of the Planning Act (Bill 108) (OZ-9176)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr Parker. So now I will go to the members of the public in the committee rooms. You can come to the microphone, one at a time, state your name and you have five minutes to address the Committee.
- Thanks Council. My name is Kris Romnes. I believe I spoke with Chuck via email. I'm in support of the the, the changes definitely and he provided me with a bit of clarity. For just some more further clarity, if a homeowner has an existing duplex or converted dwelling, would a property owner be allowed to add a third detached unit? That's all. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Anybody else in the committee room who would like to address the Committee?
- Hey, how's it going? I'm Matt Arsenault. I just have a question about the forty percent total gross floor area. So say I have a house that's two thousand square feet, I'd take the forty percent, I could build eight hundred square foot addition off the back as a secondary dwelling if it's for the, for three units does that mean my addition off the back only be four hundred square feet? I can only build four hundred square feet in the basement? Okay. We'll get answers to those questions.
- Councillor Cassidy: Any other members of the public who would like to address the Committee on this?
- Hello Committee members. I just want to add that the current, is the current zoning regulation for an accessory structure, they need to be reviewed and possibly amended by Council in order for you to support the eighty use as an accessory structure. As they stand today, they are very restrictive and there will be a difficulty and an obstacle to do them in an accessory dwelling. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Any other members of the public?
- Good evening Councillors, Committee members and Mr. Mayor. My name is Victor Anastase. I just want to have a couple statements read here about this Bill. So clearly it's an important decision point for the City of London. Right now we, we are in great need of additional housing stock, that much is clear based on our affordable housing policies and some of the data points out there. I think this is a good opportunity for a gentle intensification which is what a lot of people are in favor of. So we have to understand that if this policy is implemented successfully and it's not overly restrictive it's going to lead to not just additional housing stock but a lot of consumer spending, jobs for the local trades and additional sources of income for the City. There are development charges involved, there are increased property taxes as a result of this work that's done with permits so this is good income sources for the City. That being said, one of the main policy points is that the rules to be implemented are not overly restrictive. As it stands right now, the current forty percent gross floor area is a confusing point to many people who actually create these units. The new proposal for forty-five percent of gross floor area also becomes a moving target and, and is somewhat confusing and restrictive. So to give an example under the new proposed policy by the City of London let's say you had an eleven hundred square foot above ground bungalow with eleven hundred square feet above ground, if you added a five hundred square foot basement apartment and

four hundred square foot ancillary dwellings so like a bunkie in your backyard, you would add the five hundred and four hundred square feet together divided by the, the new total gross floor area which would be two thousand to achieve the forty-five percent rule so that means under the new rule there would be six hundred square feet in that basement that is currently unused. This is also occurring with secondary dwellings, there's already a lot of square footage that's being wasted and the danger is that people who do this legally there might be people who do it legally and then further use that space in an illegal fashion and it's not benefiting people when you can have a larger footprint in your basement of either a bungalow or a back split for that or even a side split for that matter, even a semi-detached dwelling. So I feel like these policies are very, very restrictive, especially the new ones when you're adding a third unit and it would benefit the City of London to follow other cities such as Edmonton, Windsor, Kitchener, just to name a couple where either a maximum bedroom limit is introduced, for example, seven bedrooms, we currently have five maximum bedrooms. Therefore you would have either a studio one bedroom or two bedroom third unit added or a maximum square footage for the third unit of course respecting the required setbacks, property setbacks. Just some cities are doing a thousand square feet, others are doing even more. This absolute square footage or maximum number of bedrooms would eliminate the confusion with the gross floor area that seems to be one of the most prevailing points that the City of London does differently than other municipalities and it's not really benefiting the diversity of housing stock so I would highly urge review on those two key points to create a lot of housing stock in a way that is gentle and is also borne by private citizens. It doesn't require like public funding the way affordable housing does from the provincial and federal governments, this is all born essentially one hundred percent by private homeowners so it's obviously a key matter and I thank you for your time.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Are there other members of the public would like to address the Committee? Okay. State your name, you have 5 minutes.
- Hello Committee. I'm Richard Duench. I'm here representing the Orchard Park Sherwood Forest Ratepayers Association. I've served on the Board for ten years and had the pleasure of meeting several of you during that time. I'm here today to state that we aren't, we are in support of this current draft. This will not upset our good balance within our near campus neighborhood. It's not everything we wanted but it's workable and a reasonable approach for near campus areas by Fanshawe Western. There has been extensive public input gained over the past five years to get here so we are in support in moving forward with these limits and necessary controls such as the coverage percentage limit of forty percent GFA, the limits on townhouses and, he, once you put it in place we can do an overview in two years and tweak as necessary. We just, we're concerned if they, if they did deviate from the past five years of work on this file and made some rash decisions there could be unintended consequences and we'd ask that if there was going to be deviation that it gets referred back to staff and that's it. Thank you very much for the option to speak.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you sir. Anybody else? No. Great. Okay. Thank you so much. Thank you to everybody who addressed the Committee. So I have two questions that I've made note of but the first one of I'm not clear on it was Mr. Romnes, I believe, had asked a question about the ability to add a third unit but I, I wonder Mr. Romnes if you want to come back to the microphone and just repeat your question.
- Kris Romnes: Yep. Absolutely. Thanks. So it was just some clarity and I, I spoke with Chuck via email about this the other day. If a homeowner has an existing converted dwelling, so if there's two units within an existing property

now, can they add a third unit being in as an accessory structure on that property even though the existing two units, I mean they were existing before the original by-law had passed so it wouldn't be considered technically an accessory dwelling unit, the second unit within that home.

- Councillor Cassidy: Great. Thank you so much. Thanks. Okay so with that I will look for a motion to close the public participation meeting. Moved by Councillor Turner and seconded by the Mayor except we'll hold off on that because somebody's standing up.
- My name is Sagi and just as a clarification what was said about the two units, so in specific if someone has a duplex property, in order to add a accessory, accessory unit, it will have to go back to become a single family dwelling and then convert back to a duplex. So a duplex property would be able to, the question is if a duplex property will be able to have accessory, accessory building and if not it raises the issue of then that duplex property can go back to the original or in a residential area to go back to like a single family and add two units there so that causes a bit of an issue and not including the duplex property in this Bill.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. So now we do have a motion to close the PPM. It's been moved and seconded. Make sure one last time there's nobody else. Okay. Okay. Come to the microphone and state your name and you have five minutes.
- I'm a real estate investor in London here and I currently have two duplex conversions under way right now so I just want you to consider two things: one, bedroom limits because, for example, I'm currently turning a bungalow, it's a three bedroom main floor bungalow, I'm building a secondary suite in the basement adding two bedrooms, that forty percent rule is a real big pain in the rear end. My tenants will enjoy a really big furnace room and a lot less of a footprint to actually enjoy living in; the other issue is I'm actually excited about the three unit thing I'd love to add a bunkie in my backyard. I have a huge backyard, it's in East London. I can easily add another unit out there, lots of parking, it would work really well, it would add some more living space for people but if it's limited at five bedrooms I'm not sure how I could do that. Also if I did build a bunkie I would like it to be a minimum of two bedrooms, it would probably just be a maximum two bedroom to make it affordable. My two bedroom basement secondary dwelling unit that I'm building is just so you know it's costing me one hundred and fifty thousand to build it, that's what it costs for new sewer lines, water lines, electric, plumbing, I keep track of all that stuff to make it legal, right, you know with all the permits and BCIN drawings and all of the contractors and everything else. So it's very expensive to build a unit. I'm just a, just a single income earner, I was actually, I don't even have a job anymore so thanks to Covid so it's very expensive to build these things. So we, we do need to have a little more room for the bedroom issue like five bedrooms is a little bit crazy, I mean a lot of people's regular single family primary residence have five bedrooms. So if you can consider that I'd appreciate it. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. So I'll check in those two committee rooms one more time. Are there any members of the public who would like to address the Committee? I see one more.
- My name is Therron Jones. I'm on the Ratepayers as well for Orchard Park Sherwood Forest. I think one of the things having participated in this much like Rich over the last ten years and meeting with various community groups. Those communities that are close to the campuses of Western, Fanshawe, have a unique situation because we want to support affordable housing but we need it

balanced with student housing and we appreciate the student make up in our communities is very important and it needs to be balanced and it needs controls and we found that the proposals by City staff to, to cap floor areas and bedroom limits has had a very positive effect overall in the balance of, of the intensification of student housing in our areas. We, we have it, we support it but if it goes unchecked without limits we've we see the ramifications of that and more mature areas of the London's student housing areas where it's very intense, it's high density and it's, it's not in control. So again we, we believe staff has put a lot of thought into this at a lot of input and, and we support the recommendations. Thank you.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Any other members of the public who would like to speak to this item? One more time. Any other members of the public would care to address the Committee? Okay. We have a motion to close the public participation meeting it's been moved and seconded.