

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 403 Thompson Road – File OZ-9290

- Councillor P. Squire: Is there a staff presentation on this matter?
- L. Maitland, Senior Planner: There is a staff presentation should Council want it.
- Councillor P. Squire: I think you should go ahead. Thank you.
- L. Maitland: Okay. So yes, the presentation is available on the agenda for anyone who is following along at home and or members of the committee. So, the application in front of you this evening is for 403 Thompson Road. It's Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments File OZ-9290. I'm looking at the second slide now we've provided some context in terms of the location of the property. The property is just east of the intersection of King Edward Road on Thompson between Pond Mills and Adelaide. Looking more broadly at the regulatory and policy context for the location, within the most recent Official Plan the London Plan a change was made to look at the site for a future residential development as it was historically a commercial development that hadn't developed. So, in the most recent Official Plan we have it designated in the neighbourhood place type which seeks a variety of residential uses. The current zoning at this point remains NSA1 neighbourhood shopping area which allows for a number of commercial uses and for that reason an amendment was required. So, there's two amendments in front of committee this evening. The first is an Official Plan amendment to permit a low-rise apartment building at as a use it would permit it specifically for this site. The Zoning By-law amendment provides implementing zone an R8 sorry an R9 zone which allows for a four story forty-four-unit apartment building. There are four special provisions associated with that, one it allows for fourteen parking spaces which is around point three parking spaces per unit. One that would allow for twenty-seven square metre bachelor units as a minimum size and one that allows for twenty-seven meters yard front or sorry for twenty-seven-meter yard frontage. This reflects the existing size of the lot and finally for a three-meter front yard setback which would be a reduction from the base zone. The next slide provides the conceptual site plan provided by the applicant to support the, to support the application. In it you can see kind of rectangular building pushed towards Thompson Road with parking in the rear, providing access from the easement which currently serves 409 Thompson but is legally tied to 403, 409, and 415 Thompson which would be on the other side easement it's also rather significant amount of landscaped amenity space provided in the rear and westerly interior side yards under the concept proposed. There were a number of community concerns raised through this application there were seventeen comments of which sixteen were generally in opposition, one was generally supportive. The concerns raised included concerns around the parking reduction, residents in the area felt it was inappropriately low and for units immediately adjacent there was some concern that overflow parking would be taking up, take up their visitor parking spaces in their lot. There were some concerns around the use of the legally established easement that's proposed for access, the applicant was able to provide us with the easement in our legal team review to determine that yes, they are legally entitled to use that easement as it stands. There are some concerns around children in the area and them perhaps playing in other properties adjacent that would be inappropriate. There were concerns raised with the unit size reduction currently the unit size minimum for a bachelor unit on or without a special provision rather is a forty-one square meters again the proposal is for twenty-seven square meters. The applicant who is likely here can speak to some reasons for this but this is, the request was related to

the specialized housing approach that they're taking with the development, strides in context there. There were concerns about height and potential overlook looking at the four-story development adjacent to what is currently two-story units. General concerns with the number of units and there's also significant and repeated concern from neighbors in the area that this constituted too much affordable housing located within the neighbourhoods. So, I'm not going to go into the entirety of the report and the justifications behind it but ultimately staff's recommendation is that the Official Plan amendment is approved to permit the low-rise apartment building on site. We've also suggested or recommended the rezoning to a residential R9 zone with a height limit of fourteen meters with the associated special provisions requested earlier and discussed earlier be moved and then finally we've provided a couple pieces around site plan that we recommend to provide site plan some support in ensuring that screening measures and additional amenity space are available to help address some of the neighbourhood concerns and contribute to good site plan design. The final slide if you're, if you're following along on the presentation is simply the recommendation that appears at the beginning the report. Thank you.

- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much. Any technical questions of staff? Councillor Hopkins?
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Yes, I do Mr. Chair. I know staff mentioned screen measures are to be in place through the site plan process, but I did hear some concerns through the recommendation about fencing. Can you expand on that or is that going to be looked at through site plan?
- Councillor P. Squire: Go ahead.
- L. Maitland: Yeah. Leif here again. I can take that. I think with regards to site plan we do look at all screening measures in terms of fencing and landscape. The idea in in this case in providing the additional recommendation a request rather discipline is to ensure that the measures are there perhaps enhanced and beyond kind of the minimum base standards to ensure that quality contact is made between the two properties so that is something that we would address through site plan and it is, it comes not naturally done through the Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment process but making sure that those concerns are carried forward we thought this was an appropriate way to do that.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you. We're just doing technical questions now Councillor Hillier did you have a technical question?
- Councillor S. Hillier: Mostly regarding parking. I'm looking at 44 units with 14 parking spaces I'm assuming 65 to 70 people living there. That would, I'm guessing maybe 10 people might have cars I'm being on the plus, so that leaves four open spaces I'm thinking more along the lines of personal support workers, deliveries. I don't think there's enough parking to be fair. Staff has more parking been considered I'm looking up at the lot.
- Councillor P. Squire: I am not sure that's a technical question. I realize you have an opinion on the parking but that wouldn't be a technical question unless you framed it in saying why the reduction in parking or why that level of parking for the building but we're not, we're not into argument yet.
- Councillor S. Hillier: Was considerations for more parking considered?
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright we'll go ahead with that.
- L. Maitland: Yes, that was considered. The reason the recommendation of, or the basis for the recommendation of the reduced parking is a parking study that was provided by, I believe Frank Barry and Associates is the name of the engineer. In that he, just for some context for the committee, in that he spoke to the current proposals for about .3 parking spaces per unit there are similar developments within London that are at actually at lower parking ratios so it's not, it's not standard but it's not unique either just for some context there.

- Councillor P. Squire: Okay. Councillor van Holst we're doing technical questions only again.
- Councillor M. van Holst: Thank you Mr. Chair and through you, first my technical question is who is the applicant?
- Councillor P. Squire: Go ahead.
- L. Maitland: The applicant is the Housing Development Corporation of London. They are in the room I believe, or they indicated to me that would be here.
- Councillor P. Squire: Okay next technical question?
- Councillor M. van Holst: Okay thank you. So, looking at 4.4 in the report under parking there was the study from F. and Barry Associates was that was that report included in the agenda package? So that's my question.
- Councillor P. Squire: Go ahead.
- L. Maitland: Staff reviewed it, but I don't believe it was appended to the report, no.
- Councillor M. van Holst: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair, if I may continue. The halfway through this paragraph in 4.4 it says that they note that given the specific users vehicle ownership is not likely to be a priority for the prospective tenants, so my question is who are the specific users that are contemplated for this this unit?
- Councillor P. Squire: Go ahead you can answer that I think.
- L. Maitland: I believe HDC would be the appropriate folks to speak to the programming and the ultimate residents.
- Councillor P. Squire: Is someone from HDC able to answer that question?
- C. Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Wood is in attendance.
- S. Giustizia, HDC: Hello Mr. Chair.
- Councillor P. Squire: Go ahead. So, you heard the question, it's a pretty straight forward one hopefully we can move through the technical questions.
- S. Giustizia: Yes, I did. Was the question the number of units and the number of occupants related to the parking, the parking number. I just want to make sure I heard correctly.
- Councillor P. Squire: No that wasn't the question at all. The question was and Councillor why don't you just ask it again very briefly.
- Councillor M. van Holst: Okay thank you. In the parking study it was noted that given the specific users the vehicle ownership is not likely to be a priority for prospective tenants, so my question is who are the specific users that are contemplated here?
- S. Giustizia: Through the Chair. These will be standard apartments single occupancy only focused on individuals with low-income needs are going to the apartment so based on that we do not anticipate and our experience is that there are not vehicles that are, that are going to be necessary for this population.
- Councillor P. Squire: Okay thank you.
- Councillor M. van Holst: Okay thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: Do you have anymore technical questions.
- Councillor M. van Holst: I do have a few more. Thank you. So perhaps I'll first ask how is the reduction in the minimum size for a bachelor apartment justified noting that the last time a reduction in a, like this was contemplated turned it down.
- Councillor P. Squire: I'm not sure that's a technical question. I'll look to the Clerk, but I don't think it is. I think you should raise that after the presentations. It will relate to you asking someone to comment on a Council decision. Go ahead.
- Councillor M. van Holst: Alright there's, Mr. Chair and you can tell me if this is a technical question or not, but the prevalence of low income housing here that is that how did we come up with the choice to do this in in light of the fact that this is

a low rise apartment low income housing and we've got there's twenty two other similar buildings within three hundred meters of this one.

- Councillor P. Squire: That's definitely not a technical question. We're almost getting into a debate. So technical questions.
- Councillor M. van Holst: That's probably fine. Okay.
- Councillor P. Squire: Just to the Committee a technical question is something technical something about the specifications of the development or something like that not why did you do this or why are we thinking about this so just for future reference. Okay so we're now going to go to presentations from the public. I don't know, is the applicant here?
- C. Saunders: Mr. Chair yes, they are, and I understood K. Wood was speaking on behalf of HDC, perhaps that's not the case.
- Councillor P. Squire: Okay before we start presentations, I just want to remind everyone that the presentations are limited to five minutes and we don't we don't want to get in any way derogatory during the presentations we are happy to get your information we're happy to receive it and I'll try to get any of your significant questions issued, answered sorry. So, go ahead the applicant.
- S. Giustizia: Applicant, HDC, on behalf of the work we're doing with the City of London first my thanks to the community members who helped with the submissions for you and for our committee members I want to thank our staff. We reviewed the report and the recommendations from staff, and we are in full agreement and I know that you've got a few items on the agenda tonight from us you can accept that as comments from the applicant for all three of those items and we will make ourselves available as needed to answer questions and I'm here with Ms. Wood Mr. Turcotte. Thank you very much.
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright we'll now start any public delegations.
- C. Saunders: Ms. Linker is joining us via Zoom.
- Mary-Ann Linker: Hi it's Mary-Ann Linker calling and thanks for listening.
- Councillor P. Squire: Sorry. Could you just hold on a second? Could you just give us your full name and your address if you would like to.
- Mary-Ann Linker: It's Mary-Ann Linker, 409 Thompson Road.
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright go ahead you have five minutes.
- Mary-Ann Linker: Okay I'm concerned with it all being low-income housing when we are surrounded by that as is so what does that do to the value of our housing here. My concern also is I've also heard about the size of the unit I think that is a little bit on the low, low side for anyone. The parking is definitely an issue and when I'm looking at the diagram the three parking spots that show in this picture are they taking claim of our three visitor spots or are those an additional three parking spots that are being created? And like I say I have concerns about, and the allotted who's allotted to this if it was a mixture of income that would be a different story but all low income I totally disagree with.
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright thank you very much. Is that do you have anything further to say?
- Mary-Ann Linker: No, I think that's pretty much it.
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright. Thank you very much for speaking to us today. I appreciate it very much.
- Mary-Ann Linker: Thank you for listening.
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright next?
- C. Saunders: Mr. Chair we have a number of individuals in Committee Room number five so perhaps Mr. Skalski could assist the public.
- Councillor P. Squire: Alright. Before you start could you just give us your name and your address if you'd like.
- Michael Nam: My name is Michael Nam, 397 Thompson Road.

- Councillor P. Squire: Okay go ahead five minutes.
- Michael Nam: Okay we are the property next door to this proposed site and I just had, just want to have a little request in the change in the proposal just my concern is that first thing is about regarding the fencing and trees that are dividing the adjacent properties. First thing is about the fencing if there was absence of fencing you would create a more open concept field and that's all I can say for the fencing. But as far as for the trees if there's traffic coming from the Pond Mills/Egerton direction going towards King Edward with the trees being there it'll block the view of our property and not only that with the trees there sometimes in better weather the branches fall, and tree sap fall to our customers' vehicles when they parked there and also it also increases the maintenance costs of every year of cleaning up with you know all the debris and all that altogether. And that's one of our reasons why we're here regarding about the trees and about the fencing. Moving on to about the size of the building itself I know it's four stories but we, we are open to this if possible if it can be built higher I know that with constraints it's impossible to do it but if you can make use of the property that's behind us at 150 King Edward Avenue I believe it's just a little bit under developed and it's not really used in the best way if that is a, you know an option. You know I'm just putting it out there and that could be a viable option there and as for everything else that's all we have to say.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming today to speak to us.
- Michael Nam: Thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: The next speaker? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Okay can I just get your name Sir and your address if you don't mind.
- Rene Morin: Rene Morin, president of the condo board at 409 Thompson Road. Many of us moved to this area because it's a peaceful and private location and we are already surrounded by low-income apartment buildings yet our condo complex is like a hidden gem. We feel that this zoning should not be changed to allow four-storey building be squeezed into such a small area close to us. This will create problems such as heavier traffic in our driveway and people parking in our private lot because I noticed the diagram here we have I don't know if they just forgot to put the fences in. I guess they either forgot to put the fences up or they assumed that they are there but it looks like they're going to take over our three parking spots close to their parking spots. It just looks that way I'm not sure. Your diagram should have had the fences put in actually. Any way we assumed that because the apartments are so small one person only sure but family matters and support workers will come in there and take up most of those parking spots and people living there will you know will come into our complex and take up the parking spots there. As well I'm just wondering where the garbage cans are going to be. Are you going, are they going to be stuck close to our fence or you're going to try and put them away from our fence? We do not feel the purpose, proposed building should be built instead we would like to see something that would enhance our neighbourhood within the present zoning guidelines. Thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much I'll try to get your, I know you have some questions sir, we do try to get them answered and I'll try to get staff or the applicant to answer them when we're finished all the presentation, so I don't want you to think we're not answering your questions. We just do that all at once. Someone else wishing to speak? Right could you give us your name and your address if you like.
- Amber Harrison: Amber Harrison at 409 Thompson Road.
- Councillor P. Squire: Go ahead you have five minutes.

- Amber Harrison: Okay I would just like to reiterate about the privacy that we have right now and we feel that it's going to be infringed upon with this one. Also, the noise level of the construction and the new building, will there be some type of wall or something to counteract that? And also, the whole four-storey idea that will kind of be over shadowy, it will overshadow us and I wonder if it needs to be that tall or what it is up with that. Those are my comments.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much for coming today. We appreciate it.
- Amber Harrison: Thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: The next speaker? I see someone standing in the committee room, in Committee Room 1&2 if you want to go ahead and speak that would be great.
- Christine Comrie: Christine Comrie, 435 Scenic Drive.
- Councillor P. Squire: Can I have your name and your address please?
- Christine Comrie: I just gave it, Christine Comrie, 435 Scenic Drive.
- Councillor P. Squire: Oh, I'm sorry I was watching. Okay go ahead. Sorry about that go ahead.
- Christine Comrie: It's okay. Thank you for the opportunity to put forth concern shared by many residents of Glenn Cairn Woods fortunately we have a close-knit neighbourhood along Scenic Drive or many of us would not have even known about this proposal despite how it directly impacts us. A notification distance of 120 meters, sorry they want my mask on, a notification distance of one hundred twenty meters is ridiculous and a way to push through changes without proper input from those affected. In this matter although two hundred and twenty-seven residents were provided notice the reality is that notices only went to twelve single homes, twelve, thirty town homes, a condo complex which will share the same entrance driveway of the proposed building and eight landlords which means a notice was posted in each building not to each apartment and realistically tenants are not going to care. This equates to fifty letters going out unbelievable considering the population affected. With more notifications more dissenting votes would be cast. Council should have before them numerous letters from residents outlining the inordinate population of Glenn Cairn Woods and the disproportionate amount of affordable housing we're faced with. I will summarize the details noted in saying not only are we overpopulated based on the London average we already have an additional two hundred and fifty home subdivision under construction and a double lot on Pond Mills slated for yet another apartment building the details of which are unknowns as again no notification has been received. It is believed however that this is slated as another affordable housing site. Our community consists of a significant number of affordable housing units the more, majority of addresses were listed in the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Comrie with thirty-one three-storey walk ups including one halfway house, three co-op complexes, one hundred London housing units with additionally numerous semi-detached and duplex addresses. This is just our subdivision. Immediately to the west of Pond Mills Road is another London housing or co-op projects which are not well maintained. Another London housing or co-op is situated one block southeast of Commissioners and Pond Mills, numerous rental units can again be found on the south side of Commissioners at both Pond Mills and Frontenac. And Hamilton Road also contains many low-income houses, an area that is desperately trying to revitalize. Considering all of this, the question arises as to why the city feels Glen Cairn Woods is the right neighborhood to build yet another affordable housing site. Is the city trying to create another Arbour Glenn situation where crime is even higher? Please do not misunderstand us we are not saying that every person in affordable housing is a criminal or unsavory however our personal experiences carry a lot of weight as the correlation between affordable housing and crime.

Our letter outlines statistics published by Area Vibes as well as our personal trials. I can personally attest to a stolen vehicle, break-ins of rear sheds and attempted home break-in and numerous vehicle break-ins. Concerns related to overpopulation and crime bring forth higher insurance rates. We are also troubled by the stigmatism of lower school ratings, the valuation of our property and increased traffic to our streets some of which have no sidewalks or lighting. As one of my neighborhood, neighbors aptly questioned where is the consideration of diversity. The focus of the diversity and new subdivision should apply for existing neighborhoods as well. It is our understanding that this proposed construction has already been relocated due to the public outcry. We ask that our concerns be taken just as seriously. Our neighborhood is already over tenanted with an over abundance of affordable housing what we are asking is that Glenn Cairn Woods be treated with the same deference as areas in the north and west of London thereby protecting the single-family home dwellings. It is time to look at spreading out affordable housing rather than lumping it all in one area creating a ghetto. A question has arisen from Ms. Carey of 436 Scenic Drive in relation to the viability of the Housing Development Corporation and the effect it has on the proposed development. She has noted that KPMG

- Councillor P. Squire: You have about thirty seconds left.
- Christine Comrie: is dissolving HDC as reflected in City Hall meeting minutes dated August 19, 2019 and minutes dated December 17, 2020 direct staff to bring forward documents that dissolve HDC in the spring of 2021. Will applications for HDC be placed on hold or cancelled? What support would the residents of the development have should it go through and if HDC is to be dissolved in only a few months why would the city even consider approving new construction at this point. We the residents of Scenic Drive call for Council to deny the application for 403 Thompson Road. Thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much we appreciate you coming today to speak. Is there anyone still in committee room five who wishes to speak?
- Sandra Matthews: Hello there!
- Councillor P. Squire: Can I just have your name and address?
- Sandra Matthews: Yes. Sandra Matthews, 409 Thompson Road.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much you have five minutes.
- Sandra Matthews: Yes Sir I won't be long. The fact of the traffic being much more of an issue with this coming up I think that's really going to be chaotic for us at 409 Thompson Road that's one thing for sure and then parking. We already are to capacity and I am so confident that that'll be an issue of not being able to have their own parking and to scoot over to our area. So that's what I want to just say.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much for coming.
- Sandra Matthews: Yeah, thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: Very much appreciated. Anyone else in committee room five wish to speak? Alright is there anybody in, anybody in committee room one and two who wishes to speak on this application? Could I have your name and your address Sir?
- Allen Dawe: Allen Dawe, 409 Thompson Road. I just want to comment that in that area 14 parking spots won't suffice for 44 units and there is no street parking, no street parking at all on Thompson Road and there's no other place to park. All in all, not only that, forty-four units is far too much, 27 meters people can't live that kind of space. Thank you.
- Councillor P. Squire: Thank you very much Sir we appreciate you coming today. Anyone else in committee room one and two wish to speak to this application? Okay going once going twice. Okay we're going to close, move to close the public participation meeting