

# Planning and Environment Committee

## Report

The 1st Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee  
December 14, 2020

PRESENT: Councillors P. Squire (Chair), S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins,  
S. Hillier, Mayor E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: H. Lysynski, L. Morris, J. Raycroft, C. Saunders, J.W. Taylor and  
B. Westlake-Power

Councillors M. Cassidy and E. Pelozo; G. Barrett, M. Butlin, M.  
Corby, I. De Ceuster, M. Feldberg, K. Gonyou, P. Kokkoros, G.  
Kotsifas, S. Meksula, B. O'Hagan, M. Tomazincic, M. Wu and P.  
Yeoman

The meeting is called to order at 4:00 PM, with Councillor P.  
Squire in the Chair, Councillors S. Lewis, S. Lehman and A.  
Hopkins present and all other Members participating by remote  
attendance

### 1. Call to Order

#### 1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

#### 1.2 Election of Vice Chair for the term ending November 30, 2021

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That Councillor Hopkins BE ELECTED as Vice Chair of the Planning and  
Environment Committee for the term ending November 30, 2021.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E.  
Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

### 2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That Items 2.1 to 2.6, inclusive, BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

#### 2.1 4th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That S. Levin, Chair, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory  
Committee (EEPAC) BE GRANTED authority to draft a summary of

comments from EEPAC members with respect to the City of London 2021 Budget Update for submission to the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee; it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the 4th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee from its meeting held on November 26, 2020.

**Motion Passed**

2.2 Argyle Regeneration Study Recommendations

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the Argyle Area Regeneration Study:

- a) the staff report dated December 14, 2020, entitled "Argyle Regeneration Study Recommendations" BE RECEIVED for information; and,
- b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to undertake the development of a Community Improvement Plan for the Argyle area;

it being noted that any potential funding requirements associated with the Argyle Community Improvement Plan will be identified for Council's consideration as part of a comprehensive review and recommendation on funding levels for all Community Improvement Plan programs, prior to the 2024-2027 Multi Year Budget process.

**Motion Passed**

2.3 Application - 3087 White Oak Road - Removal of Holding Provisions (h, h-100, h-161 and h-227) (H-9235)

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Whiterock Village Inc., relating to the property located at 3087 White Oak Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 14, 2020 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on January 12, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h\*h-100\*h-161\*R1-3 (21)) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision h\*h-100\*h-161\*R1-3 (22)) Zone TO a Residential R1 Special Provision R1-3 (21) Zone, and a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-3 (22)) Zone to remove the h, h-100, h-161 and h-227 holding provisions.

**Motion Passed**

2.4 Application - Removal of Holding Provision - 1093 Westdel Bourne (H-9185)

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Norquay Developments, relating to a portion of the lands located at 1093 Westdel Bourne, the proposed by-law

appended to the staff report dated December 14, 2020 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on January 12, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a holding Residential R1 (h.h-82\*R1-4) TO a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone to remove the holding provisions.

**Motion Passed**

2.5 Subsections 45 (1.3) and (1.4) of the Planning Act Regarding the Two-Year Freeze on Minor Variances Following a Privately Initiated Zoning Amendment

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to Minor Variances as per subsections 45 (1.3) and (1.4) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*:

- a) the staff report dated December 14, 2020 entitled "Subsections 45 (1.3) and (1.4) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13* regarding the two-year freeze on Minor Variances following a privately initiated Zoning Amendment" BE RECEIVED for information;
- b) the Municipal Council BE REQUESTED to resolve that subsection 45 (1.3) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13* shall not apply, pursuant to subsection 45 (1.4) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*;
- c) pursuant to subsection 45 (1.4) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, all Minor Variances shall be exempted from the two-year moratorium contemplated in subsection 45 (1.3) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13* except for the following classes of applications:
  - i) applications for Minor Variance to any zone that is in conjunction with an h-5 holding provision requiring a public site plan review;
  - ii) applications for Minor Variance to any Bonus Zones passed under S.37 of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*;
  - iii) applications for Minor Variance to modify a regulation permitted by Special Provision;
  - iv) applications for Minor Variance to a General Provision (Section 4) within the Z.-1 Zoning By-law; and,
  - v) applications for Minor Variance to change a Definition (Section 2) within the Z.-1 Zoning By-law.

**Motion Passed**

2.6 Building Division Monthly Report for October 2020

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the Building Division Monthly Report for October 2020 BE RECEIVED for information.

**Motion Passed**

### 3. Scheduled Items

#### 3.1 Application - Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium - 3542 Emilycarr Lane 39CD-19516

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Goldfield Ltd., relating to the property located at 3542 Emilycarr Lane:

- a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium relating to the property located at 3542 Emilycarr Lane; and,
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the Site Plan Approval application relating to the property located at 3542 Emilycarr Lane;

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 proposed Vacant Land Condominium is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, which directs new development to designated growth areas and areas adjacent to existing development;
- the proposed Vacant Land Condominium conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan including but not limited to Our Tools, Key Directions, and the Neighbourhoods Place Type policies;
- the proposed Vacant Land Condominium conforms to the policies of the Southwest Area Secondary Plan and will implement an appropriate housing form for the North Longwoods Neighbourhood; and,
- the proposed Vacant Land Condominium conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential Designation and will implement an appropriate form of residential development for the site.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

### 3.2 Application - 260 Sarnia Road (Z-9246)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Shana'a Holdings Inc., relating to the property located at 260 Sarnia Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 14, 2020 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on January 12, 2021 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 R1 (R1-9) Zone TO a Residential R8 Special Provision (R8-4 ( \_)) Zone;

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 requested amendment is consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 that encourage efficient development and land use patterns that support the use of transit and active transportation where it exists;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan including but limited to the Key Directions, City Design policies, and Neighbourhoods Place Type policies that contemplate townhouses as a primary permitted use where the property has frontage on a Civic Boulevard;
- the requested amendment conforms to the Residential Intensification policies of The London Plan and the 1989 Official Plan which direct intensification to ensure that character and compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood is maintained. The subject lands represent an appropriate location for Residential Intensification, within the Built-Area Boundary and Primary Transit Area, along a higher-order street at the periphery of an existing neighbourhood. The recommended amendment would permit development at an intensity that is appropriate for the site and the surrounding neighbourhood; and,
- the requested amendment is consistent with the policies for Near Campus Neighbourhoods in The London Plan and the 1989 Official Plan, insofar as the site is unique within its context and has special attributes that warrant a site-specific amendment to permit the proposed form and intensity of development. As well, the site can reasonably accommodate the use, intensity and form of the proposed use.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

3.3 Application - Applewood Subdivision - 660 Sunningdale Road East - Application for Zoning By-law Amendment - Request for Revisions to Draft Plan Subdivision 39T-09501 (Z-9243)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Auburn Developments Ltd., relating to portions of the lands located at 660 Sunningdale Road East:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 14, 2020 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on January 12, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h\*h-100\*h-173\*R1-4(27) Zone TO a Holding Residential R4 Special Provision (h\*h-100\*h-173\*R4-6( )) Zone, FROM a Holding Residential R1/R4 Special Provision (h\*h-100\*h-173\*R1-3)/R1-4(27) Zone TO a Holding Residential R5/R6 Special Provision (h\*h-100\*h-173\*R5-6(\_\_)/R6-5(\_\_)) Zone; Special provisions for the proposed R5-6(\_\_)/R6-5(\_\_) zone would include rear yard decks to encroach in the yard setback as per section 4.27 (5) but may be closer than the stipulated maximum of 1.2m (3.9 feet) permitted;
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports the proposed red-line revisions to the draft-approved plan of subdivision as submitted by Clawson Group Inc., prepared by Archibald, Gray & McKay Engineering Ltd. (Drawing No. DP 1, Office File: 1442-1 dated June 4, 2020), which shows the amalgamation of Blocks 21-24, Blocks 27-29, Block 26, Block 30 and Streets "H", "J", Moon Street and Luna Crescent SUBJECT TO the conditions contained in staff report dated December 14, 2020 as Appendix 'A-2'; and,
- c) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the proposed red-line revisions to the draft plan of subdivision for Applewood Subdivision, as submitted by Clawson Group Inc.;

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 zoning amendments and revisions to draft plan of subdivision are considered appropriate and consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
- the proposed and recommended amendments conform to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to Our Strategy, Our City and the Key Directions, as well as conforming to the policies of the Neighbourhoods Place Type;
- the proposed and recommended amendments conform to the policies of the (1989) Official Plan, specifically Low Density Residential and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential; and,
- the zoning and red-line revisions as proposed are compatible and in keeping with the character of the existing neighbourhood.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

#### **4. Items for Direction**

None.

#### **5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business**

##### **5.1 Deferred Matters List**

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the Director, City Planning and City Planner and the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official

BE DIRECTED to update the Deferred Matters List to remove any items that have been addressed by the Civic Administration.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

5.2 (ADDED) 1st Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 1st Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from its meeting held on December 9, 2020:

a) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the heritage designated property at 660 Sunningdale Road East (2370 Blackwater Road), the following actions be taken:

i) Notice BE GIVEN under the provisions of Section 30.1(4) of the Ontario Heritage Act, R. S. O. 1990, c. O. 18, of Municipal Council's intention to pass a by-law to amend the legal description of the property designated to be of cultural heritage value or interest by By-law No. L.S.P.-3476-474, as amended, as defined in the staff report dated December 9, 2020 as Appendix B; and,

ii) should no appeals be received to Municipal Council's notice of intention to pass a by-law to amend the legal description of the property, a by-law BE INTRODUCED at a future meeting of Municipal Council immediately following the end of the appeal period;

it being noted that should an appeal to Municipal Council's notice of intent to pass a by-law to amend the legal description of the property be received, the City Clerk will refer the appeal to the Conservation Review Board;

b) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act for consent to alter the heritage designated property at 660 Sunningdale Road East (2370 Blackwater Road) BE GIVEN subject to the following terms and conditions:

- the mortar used in the adaptive reuse colour match the existing mortar;
- a corrugated sheet metal roof material, as shown in Appendix D6, be used for the roof of the barns and their gable ends;
- the replica concrete piers faithfully replicate the details of the original concrete piers, including the colour and casting details/lines;
- within amendment(s) to this Heritage Alteration Permit, the following details be provided:
  - specifications on the proposed outer windows;
  - specification on the proposed new doors/doorways;
  - specifications on the proposed interior walls of the barns, demonstrating their reversibility, the protection of the interior clay tiles, as well as the cladding/finish of the interior walls;
- mechanical and electrical requirements required to facilitate the adaptive reuse of the barns;
- approval authority for subsequent amendment to this Heritage Alteration Permit required to implement the adaptive reuse of the red barns be delegated to the City Planner;
- the Civic Administration be directed to pursue a Heritage Easement



Agreement with the property owner to define the scope and extent of the interior clay tile required for preservation;

- where possible, the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed; and,
- the property owner commemorate and interpret the cultural heritage value of the barns, the adaptive reuse of the barns, and the three original barns through signage;

it being noted that a verbal delegation from R. Redshaw, MHBC, with respect to this matter, was received;

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 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 iron (metal) with a painted or powder coated finish as depicted in the staff report dated December 9, 2020 as Appendix C; 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 retroactive approval for the alterations to the heritage designated property at 61 Wilson Avenue, within the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED as submitted in the drawings appended to the staff report dated December 9, 2020 as Appendix C with terms and conditions that all exposed wood be painted within one year of Municipal Council's decision;

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 on English Street, within the Old East Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED;

f) the London Advisory Committee on Heritage 2021 membership with the Community Heritage Ontario BE APPROVED; it being noted that the CHOnews newsletter for Autumn 2020, was received; and,

g) clauses 1.1 and 1.2 and 3.1 to 3.3, inclusive, BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 PM.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium – 3542 Emily Carr Lane 39CD-19516

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Are there any technical questions from the Committee? Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Chair and through you I have got a question about the h-9281 provision. It's under review, if you could just give me a few more details about that provision.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Sorry, are you referencing the new application for holding provision that just was circulated?
- Councillor Hopkins: That's right. I'm referencing on page 61 the application for the removal of the holding provision 9281 and just trying to understand the sequencing of events here.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Sure. So the holding for that provision for that application was just received and circulated for comment. Basically, no development can occur until those holding provisions are removed but we can move forward with the site plan process and the vacant land condominium process because completing that site plan process will actually allow us to remove a lot of those holding provisions.
- Councillor Hopkins. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Any other technical questions only from the Committee? Alright, there being none, we will open it up for public participation. Is there any calls or people in the overflow to make comments? Madam Clerk?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Thank you Mr. Chair. There are no calls. I would ask if committee room number five could confirm whether there's any members of the public in the committee room regarding this application?
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. Before you start I just want to indicate that you'll have up to five minutes to make any comments that you might have and we try to, try to hold that strictly to the time limit so that being said, go ahead.
- Scott Allen, MHBC Planning: Thank you Mr. Chair and good afternoon Committee. My name is Scott Allen. I'm with MHBC Planning. We're acting on behalf of the applicant. At this time we just want to express our support for the recommendations of the planning report as presented by Mr. Corby and we'd also like to thank Mr. Corby for his assistance through this process. Thank you and we will gladly answer any questions Committee members may have.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Not even close to the five minutes. Well done. Any other public comments? It doesn't appear there are any. Am I right? All right then I'll just need a motion to, well, we're not going to close the public participation meeting. We'll go on to the second matter at this point in time.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 260 Sarnia Road – (Z-9246)

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Are there any technical questions from the Committee? There doesn't appear to be any technical questions so we are going to go to public participation. No calls. Alright. So we'll go to the, there are no telephone calls so we'll go to the committee room for public comment. Thank you very much. Thanks for coming. As I indicated to the previous speaker you'll be allowed five minutes for your presentation and go ahead.
- Thank you Councillor Squire and Committee members. My name is Laverne Kirkness Consulting and Strik Baldinelli Monez Planners and Engineers as it is now and I act for Ayman Shanaa, who is behind me at the back of the room should you have any questions but he is the owner and the proponent of this development. He has owned the property for approximately five years. So, Committee, you have a report and recommendation in front of you. Monica Wu presented to you and we agree with that report and agree with the draft by-law and hope that you'll take that to Council and recommend it but I just want to be clear that basically eight bed, eight units are proposed here. At the front it's two storeys, at the back it's three but it's a total of sixteen bedrooms. I just got a bit confused in the presentation as to twenty-four and eighteen but I want to assure you that it's, they're two bedroom units, they're specifically designed to be smaller with a kind of a household unit to be smaller, that's more manageable. We know that they are students that will likely occupy this. The proponent advises me that in the five years that he's owned the place, he's never needed more than two or three parking spaces in any semester of the University and it's because we're only within a kilometer, half a kilometer of, of the campus itself so people move here, want a place here because they don't have a vehicle and don't want one. David Yuhasz of Zedd Architecture, we feel, really did a great job here and I think we can attest to it because we, it did appear in front of the Urban Design Panel and they were pretty much favourably disposed towards it. They did make some suggestions about reducing pavement and increasing planting area, which we did implement on that final sketch by reducing the, the for example the aisle of six meters to the backyard is now 4.5. We did a lot of reports including stormwater management, sanitary capacity, archaeology, heritage impact, neighbourhood character, land use compatibility, urban design and planning justification so we have really addressed the policy framework and in particular the Near Campus Neighbourhoods which are a rough set of policies to kind of get through but we hope that you would agree that, with the staff report that this is appropriate intensification and meets the policy framework. We did try to deal with the four concerns from the circulation of the application to the public. I suspect that there were somewhere around fifty to seventy-five letters that went out to households in the neighbour, in the neighbourhood. We only got five replies back, four concerns, one in support but we feel that we have addressed those in our site design and our building design and I think the staff really agree and we really appreciate if we go to the very last sentence of their report, Mr. Chairman, I, I can't help but want to read it because I think that that's so true based on these unique attributes which Monica described in terms of the site design and building design features. A site specific amendment for residential intensification at this location is reasonable and serve as a positive and appropriate example for similar, similar locations along the or in the Near Campus neighbourhood areas. I think that stands pretty tall and I sure hope that you would agree with me but I'm here to answer any questions should you have any. Thanks.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much Mr. Kirkness. Any other public comments from the committee room? It doesn't appear so and we don't have any calls so what I would like to do now if there's no more input is to close the public participation meeting with regard to items 3.1 and 3.2.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – Applewood Subdivision – 660 Sunningdale Road East – Application for Zoning By-law Amendment – Request for Revisions to Draft Plan Subdivision 39T-09501 (Z-9243)

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. I see Councillor Cassidy's here, the Ward Councillor. Welcome. Any technical questions from the Committee or Councillor Cassidy? I'll let you go ahead Councillor Cassidy. You're, you're first.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks for recognizing me at your Committee. I have a couple of questions for staff. Number one, I wonder if you could give me, I understand there was a resurveying being done but in real terms, what is the adjustment to the park pathway going to mean?
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Sean Meksula, Senior Planner: I'm sorry. Through the Chair it had been resurveyed twice in the past two years and with the adjustment, there was just like a minor adjustment so it's very negligible on the survey so it's just readjusting the lines the way they were surveyed so that they're correct at this time.
- Councillor Cassidy: Okay. So just one more Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Councillor Cassidy: So we're changing nine that used to be single-detached blocks, single family blocks and replacing them with a couple of medium multi-family blocks that I see in the report that will mean two hundred twelve units. Can you, do you have an idea of how many individual dwelling units were originally in the plan when it was single-detached?
- Sean Meksula, Senior Planner: Through the Chair, I am not sure how many single-family houses were originally destined for this area. That being said, the original plan of subdivision came through for this was for a cluster development and then it was rezoned to allow for the single detached and now it's going back to the cluster development.
- Councillor Cassidy: Okay. Thanks.
- Councillor Cassidy: Alright. Thank you Councillor. Any other further just technical questions right now? Alright. It doesn't appear, there's nobody on the phone in terms of public participation. Is there anybody in committee room five? One person. Go ahead.
- Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. My name is Paul Hinde, Principal of Tanfield Consulting, representing the Clawson Group. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and just briefly we are in support of the staff recommendation going forward to Planning Committee through to Council in the coming months. I appreciate the efforts that Mr. Meksula has undertaken in order to get this to you tonight and we look forward to continuing a development that has been long, long on the books for a number of years. Just to address Councillor Cassidy's couple questions, there was originally pre-2018, the two blocks were zoned for single-family housing but it was in a block nature so the individual lots were not actually created at that time so there wasn't a specific number because it would have been done at a later point when the blocks were divided up into individual lots but this redline revision is to go back to the pre-

2018 time frame when it was two blocks for multi-family, multi-family cluster housing. As you're fully aware, that form of development is very sought after right now and it's really to recognize a change in market conditions once again over the years as this subdivision has been on the books for well over a decade and slowly proceeding now. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much and if we have any questions for you we'll, we'll ask you. Anybody else in committee room five? No other public participation then? Alright. I just need a motion to close the public participation meeting.