

**8TH REPORT OF THE**  
**PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

Meeting held on April 9, 2013, commencing at 4:08 PM, in the Council Chambers, Second Floor, London City Hall.

**PRESENT:** Councillor B. Polhill (Chair), Councillors D.G. Henderson, P. Hubert and S. White and H. Lysynski (Secretary).

**ABSENT:** Councillor N. Branscombe.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors W.J. Armstrong, J. Baechler, D. Brown, M. Brown and J.P. Bryant, G. Barrett, J. Braam, M. Corby, M. Elmadhoon, J.M. Fleming, T. Grawey, P. Kokkoros, B. Krichker, E. Lalande, A. Macpherson, D. MacRae, D. Menard, N. Musicco, J. Ramsay, M. Ribera, A. Riley, C. Saunders, C. Smith, L. Stevens and J. Yanchula.

---

**I. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

1. That it **BE NOTED** that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

**II. CONSENT ITEMS**

2. McCormick Area Study Update (OZ-7601)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the staff report dated April 9, 2013, with respect to the lands generally bounded by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the north, Quebec Street and Burbrook Place to the west, Dundas Street to the south and Ashland Avenue and McCormick Boulevard to the east, **BE RECEIVED**. (2013-E20)

3. Secondary Dwelling Units (OZ-8053)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the staff report dated April 9, 2013, with respect to city-wide Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, as it relates to secondary dwelling units, **BE CIRCULATED** for public comment; it being noted that the matter shall be considered at a future public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee. (2013-D14A)

4. Properties located at 181 & 199 Commissioners Road East (39T-08501)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council supports a one (1) year extension of draft approval for draft approved plan 39T-08501, submitted by Highland Green London Inc., prepared by ENG Plus (Project No. 06.257), certified by J. Andrew Smith OLS, on December 18, 2007, as red line amended, which shows 27 single detached residential lots served by an extension of Edwin Drive and an extension of Carnegie Lane **SUBJECT TO** the previously approved conditions as modified on January 19, 2011. (2013-D12)

5. Property located at 3047 Tillman Road (H-8146)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, based on the application of York Development Group, relating to the property located at 3047 Tillman Road, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated April 9, 2013 **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 16, 2013, 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 Restricted Office/Residential R9/Convenience Commercial (h-5.h-53.h-55.h-56.RO2/R9-7.H40/CC6) Zone **TO** a Restricted Office/Residential R9/Convenience Commercial (RO2/R9-7.H40/CC6) Zone to remove the "h-5", "h-53", "h-55" and "h-56" holding provisions. (2013-D14A)

6. Property located at 3200 Singleton Avenue (H-8117)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, based on the application of Sifton Properties Limited, relating to the property located at 3200 Singleton Avenue, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated April 9, 2013 **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 16, 2013, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to remove holding provisions “h”, “h-54”, “h-71”, “h-100”, and “h-105” from 3200 Singleton Avenue and to retain holding provision “h-136” and the Residential Special Provision R5-6(6), R6-5(30) and R8-4(16) Zones. (2013-D14A)

7. Annual Report on Building Permit Fees

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official, the Civic Administration’s report, dated April 9, 2013, relating to 2012 building permit fees collected and costs of administration and enforcement of the *Building Code Act* and regulations, for 2012, **BE RECEIVED**; it being noted that the Civic Administration is requested to provide a further update to the Planning and Environment Committee in July, 2013. (2013-P10)

### III. SCHEDULED ITEMS

8. 4th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee from its meeting held on March 21, 2013:

- a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Conditions of Draft Approval included with the Notice dated February 15, 2013, from N. McKee, Senior Planner, with respect to an application submitted by 700541 Ontario Limited, relating to the property located at 1300 Fanshawe Park Road East:
  - i) conditions 30, 31 and 32 should **BE RETAINED**;
  - ii) the last line of condition 33 should **BE REMOVED**;
  - iii) the final boundaries of the natural hazard lands **BE DETERMINED**;
  - iv) all natural heritage issues **BE RESOLVED**, prior to the approval of this application;
  - v) the Stoney Creek Master Drainage Plan, the Stoney Creek Stormwater Management Class Environmental Assessment, and any applications for the construction of the Stoney Creek On-line Flood Control Facility, that may be outstanding, **BE COMPLETED** prior to the approval of this application; and,
  - vi) the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee **BE CIRCULATED** the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed stormwater management pond;
- b) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to provide the following to the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, within the context of the Planning Department Work Plan Priorities:
  - i) the encroachment inventory for the Kilally ESA;

- ii) the Manager, Licensing and Municipal Law Enforcement **BE REQUESTED** to provide a presentation with respect to encroachments - actions that can be taken to ensure a higher enforcement priority, the types and how encroachments are addressed, to a future meeting of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee;
  - iii) the Restoration Protocols, prepared by J. Bruin, Landscape Architect/Parks Planner;
  - iv) the Manager, Parks Planning and Design **BE REQUESTED** to provide a presentation with respect to the Management of Wildlife Trees in ESAs;
  - v) prepare a summary on the deer studies prepared by Dr. Bazely; and,
  - vi) a copy of the Nature London template forms;
- c) that clauses 3 through 12, inclusive, of the 4th Report of the EEPAC, **BE RECEIVED**;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard a verbal presentation from Dean Sheppard, Chair, EEPAC, with respect to these matters.

9. Properties located at 555-557 Ridout Street North (Z-8133)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Agent Realty Ltd. (2049401 Ontario Ltd.), relating to the property located at 555-557 Ridout Street North:

- a) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated April 9, 2013 **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 16, 2013, 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 R4 Special Provision/Residential R5/ Residential R8 (R4-6(1)/R5-5/R8-2) Zone, which permits street townhouse, cluster townhouse, apartment buildings, handicapped persons apartment buildings, lodging house class 2, stacked townhousing, senior citizen apartment buildings, emergency care establishments, continuum-of-care facilities **TO** a Residential R4 Special Provision/Residential R5/Residential R8/Temporary Use (R4-6(1)/R5-5/R8-2/T-\_\_) Zone, to permit a real estate agency use for a temporary period not exceeding three (3) years; and,
- b) the request to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1 to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Residential R4 Special Provision/Residential R5/ Residential R8 (R4-6(1)/R5-5/R8-2) Zone, which permits street townhouse, cluster townhouse, apartment buildings, handicapped persons apartment buildings, lodging house class 2, stacked townhousing, senior citizen apartment buildings, emergency care establishments, continuum-of-care facilities **TO** a Residential R4 Special Provision/Residential R5/Residential R8/Temporary Use (R4-6(1)/R5-5/R8-2/T-\_\_) Zone, to permit Service Offices and Professional Offices **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:
  - i) temporary zones are intended to support a single new use and to be implemented for a short period of time;
  - ii) the additional uses permitted by the Service Office and Professional Office definitions would promote additional tenants on site that are not associated with the proposed future high density residential use intended to be developed on the site; and,
  - iii) the request for Service Offices and Professional Offices could lead to potential long term office uses on the site;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Steven Cromwell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – expressing support for the Civic Administration’s recommendations.
- Barry Gribb, 549 Ridout Street – advising that he has no issues with the recommendations being proposed by the Civic Administration; expressing concern with the removal of trees on the property; noting that the view from his building has deteriorated; requesting assurance that the driveway and landscaping will continue to be implemented; and requesting that, if possible, mature trees be planted. (2013-D14A)

#### 10. Wortley Village - Old South Heritage Conservation District (O-8118)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the creation of a Heritage Conservation District for the Wortley Village-Old South neighbourhood:

- a) the Wortley Village-Old South Plan and Guidelines **BE CIRCULATED** to the public for comment; it being noted that the Plan and Guidelines shall be considered at a future Planning and Environment Committee public participation meeting;
- b) the proposed draft by-law, as appended to the staff report dated April 9, 2013 **BE CIRCULATED** for public review and comment; it being noted that the Plan and Guidelines shall be considered at a future Planning and Environment Committee public participation meeting; and,
- c) the proposed draft Official Plan amendment, as appended to the staff report dated April 9, 2013 **BE CIRCULATED** for public review and comment; it being noted that the Plan and Guidelines shall be considered at a future Planning and Environment Committee public participation meeting;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard a verbal presentation from the Heritage Planner with respect to this matter. (2013-R01)

#### 11. 4th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Recommendation: That the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on March 13, 2013:

- a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Guy Lombardo Tempo VII Hydroplane (Hydroplane):
  - i) the mandate of the Tempo VII Hydroplane Sub-committee **BE AMENDED** to allow for the consideration of locations outside of the City of London to display the Hydroplane;
  - ii) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to establish a process to allow for the temporary exhibition of the Hydroplane at various venues; and,
  - iii) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to determine a Source of Financing to cover the cost of ensuring the road-worthiness of the Hydroplane’s trailer and other expenses that would be incurred in transporting and exhibiting the Hydroplane;

it being noted that the Tempo VII Sub-committee has been unsuccessful, thus far, in finding display and/or permanent storage space within the City of London for the Hydroplane

- b) that clauses 2 through 10, inclusive, of the 4th Report of the LACH, **BE RECEIVED**;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard a verbal presentation from George Goodlet, Chair, LACH, with respect to these matters.

12. Property located at 77 Tecumseh Avenue West (Z-8136)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Malcolm Ross, relating to the property located at 77 Tecumseh Avenue West:

- a) the attached, revised, proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 16, 2013 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Neighbourhood Facility (NF) Zone, which permits elementary school uses **TO** a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-3 (4)) Zone, to allow for 10 single detached dwelling lots with a minimum lot frontage of 10m, a minimum front and exterior setback to a main dwelling of 3.0m from a local street and with a 1.2m minimum interior side yard setback and a Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h-5\*h-( ))\*R8-4 ( ) Zone, to permit an apartment building in a converted institutional building (Manor Highland Park Public School) as it exists at the time of the passing of this by-law with a density of 39 units/ha (28 units), subject to a holding provision to ensure sanitary and stormwater servicing reports have been prepared and confirmation that sanitary and stormwater management systems are implemented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and a public site plan meeting be held; and,
- b) the Site Plan Approval Authority **BE REQUESTED** to consider the following site specific design issues through a public site plan process:
  - the site plan application drawings remain consistent with the drawings submitted through the zoning by-law amendment process, particularly with regard to the following:
    - incorporating architectural features on the exterior of the existing elementary school building, such as large windows and the dual entrances marked by canopies (one on the north elevation at the location of the existing principal entrance facing Murray Park and one on the south elevation leading to the proposed driveway and parking area) to improve the residential character of the building by reducing the prevalence of large blank walls characteristic of the elementary school use;
    - retaining the Forbes Street parking area loop layout with a loading lay-by found adjacent to the main entrance to minimize the street front exposure of the parking lot and maximize the amount of open landscape area fronting Forbes Street;
    - providing safe, convenient and direct pedestrian connections between the existing public sidewalks along Forbes Street and Tecumseh Avenue to the proposed main entrances of the building; and,
    - determining the feasibility of having the entrance on Tecumseh Avenue instead of Forbes Street;
- c) the Managing Director, Engineering and City Engineer **BE REQUESTED** to undertake dye testing to ensure that raw sewage is not being discarded into the Coves and to examine the sewage issues in the Coves;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee received a communication, dated January 24, 2013, from Kimberley Wood, 27 Forbes Street, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Malcolm Ross, on behalf of Homes Unlimited – expressing support for the Civic Administration’s recommendations; advising that Homes Unlimited is a charitable, non-profit organization; indicating that Homes Unlimited manages several properties; noting that most of their properties have live-in superintendents; advising that they are applying for a grant through the City of London’s Affordable Housing program; advising that the income range for the proposed tenants will be between \$24,000 to \$36,000; advising that this will assist young people and couples get established; indicating that Habitat for Humanity has approached them for first rights of refusal; indicating that, in areas where Homes Unlimited has built, the area property values have increased and the neighbourhood has been improved; noting that Homes Unlimited won a design award for their building on Nelson Street, near Adelaide Street; advising that the application is for 28 units to be built in the former school building and renovations will be completed to allow the school to look more like an apartment building, rather than an abandoned school; and advising that the proposed parking location is the most sensible location on the site.
- Thom McClenaghan, 220 Base Line Road East – advising that he has lived in the area for many years; indicating that he has a connection with Friends of the Coves Subwatershed; indicating that there is currently an undertaking to make Elmwood Avenue a significant gateway to the Coves Environmentally Significant Area; advising that Ms. Wood makes excellent points in her communication; enquiring as to the status of the current capacity of the existing storm and sanitary sewers; noting that many millions of dollars have been spent on infrastructure; advising that there is a combined storm and sanitary sewer in one pipe and that there is also a crossover of pipes; requesting that the project be held back until the infrastructure is fixed; advising that we do not need more sewage in the Coves; and advising that the Coves is one area in the City that is the most efficient to the quality of life in the neighbourhood.
- Kimberley Wood, 27 Forbes Street – advising that she has resided at her residence since 2008; indicating that it is a quiet area; advising that the loss of the school resulted in the loss of a community hub; noting that the area is now used as a dog park; advising that she does not think that this is the best fit for 28 affordable housing units; advising that she sees the school property as a way to re-establish the community; recommending that an Ontario Works satellite office be moved to the school or maybe open a small dance school; indicating that she supports residential development; requesting that everyone picture her street competing with 28 more cars; advising that she would look out onto a parking lot; advising that it would increase traffic on their street; indicating that the lack of visitor parking would have people parking on Forbes Street and Tecumseh Avenue; advising that her driveway is immediately across from the proposed parking lot; and indicating that if you take out one lot for Habitat for Humanity, you could square up the lots.
- David Galloway, 19 Forbes Street – requesting two low density projects be developed here instead; enquiring as to whether studies have been completed on the potential impact on property values in the area; advising that he has lived in this area for four years; and indicating that their property values took a big hit when they were not able to block the methadone clinic that is four blocks away.
- David Brooks, 25 Forbes Street – advising that many new people are moving into the area and investing a lot of money in their properties; advising that the area is becoming the new “Wortley” area; and, advising that if the affordable housing units are built here, it will devalue their properties.
- Kim Semper, 31 Forbes Street – echoing what the other speakers have said; indicating that, with the installation of 28 single apartments, there will be an increase in the number of people, cars, guests and friends; advising that it makes more sense to have access on Tecumseh Avenue; enquiring as to where the snow will be piled; and enquiring as to the reason for 28 single units.

- Chris Kalmar, 21 Forbes Street – advising that the school closure was unexpected; expressing support for the Habitat for Humanity house, but not the rest of the application; enquiring as to what other proposals can be put in there; indicating that the crime rate in this area will increase; and, advising that this is a quiet neighbourhood and they would like to keep it this way. (2013-D14A)

13. Property located at 193 Clarke Road (Z-8143)

Recommendation: That the Planning and Environment Committee was unable to reach a majority decision with respect to the staff recommendation contained in Agenda Item No. 13 relating to the application of Southside Group regarding the property located at 193 Clarke Road and pursuant to Section 18.6 of the Council Procedure By-law the appended staff recommendation **BE SUBMITTED** to the Municipal Council for its disposition; it being noted that the relevant staff report is attached for reference;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter:

- a communication from Angela DeCicco, Subdury Avenue; and,
- a communication from Ken Nickles, 1811 Royal Crescent;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Greg Playford, on behalf of “It’s Our Home” – advising that “It’s Our Home” is a group of parents who have independent children with autism spectral disorder; advising that the parents researched four properties and this one is on a scale of what they are looking for; expressing support for the Civic Administration’s report; and indicating that there is a lot of need for housing for this particular group.
- Debbie Newman, 1801 Royal Crescent – see attached photographs; indicating that they met as a neighbourhood group; noting that 47 people attended; further noted that there are 47 properties on the street; expressing opposition to the application; expressing fear for the consequences; indicating that the size of the project does not fit; expressing concern with a 14 unit building with 12 parking spots; indicating that the surrounding streets are peaceful, but that they will be filled with parked cars, if the application is approved; indicating that she and her husband own a lovely, large lot with mature trees and built their dream home two years ago; indicating that if anything other than a single family residence is built, it will bring down their property value; advising that “It’s Our Home” does not have the funding or their charitable license; advising that there is a church on Dundas Street with 10 acres of land willing to build on their land; and, requesting that respect be shown for the existing property owners.
- Lynn Johnston, 1797 Royal Crescent – see attached photographs; indicating that the proposed building looks more institutional than residential; advising that she has no objection to “It’s Our Home” building a home for this purpose; however, the proposed building does not fit in the neighbourhood; and asking the Councillors to look around their own neighbourhoods to see if this type of building would fit in their neighbourhood.
- Michael Groshok, 1805 Royal Crescent – indicating that it is part of the normal process that the Urban Design Peer Review Panel reviews applications as per the attached flowchart; advising that he works in the construction industry; advising that the scale of adjacent land uses must be recognized; and indicating that this application does not work as there will be no green space.
- Sarah Teixeira, 1810 Royal Crescent – advising that their neighbourhood is safe and inviting; and advising that the building does not fit in; and noting that it is like having a chicken coop in your backyard.
- M. Molinaro, 1814 Sudbury Avenue, on behalf of his parents – indicating that there is no flow in the community; advising that the non-profit is hoping that it will be receiving funding; indicating that they will be building a home with no chance of funding; advising that the proposed building

does not fit into the neighbourhood; advising that there are many unanswered questions; indicating that a full review should be done; advising that in March, 2009, his father contacted the City as water was flooding their backyard (see attached photographs); advising that the City ignored his father's concerns; and advising that the proposed application has to work within their community.

- Adam, 650 Cheapside Street – advising that he does not reside in the area; and indicating that it is not fair for people who live there to have a large building built in the neighbourhood that does not fit.
- Leonard Fluher, 106 Rhine Avenue - advising that many individuals will be using paratransit vans that are big and bulky; indicating that there has been very little consideration given to paratransit vehicles parking there; and enquiring as to whether or not this application has been forwarded to the City of London's Accessibility Advisory Committee.
- Mr. Johnstone, 1797 Royal Crescent – commending the "It's Our Home" group for what they are doing; however this is not the appropriate location; indicating that everyone on the street is opposed to this application; indicating that his wife advised the Planning and Environment Committee that an area church is willing to have this building built on their lands; noting that his wife is part of the Justice Committee at the church; and advising that the church will gladly look at the proposal.
- Sue LeBlanc, 1799 Royal Crescent – advising that the proposed building does not fit into their neighbourhood; and advising that the neighbours are used to backing onto and seeing green space. (2013-D14A)

#### 14. Properties located at 275-277 Piccadilly Street (Z-8132)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with respect to the application of 1875425 Ontario Inc., relating to the properties located at 275-277 Piccadilly Street, the request to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Residential R2 (R2-2) Zone, which permits single detached, semi-detached, duplex and converted dwellings **TO** a Residential R8 (R8-3) Zone, to permit, apartment buildings, handicapped persons apartment buildings, lodging house class 2, stacked townhousing, senior citizen apartment buildings, emergency care establishments and continuum-of-care facilities **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- i) the current zoning for this area is appropriate, promotes neighbourhood stability, and allows redevelopment of residential properties in a manner which is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood, consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
- ii) opportunities for infill and intensification have already been provided in areas around the Piccadilly Neighbourhood;
- iii) the site is currently developed at a higher density than what is currently permitted by the zoning and official plan and is not considered underutilized;
- iv) the requested amendment is not consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 which encourage efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the municipality;
- v) the requested amendment is not consistent with the Residential Intensification policies of the Official Plan;
- vi) the proposed amendment would constitute "spot" zoning, and is not considered appropriate in isolation from the surrounding neighbourhood; the site is not unique and does not have any special attributes which would warrant a site specific amendment; and
- vii) the requested amendment could create opportunities for additional multiple unit residential uses and erode the residential character of the area;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter:

- a communication from Wendy Dickinson, Planning Chair, The Woodfield Community Association; and,
- a communication, dated April 8, 2013, from John Fracasso, 314 Piccadilly Street;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Richard Zelinka, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – advising that the site is not unique within the context; however, it is unique; noting that the building design is unique and within the character of the area; advising that the two properties currently contain nine dwelling units; noting that the applicant wishes to increase the number of units to 11; advising that these will be premium units, consisting of a multi-level design; noting that it is similar to a fourplex, with three level units; advising that there will be one unit underneath the units in both buildings; indicating that this will be a different design from what is normally associated with apartment buildings; indicating that this will be attractive to students and families; indicating that these buildings are intended to be turned into condominiums; indicating that it is a desirable area; noting that it is close to parkland, is an easy walk to Richmond Row and is transit supported; advising that 275 Piccadilly Street is the largest lot in the area; indicating that both properties have 2½ storey houses on them now; noting that the same height is proposed for the new buildings; further noting that the entrance will be onto Piccadilly Street; indicating that the west facing wall bears no recognition to the fact that it is the entrance to a neighbourhood; indicating that they are not intensifying, they are only adding two additional units; noting that the intensity is well within the area; advising that the building has had nine units for a long time; advising that the open space design will help to enhance the area; advising that, currently, this corner is very open, with an exceptional amount of openness and low coverage; indicating that the proposed buildings will be built in a way that maintains openness on the site; indicating that the site maintains a large landscaped area; advising that the corner site is on two double-wide road allowances which means the yards are abundant in landscape, open space and boulevard; indicating that this site is at a transition, being opposite Wellington Street; indicating that the building heights are 27 metres on the west side; indicating that this is intended to be a transitional area using built form consistent with the general area; advising that the proposed height of the buildings is less than what is there today; advising that the proposal is permitted by Official Plan intensification policies; advising that the City's urban design staff are generally supportive of the buildings, which will have front, wrap around porches and parking in the rear yard; advising that the Urban Design staff encouraged the building to be built closer to Piccadilly Street; indicating that they are able to address most of the recommendations, including moving the buildings closer to the street; indicating that the buildings are set back from the road as they have major front staircases; advising that most of the buildings on the street are set back from the street; indicating that the design the applicant is putting forward tries to maintain the character in the area; indicating that there are revised drawings prepared, with the porch being a major element of both dwellings; noting that the rear portion of the building has a porch as well; indicating that the current design addresses Piccadilly Street and Wellington Street by removing the existing seven car garage, bringing in a usable landscape area, covers less than the maximum allowed in the area; and conforms with the Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement.
- Anna Woodson, 300 Piccadilly Street, Executive Director, Piccadilly Area Neighbourhood Association, and on behalf of the Woodfield Community Association – indicating that the property is designated low density residential; advising that the property is currently legal non-conforming; indicating that the use would eventually revert back to an R2-2 Zone; advising that the neighbourhood has fought hard against this type of development; indicating that the intensity is not compatible with the neighbourhood; advising that Wellington Street is the boundary between

commercial and residential; indicating that a large number of the properties are owner occupied; advising that they live on a beautiful street with beautiful heritage homes; expressing support for the Civic Administration's recommendations; and advising that the Woodfield Community Association wrote in as well, expressing their support for the Civic Administration's recommendations.

- Tom Burns, 274 Piccadilly Street – advising that he lives directly across from the proposed buildings; indicating that for 18 years, their home has been a single family home; advising that they are used to the students and busyness of the area; advising that there are ongoing noise issues from the students partying on the porches at 275 Piccadilly Street; advising that wrap around porches will become magnets for student parties; noting that this will be the same for the barbeque area; indicating that this will be a great place for people occupying 37 bedrooms; indicating that there will be an increase in traffic; advising that the current tenants leave garbage and recycling out days after pick up; advising that they love where they live and want to remain there; indicating that they are the anchor on the corner where they live; and advising that the proposed development will do damage to the neighbourhood.
- Gord Buxton, 289 Piccadilly Street – advising that he has seen the neighbourhood change over the years; indicating that it is now family oriented; expressing concern with the proposal and the changes that it will bring to the neighbourhood; and advising that it would be the same for any other neighbourhood development that went in.
- John Baskerville, 319 Piccadilly Street – advising that he has lived in his residence for a long time; indicating that the proposal is not what the neighbourhood is about; noting that the applicants' representative was careful not to mention the number of bedrooms; expressing opposition to the application; and expressing support for the neighbours' comments.
- Craig Martin, 735 Waterloo Street – indicating that Ms. Woodson summarized his comments; expressing concern with the intensity of the proposal; and expressing support for the Civic Administration's recommendations.
- John Fracasso, 314 Piccadilly Street – advising that he has lived in the area for 33 years; indicating that people talk about design but not livability; requesting that livability be kept in perspective; expressing surprise at Mr. Zelinka's defense of the development as he appeared before the Ontario Municipal Board in support of lines and the difference they make for the same residential block; noting that there is a domino effect; and requesting that people listen to what Mr. Zelinka said a few years ago, not today.
- Susan Buxton, 289 Piccadilly Street – advising that they have gotten used to some level of student activities; and expressing support for the Civic Administration's recommendations.
- Lisa Lansink, 34 Kenneth Avenue – advising that she is not here to either support or oppose the application; indicating that she would like to see a mutual fence between the two properties; and requesting that the lighting not shine on her backyard.
- Brenda Stevenson, 301 Piccadilly Street – advising that they just purchased a historical home that they plan to bring up to standard; indicating that this application scares her; indicating that all of the homes in the area are older; and advising that, if they had known about this application, they would not have purchased their property.
- Peter Burnett, 300 Piccadilly Street – advising that he has lived in his residence for over 20 years; indicating that Ms. Woodson has been before this Committee a number of times relating to the increased intensification of the neighbourhood; advising that this is a block of historic homes; indicating that many of the homes on the street are single family, owner occupied homes; advising that the proponent noted that there would be a modest increase in the number of units; enquiring why the owner would not continue with business as usual; enquiring why the redevelopment is necessary; reiterating that there will be increased traffic problems; advising that there are traffic calming measures on the street; advising that there is confusion at the corner; indicating that there are problems with the students coming home at 2:00 a.m.; and indicating that he used to have a white picket fence around his property, but he had to remove it as a support post was kicked so hard that it was broken.

- Margaret Whitley, Montessori School of Children – expressing support for the Civic Administration’s recommendations; advising that there are many families in the area whose children attend Montessori; and that Montessori has ensured that their buildings are in keeping with the neighbourhood. (2013-D14A)

15. Medway Valley Heritage Forest Environmentally Significant Area - North - Trail Master Planning Study

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the Medway Valley Heritage Forest Environmentally Significant Area, North Trail Master Planning Study:

- a) the Medway Valley Heritage Forest North Environmentally Significant Area Trail Master Planning Study, March, 2013 **BE ACCEPTED**;
- b) Trail Option 5B - ‘Enhanced Accessibility’ **BE APPROVED** for implementation as shown in Appendix “B” of the Civic Administrations report dated April 9, 2013, subject to the following modifications being undertaken:
  - i) the area marked on Appendix B as ‘proposed 1.0 m wide hiking trail with wood chip surface’ be changed to a 2.0 m wide hiking trail with wood chip surface, with a smooth and even solid base, without obstructions, such as visible tree roots;
  - ii) the existing maintenance access/hiking trail be improved to a 3.2m asphalt pathway north and south of the ‘bend’;
  - iii) the only non-asphalt surfaces will be ~225 metres at the “bend” which will be a boardwalk over the tributary and the 2.0m wood chip hiking trail, noted in i), above; and,
  - iv) construction of i) and ii), above, be completed by June 1, 2014, with the exception of the Sunningdale West pathway connection;
- c) the Trail Advisory Group (TAG) **BE THANKED** for their input into this process and that no further comment be sought with respect to this matter;
- d) an additional inventory to confirm the management zone limits and boardwalk layout around the ‘bend’ in the Medway Creek to cross the Wonderland Road Tributary **BE INITIATED** this spring;
- e) implementation of the recommended trail option, including “on-road” linkages **BE INITIATED** and include involvement of the Transportation Division as required by the City’s Trails Standards in environmentally significant areas;
- f) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to continue land acquisition discussions with private landowners to support implementation of the preferred option; and,
- g) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to develop and implement a monitoring program for the long-term sustainability of the trail use for intended objectives that will consider adaptive management where and if required;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter:

- communications from the Sunningdale West Residents Association; noting that a petition signed by approximately 209 individuals is on file in the City Clerk’s office;
- a communication, dated March 28, 2013, from Lori and Keith Zerebecki, 1966 Valleyrun Boulevard
- a communication, dated March 27, 2013, from William J. Lyons, #36 – 1511 Aldersbrook Road;
- a communication from Dr. Peter Agathos, 2112 Valleyrun Boulevard;

- a communication, dated March 27, 2013, from Gordon Wood, 195 Brunswick Crescent;
- a communication, dated March 27, 2013, from David Potten, 110 West Rivertrace Walk;
- a communication, dated March 27, 2013, from Fred Fretz, 1984 Valleyrun Boulevard;
- a communication, dated March 26, 2013, from Bill Davis, President, Old Masonville Ratepayers Association;
- a communication, dated March 27, 2013, from Sean Hunt, 2124 Wallingford Avenue;
- a communication, dated March 24, 2013, from Alain A. Proulx, Ivey Eye Institute;
- a communication, dated March 16, 2013, from Anita Caveney, David and Winnifred Wake, Nature London;
- a communication from David Bronicheski, 314 Rivertrace Close;
- a communication from Bruce McMillan, McMillan Company;
- a communication, dated April 8, 2013, from Mike Harasym, Harasym Development Inc.,
- a communication from Carmine Gargarella, Bridlewood Homes;
- a communication from Judy Kwasnica, #706 – 655 Windermere Road;
- a communication from Nisha and Adrian Lattanzio, 332 Cornelius Court;
- a communication from Ella, Julie, Nicholas and Matteo Votta, 345 Cornelius Court;
- a communication from Jonathon Batch and Elizabeth Abbott, 231 Pebblecreek Walk;
- a communication from Bruce and Dana McMillan, 613 Eagletrace Drive;
- a communication, dated April 1, 2013, from Laura Price and David Pringle, 2148 Valleyrun Boulevard;
- a communication, dated March 31, 2013, from Robert, Janet, Taylor and Jaxon Lee, 1995 Wallingford Avenue; and,
- a communication from Julie Robertson, 2128 Valleyrun Boulevard;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- C. Sheculski, Vice President, Sunningdale West Residents Association – advising that the Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning gave a wonderful history of the Medway Valley Heritage Trail (Trail); indicating that he contacted the developer and the City in 2007 to enquire as to how the Trail would connect; noting that he was advised that it would be based on the 2005 Plan; indicating that he moved into his residence in 2008; advising that he kept in touch with the project advancement; noting that he contacted the developer with respect to the bridges; indicating that an alternative method was found that did not require a bridge; advising that there has been a change in the Municipal Council since the commencement of this project; indicating that there was a public meeting held in December, 2011; indicating that this new proposal is quite an alarming surprise; noting that it looked like the trail system was gone; further noting that it did not feel like there was a good chance for the trail system; indicating that a second public participation meeting was held; advising that in November, 2012, he asked about the Planning Advisory Group and the Trails Advisory Group; noting that many of the area residents expressed concern with their lack of voice on the two groups; indicating that, in January, 2013, he shared some points and concerns and the construction of the bridges was reduced to one; indicating that there has been no change in the community position; advising that 207 area residents signed their petition; advising that he feels that this is a discussion of principle; advising that he has spent half of his life working in the environmental industry; indicating that there is development on every side of them; and indicating that people are using the trails; advising that he will continue to advocate for the trails; advising that the enhanced Option 5b is not there yet; advising that he would like to see the areas up until the bend, paved with asphalt; noting that split asphalt is acceptable; indicating that he supports the boardwalk through the bend; expressing agreement with the two metre trail system; indicating that the bulk of the request for asphalt is around accessibility or strollers; noting that there are a lot of elderly residents living in the area; and advising that

there is also a seniors building in the area.

- Michael Dawthorne, Chair, Accessibility Advisory Committee and resident of northwest London – advising that this is a unique opportunity for people with disabilities; noting that one in seven people have a disability; advising that there are many trails that are not accessible; indicating that this is an opportunity to put in a trail that will be used by over 50% of the residents; advising that the last speaker expressed how passionate people are about their city; indicating that woodchips and gravel are not accessible; advising that he realizes that accessibility is expensive; indicating that the Civic Administration has advised the Accessibility Advisory Committee that every consideration is given to access; indicating that this is the first step to see this honoured; and advising that accessibility is not a price tag, it is a right.
- Leonard Fluher, 106 Rhine Avenue – advising that he has been a member of the Trails Advisory Group since January; indicating that he had a heated discussion with a city employee; enquiring as to whether or not we should cave into these people; advising that he is from one of the oldest families in London; indicating that this is one of the oldest trails in London; advising that John Graves Simcoe made the access open to everyone (Dundas Street); noting that this is listed as part of the surrender of London; expressing outrage at the way people with disabilities are treated; advising that his family has been part of the forest ranger service; indicating that today is the 99th anniversary of Vimy Ridge; and providing some family history.
- David Bronicheski, 314 Rivertrace Close – advising that he moved to London 10 years ago; indicating that the most base issue is whether or not this Council will honour the commitment that the previous Council made 10 years ago when the sewer went in; advising that he takes visitors to the areas that have been completed and everyone is impressed; and requesting that the Civic Administration's recommendation be rejected and that a continuous asphalt link be installed.
- Angela McGonigle, 297 Cornelius Court – advising that she has lived at her residence since 2008; indicating that Sunnigdale West is close to the Trail system; advising that her son relies on a powered wheelchair to get around; indicating that, through the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act*, people are able to access places for work, travel and play; expressing disappointment that they have been fighting for 8 years for universal access; advising that it is difficult to ask for compromise but she wants to be able to take her son for a walk; requesting that the Trail be 2 metres wide, with a woodchip surface that is smooth and even with no tree roots; advising that the only non-asphalt surface that she will support is the boardwalk; requesting that the Trails Advisory Group be thanked for its work; indicating that there is a difference between those with an interest in a subject and those who have a stake in a subject; advising that she has attended every meeting and felt that, as of November, 2012, she was losing her voice on this matter; indicating that she has volunteered 50 hours of her time on this matter; expressing hope that the community is being heard tonight; advising that on page 2 of the Civic Administration's report, the second last paragraph mentions that the road pathway was to be built to four metres; advising that on page 2 of the Civic Administration's report, the last sentence, she did not learn about this until 2 ½ years later; indicating that she was not invited to be a member of the Planning Advisory Group until this year; advising that in Appendix C of the Civic Administration's report, the existing gravel base road gets muddy and wet; advising that on page 12 of the Civic Administration's report, the existing dirt hiking trail, what happens if a wheelchair and a stroller meet up from opposite sides, how do they get by each other; advising that the area is a natural beauty; and indicating that with the enhanced Option 5b, her son, Owen cannot get across the creek to see his friend.
- Jacqueline Madden, 2134 Valleyrun Boulevard – advising that she has lived in world class cities; indicating that London considers itself a world class city and everything should be done world class, including this Trail.

- Renee Agathos, 2112 Valleyrun Boulevard – advising that they have a stake in this area; indicating that she was not aware of this issue until the Fall of 2011; indicating that she tried to follow the pathway with children and they were dumped out just south of Fanshawe Park Road; noting that they walked up to Wonderland Road, which was scary; indicating that they found their way through a field and back to the Trail; advising that, with the new work that has been completed on Wonderland Road North, it does not provide access to bicycling or rollerblading in safe ways; expressing a preference for the continuous asphalt pathway; and requesting that sidewalks be built further away from the road.
- Alain Proulx, 2044 Creekbend Place – reiterating the previous comments; advising that environmentally significant areas deserve respect; and advising that there is heavy equipment at the sewer.
- Roslynn Moorhead, 7 Hastings Gate – advising that environmentally significant areas are the jewels of London; advising that she was talking to someone visiting London from Kingston and they were impressed with the beauty of London; advising that Medway has been compromised by the sewer; noting that there is some need to compromise, but requesting that everyone remember that this is not a neighbourhood park; and advising that she does not support a continuous asphalt pathway.
- Keith Zerebecki, 1966 Valley Run Boulevard – indicating that he and his grandchildren love visiting Plane Tree Park; advising that, if he was on the Planning and Environment Committee, he would be tempted to vote in favour of the Civic Administration's recommendations; noting that the recommendations add a valuable bridge and paves some of the pathways; indicating that the enhancements have been well thought through; indicating that one of the enhancements meets up with the lookout; advising that Option 5b links asphalt with multi-use pathways; advising that the Trail is an outstanding feature in the city; advising that if Option 5b is approved, part of the pathway would be paved; advising that the link for the pathways is 500 metres of additional asphalt; indicating that there is approximately 80% in place; and expressing gratitude that only one bridge has to be built, not three.
- David Potten, 110 West Rivertrace Walk, on behalf of Friends of Medway Creek – advising that the 1998 Sunningdale Community Plan had an impact; indicating that there is no one here from Upper Richmond Village; indicating that there is no mention of cycling; noting that the alternative is to use Sunningdale Road, which is unsafe for recreation; advising that phase one of the plan is north of Fanshawe Park Road; indicating that if people stay on the pathway, they can keep the area clean; enquiring as to what it will be like in the summer and when Hickory Heights subdivision is built; advising that 72% of people voted to use the 50/50 weighing of environmental and social criteria of the study; indicating that if you cannot put a trail here, no trails would have positive scores; enquiring why taxpayers money is spent on conducting environmental studies; expressing appreciation to the members of the Trails Advisory Group; noting that the Group conducted a site visit, evaluated the options and reached a consensus; advising that Medway Creek residents educate the community on responsible environmental options; expressing support for an enhanced Option 5b; and advising that if half of the access road is paved on top of the sewer, it will satisfy more people.
- Sandy Levin, 59 Longbow Road, on behalf of the Orchard Park/Sherwood Forest Ratepayers Association – advising that he served on the Planning Advisory Group; recommending that the Trails Advisory Group should continue; advising that the policies and practices that the Municipal Council implements are what balances the conflicts between neighbourhoods; indicating that, by improving the access to the Trails, you are turning them into bicycle lanes; advising that someone took leaf bags and threw them in the bollard; advising that Option 5b might be the right compromise; indicating that this is only one part of the environmentally significant areas; enquiring as to whether the next step is to provide access through the entire environmentally significant areas; indicating that Option 5b bends the rules of the Official Plan a bit, but does not break them; indicating that the issues with the muddy areas are a result of the fallout from the sewer work being undertaken; and advising that no one is going to get what they want.

- Bill Davis, Old Masonville Residents Association – advising that people have provided reasons for approving or disapproving the Civic Administration’s recommendations; and indicating that the environmentally significant areas can be protected.
- Susan Blocker, 367 Grosvenor Street – advising that there is an excellent park system in the City; indicating that environmentally significant areas are different than park systems; advising that environmentally significant areas are not just for us, but are to protect and preserve other species; and advising that she does not support the continuation of the asphalt pathway.
- Jack Blocker, 367 Grosvenor Street – reminding the Committee that there is one set of actors who have an even larger stake in this, the wildlife who will be impacted with the increase in human traffic; advising that the Municipal Council passed a resolution to suspend asphalt paving in environmentally significant areas in 2009; indicating that with an increase in asphalt paving, there is an increase in human traffic; advising that all Londoners have the advantage of natural areas in the City; indicating that he agrees with the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee recommendation to weigh environmental consideration, with Options 3, 5a and 7b being given the highest priority; and noting that these recommendations are cheaper.
- David Wake, Nature London – advising that the Medway Valley Trail is an environmentally significant areas and is set aside for all the reasons that we know about; advising that the issue of the bend around the River is a substantial issue; advising that trails and bicycles are not allowed in environmentally significant areas; requesting the minimum footprint be allotted for the bend in the Trail; and recommending that bicycle racks should be placed at the end of the asphalt trail so that people can walk, not bicycle.
- Winnifred Wake, Nature London – supporting her husband’s comments; requesting that the integrity of environmentally significant areas be put first; advising that a lot of compromise has already taken place; and recommending the minimum footprint around the bend in the Trail.
- Anita Caveney, Nature London – advising that Nature London is relentless in its protection of environmentally significant areas; advising that there are reasons why environmentally significant areas are given that designation; indicating that these reasons should be considered first and foremost; expressing disappointment to hear how other people put their interests first; and reading an exemption from the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* relating to environmentally significant areas.
- Lori Pratt, 519 Sundance Place – advising that, even with all of the building going on, she sees all kinds of wildlife; and indicating that she loves nature and wants to enjoy it.
- Jim Cushing, 25 Elmwood Avenue East – advising that he enjoys the paved pathways in the parks; and indicating that he does not want to see pathways in environmentally significant areas.
- Chester Pawlowski, 178 St. Bees Close – indicating that the 2005 Medway Valley Heritage Trail Plan was on track; advising that Sandy Levin and the Attawandaron Residents supported the 2005 Plan; indicating that, with respect to Councillor Henderson’s concerns relating to the bend in the Trail, Stantec reported on the costs and assessment; and advising that this information is not provided in the Civic Administration’s report. (2013-E20)

#### IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION

#### V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

##### 16. Enquiry – Infill/Planning Projects

That, the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner **BE REQUESTED** to report back at a future meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee with respect to infill and planning projects in established communities; it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC) received the attached enquiry from Councillor J.P. Bryant with respect to this matter; it being further noted that the word “infrastructure” was amended to read “infill”.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 p.m.