

From: Michael J Crawford

Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 4:27 PM

To: ppmclerks <ppmclerks@london.ca>

Cc: Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>; Squire, Phil <psquire@london.ca>; Lehman, Steve <slehman@london.ca>; Lewis, Shawn <slewis@london.ca>; Hillier, Steven <shillier@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] PEC 18 Jan 2021 meeting Re: H-9255 for 307 Fanshawe Esat

Dear Councillors,

I am writing as a neighbour of the 307 Fanshawe development to register concerns regarding the lifting of holding provisions. Before these provisions are lifted:

- 1.** please ensure that a Tree Protection Plan is implemented BEFORE all other work, including sediment plan/controls begins. Last week, a backhoe was in digging trenches that severed roots, and demonstrated no respect for the root bed of trees designated for retention. Indeed contractors thought they were preparing for removal of all vegetation;
- 2.** please probe justification for removal of tree 31. It has a very inconvenient location for the proposal, but was specifically designated for retention by City Council. The tree is massive, and our guess is that it is considered a hazard merely because it is a Silver Maple. Branches fall off all sorts of trees, and there are remediation strategies that can be employed short of removing the tree entirely. Site Plan aspirations should not be driving tree removal - Council was clear;
- 3.** ensure Bylaws are respected in their FULL context. Bylaw CP 1455 541 permits common parking lots to approach no closer than **1.5** meters to a common property line. The **same bylaw** requires "private outdoor spaces" to enjoy a buffer **minimum** of **3** meters. Why should residents of a new development enjoy literally twice the buffer from their own parking lot compared to their established neighbours to the south (backyards)? This is a perverse, selective, and unfair application of the Bylaw;
- 4.** preserve privacy: the developer's initial "sales pitch" for a relief of setback from westerly neighbours included the installation of transom rather than full height windows on the westerly and overlooking face of the 3.5 story front building. Setback was reduced from 6 to 4.9 m. The design has now been reversed and transom windows are to be replaced with full length windows in the present plan. The closer proximity of the building and its larger height will adversely affect enjoyment of privacy for the westerly neighbours (Contrary to London Plan, City Plan etc.). If the City accords special relief for setback, increases density, raises structural height, then there is a moral obligation to ameliorate effects on neighbours. Please petition for transom windows to preserve some semblance of privacy.

Sincerely,

Michael Crawford

21 Camden Place

London Ont.

N5X 2K5