



London
CANADA

P.O. Box 5035
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON
N6A 4L9

April 14, 2021

2690015 Ontario Inc.
c/o Dillon Consulting
130 Dufferin Avenue Suite 1400
London, ON
N6A 5R2

I hereby certify that the Municipal Council, at its meeting held on April 13, 2021 resolved:

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of 2690015 Ontario Inc. relating to the property located at 101 Meadowlily Road South:

- a) the proposed attached by-law BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on April 13, 2021 to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM an Urban Reserve Community Growth designation, TO a Low Density Residential designation and Open Space designation;
- b) the proposed attached by-law BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on April 13, 2021 to amend The London Plan to change the Place Type on a portion of the subject lands FROM a Neighbourhood Place Type, TO a Green Space Place Type; it being noted the amendments will come into full force and effect concurrently with Map 1 and Map 7 of The London Plan;
- c) the proposed attached by-law BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Holding Urban Reserve (h-2*UR1) Zone, TO a Residential Special Provision R6 (R6-5(_)) Zone and Open Space (OS5) Zone;
- d) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public participation meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium relating to the property located at 101 Meadowlily Road South;
 - i) increased traffic on Meadowlily Road South and lack of street parking;
 - ii) design and spacing of the units; and,
 - iii) minimal buffering on the east and west side of the area facing Meadowlily Road South and Highbury Woods;
- e) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public participation meeting with respect to the Site Plan Approval application relating to the property located at 101 Meadowlily Road South:
 - i) lack of bird-friendly lighting approaches in the design; and,

f) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) with any recommendation and continue to consult with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) on HIA matters;

it being noted that the Municipal Council approves these applications for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020;
- the proposed amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Low Density Residential and Open Space policies;
- the proposed amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Neighbourhood Place Type and Green Space policies.
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of an underutilized property and encourages an appropriate form of development;
- the subject lands are located in close proximity to arterial roads, surrounding services and access to the Meadowlily Trail and Thames Valley Parkway which provides pedestrian movements from East London to the City core;
- the Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium application is considered appropriate and in conformity with The London Plan and the (1989) Official Plan as recommended and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020;
- the proposed residential use is also consistent and permitted under the subject recommended Zoning By-law amendment application. Application for Site Plan Approval has also been reviewed and has advanced to the drawing acceptance stage;

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

- a presentation from S. Shannon, Dillon Consulting;
- a communication dated March 16, 2021 from N.J. Small, by e-mail;
- a communication from Lorraine, by e-mail;
- a communication from S. Nichols, by e-mail;
- a communication from E. Sweitzer, by e-mail;
- a communication dated March 21, 2021 from G. Smith and S. High, 141 Meadowlily Road South;
- a communication dated March 14, 2021 from A. Swan, by e-mail;
- the staff presentation; and,
- a communication dated March 26, 2021 from D. Kosciński, Acting Executive Director, Thames Talbot Land Trust;

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. (2021-D08) (AS AMENDED) (3.5/5/PEC)



C. Saunders
City Clerk
/ap

cc: G. Kotsifas, Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and
Chief Building Official
P. Yeoman, Director, Development Services
M. Feldberg, Manager, Development Services – Subdivisions
B. Page, Manager, Development Services – Subdivisions
M. Pease, Manager, Development Services – Site Plans
M. Corby, Senior Planner, Development Services – Subdivisions

M. Vivinetto, Executive Assistant to the Managing Director, Development and
Compliance Services and Chief Building Official
Documentation Services Representative
Chair and Members, London Advisory Committee on Heritage
List of External cc's on File in the City Clerk's Office

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 101 Meadowlily Road South 39CD-20502 (OZ-9192)

- Councillor P. Squire: I'll look for the staff presentation please. Sorry is someone prepared to make a presentation on this matter.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair, Mike Corby here. I have a presentation available for this and also, it's included in the added agenda if people want to follow along with it and before I start, I forgot a slide just a reminder that this application did go to the Planning and Environment Committee back in October 5, 2020. At that meeting the applicant sought to get this deferred back to staff, their original proposal showed three story townhomes and through our recommendation we required a maximum two and a half stories so the applicant sought deferral and so they've gone back and now we're here today with the slightly revised application. So, the subject site is 101 Meadowlily Road, it's located in the north east corner of the Highbury Avenue South and the Commissioners Road East. It's between the Highbury Woods on the west side of the site and the Meadowlily Woods ESA along the east side of the site. The nature of the application so part of this application is a city initiated Official Plan amendment changing the Urban Reserve Community Growth designation of the 1989 Official Plan to Low Density Residential along with that is a Zoning Amendment application and Vacant Land Condominium application that would permit an 88-unit cluster residential developments, 36 single detached dwelling units within it and 10 townhomes totaling 52 units within them. The conceptual site plan you can see in there identifies open space area, naturalized area on the west side of the property those lands will be zoned and designated as open space and dedicated to the City as part of the site plan approval process. You can see the units that are now fronting along Meadowlily Road previously had driveways out to Meadowlily Road they've been moved internally and access to those buildings from the street. Those buildings also along Meadowlily Road have been reduced to two storeys in height. In terms of policy within the London Plan the site is within the Neighbourhood Place type designation. The proposed cluster residential development is in keeping with the range of permitted uses within this place type. In the 1989 Official Plan as mentioned this is within the Urban Reserve Community Growth designation. This designation is used to identify lands that will be used for a mix of urban land uses in the future. The City has initiated an application to change these low density residential and feel it's appropriate on the site-specific basis given that the London Plan has already does any of these lands as the Neighbourhood Place type. Through this process there was a lot of public concern a lot of this was addressed at the original meeting, but we'll go through the main issues again. So, one of the main issues was traffic and so through the review process it was determined that the proposed use will not generate significant levels of traffic and should not have any adverse effects in the area. Safety was a concern and through the application a sight line analysis was completed to ensure safe sight lines are available along Meadowlily Road. A reduction in speed to forty kilometers an hour is forthcoming through a Council approved initiative to reduce speeds on local roads throughout London and as mentioned the applicant has removed fourteen driveways from accessing Meadowlily Road South helping improve safety along along the road. Parking was another main concern specifically on street parking and the ongoing issues they're having with that. The vacant land condo proposed originally had ten visitor parking spaces through the revised plan

they've increased this to thirty one visitor parking spaces which is well above what's required. Impacts on the surrounding feature in terms of the abutting woodland to the east and the Meadowlily ESA to the west and staff feel appropriate buffering have been provided between these land uses. Now we're receiving a thirty-five-meter set back from the drip line of the Highbury Woods. All lands outside the development limit will be dedicated to the City and zoned and designated open space and the existing right of way for Meadowlily Road provides a significant buffer and hard boundary between the land uses to the east and does not allow for the potential encroachment of the proposed development into the natural heritage feature. This right of away combined with the proposed setbacks creates an appropriate buffer and separation between land uses resulting in minimal impacts from the proposed development on the abutting ESA. Heritage concerns and maintaining that real context was also raised at the original public meeting. Staff feel that with the reduced height along Meadowlily Road as well as the proposed setbacks and the removal of the driveways and garages the development provides an appropriate response to the abutting lands and the rural setting of the area. The large more functional green space now provided in front of the development will provide a greater opportunity to implement the recommendations outlined through the Heritage Impact Assessment in an effort to maintain the rural context. Some of the abutting property owners had concerns about stormwater and flooding and whether it will affect their property or not as part of the site plan approval process the applicant is required to demonstrate that stormwater will not impact the surrounding lands. Through the site plan process the applicant has been able to prove that the site stormwater management design will match and or improve the site's predevelopment conditions so there shall be no impacts on the abutting properties. Staff is recommending approval of the pros of the proposed amendments the proposal is keeping with the policies of the 1989 Official Plan, the London Plan, and the Provincial Policy Statement. The proposal will facilitate the development of an underutilized property and encourages an appropriate form of development. The subject lands are located in close proximity to arterial roads ensuring easy access to the 401 and other areas and services within the city and the site is situated near two community commercial nodes which will support and benefit from the proposed increase in density for the community. That's it thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. From the committee technical questions only please. There being no technical questions we'll go to a public participation and first all here, we'll hear I should say from the applicant and again everyone will have 5 minutes to speak. Is there someone from the applicant who wishes to make a presentation?
- Melanie Muir, Planner, Dillon Consulting: Hi yes. Hi I'm Melanie Muir from Dillon Consulting a planner for the applicant.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Melanie Muir: Thank you committee members. We would like to just give a brief overview. The presentation was already included in the agenda package. The project overview, on October 5, 2020 a public meeting as Mr. Corby has said for this proposed development was held at City Hall. Based on the concerns brought forward by the residents as well as the municipality we redesigned some of the proposal to address many of the concerns as possible. The preposed development consists of the following, 36 single detached dwelling units which is

one less than what was originally proposed and 52 townhome units for a total of 88 units. All units have been designed to a maximum of two and a half storeys in height as required by the by-law, reduction from the three storeys as Mr. Corby indicated that we had already proposed. Direct access to Meadowlily Road for individual townhome units have been removed and internal access provided allowing for a larger setback from the ESA and additional landscaping and tree planting to intensify visual buffer between the road and the development. Private sanitary sewers and storm sewers including a private sanitary pump station and forcemain are to be provided. A public/private watermain will be constructed to service the development. Buffers from the Highbury Woods Park and the Meadowlily ESA in accordance with provincial and municipal requirements are being maintained. Landscaping and heritage compensation features complimentary to the natural existing landscape will be included. As Mr. Corby indicated visitor parking from the site will be increased from the required ten to thirty-one spaces well over the number of spaces required under the by-law. Since the public meeting the City has approved our request to reduce the speed limit of Meadowlily Road South from the existing fifty kilometers an hour to forty which is anticipated to go to Council sometime within 2021. The next page shows the changes to the conceptual development plan with the enhanced buffer along Meadowlily Road as well as the naturalized areas in the open space will be dedicated to the municipality in the rezone. We also included some examples some renderings of the, both the single detached as well as the townhome units. The ones facing Meadowlily Road with, which are on the second page of the renderings they include the access only via sidewalks to trail and the open space with the following page showing the garages in the rear along the internal road and as well the front and side facing views of the traditional units which are further interior to the proposed development as well as the back sorry. And we have some views looking along private street A and Meadowlily Road South both looking south and north along that road. With respect, regards to response to some of the additional public comments received are they are asking about overflow to the pump station where would it go and that it should not outlet to the watercourse or the ESA and our response is that the sanitary sewer pumping stations has a large capacity of concrete holding tank with the two-pump design with one primary and one back up. There is no overflow outlet to any watercourse nor to any part of the ESA as it is a closed system. The pumping station is designed and is in compliance with the Ministry regulations. Who's responsible, whose responsibility will it be to maintain the pumping station and alarm system. It should be noted that the condominium corporation will own and maintain the pump station via a maintenance contract with a City approved contractor and will include a proactive maintenance schedule. There is a backup pump in the pump station in case the primary pump malfunctions and requires repair. The pump station will have automatic alarm notification via telecom to the maintenance contractor. Another concern was that are there any erosion concerns and potential drainage into the TTLT property, and this has been addressed in the stormwater management design. The stormwater is to be managed on-site mainline sewers and/or holding chambers before releasing it into the City storm sewer system. A comprehensive erosion and sediment control management plan has also been developed and provided as part of this submission. There were also concerns with regards to flooding as Mr. Corby indicated and his response is what we have designed which is it's addressing the stormwater management design. Concerns with the need for compensation seedlings and monitoring of the butternut trees, the habitat zone which is a fifty metre radius of a single category 2 retainable butternut will be disturbed by the grading work, as a result of the anticipated disturbance ten butternut saplings will

be planted as compensation within the cultural meadow area of the subject property as well as ten compensation trees as specified in the regulations. A Butternut Health Assessment report is being filed and approved by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks. Prior to disturbance of the butternut habitat zone impact will be registered with the MECP in accordance with section twenty-three point seven under the Ontario regulations. The locations of the ten butternut samplings will be provided in a planting plan following confirmation of the compensation ratio for other trees removed from the subject property with the City.

- Councillor Squire: We're now well over five minutes I've given you a little extra time but if you could wrap up that would be great.
- Melanie Muir: Sure, basically we're in complete agreement with the recommendations of administration and are here to answer any questions. I also have my other, our engineer sorry are here as well Jason Johnson and Sam Shannon as well as the developer himself in case anyone has any questions.
- Councillor Squire: Great thank you very much. So now we'll go to the public and just before we start that each person will be allowed up to five minutes. If you could identify yourself with your name and your address if you would like that would be really helpful and if you just keep in mind that we try to keep these meetings civil. I know there's strong opinions but if you could refrain from, from any personal remarks or any cheering and clapping that would be really helpful as there may be people with a different point of view as you. In terms of questions and this is not sort of a question and answer session but if you ask questions or there's things you want to know and I can try to get the answers from staff or the applicant for you I will make sure I do that. So, with that being said we're looking forward to hearing from you and are we going to do online first or in the meeting rooms. Alright why don't we go to online and the first one I have is Daniel Hines that was the name given so perhaps I could just find out who is online waiting to speak.
- Cathy Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair this is Cathy Saunders. Mr. Weir is ready to speak.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. Sorry we're still not hearing anyone.
- Cathy Saunders: Mr. Weir is unmuted so I'm not sure why he is unable to speak. Perhaps you could go on to Mr. Richardson in the meantime.
- Bruce Richardson: Good afternoon my name is Bruce Richardson and I'm a resident at 25 Meadowlily Road South and have been for approximately fifteen years. The main thing that we're, speaking to my neighbors seems to be the consensus and we all do support some kind of low-density development I'm certainly surprised that eighty-eight units would be considered low density that is approximately anywhere from one hundred seventy-six people up to two hundred and sixty-four people depending on the family size. We personally or a few of us have discussed this and we definitely think that it would be more advantageous for the development to be private family homes. We understand that the thirteen approximately thirteen-acre property is down to about twelve acres because of the abutments or the space between the ESAs. But the other thing that we always bring up is the traffic and the parking both human and vehicles. The traffic down here in the last year has gone ten times what it was already with visitors to

the park there is obvious safety problems. The speed's been addressed that's wonderful. There is a blind curve on the road, there is no sidewalk, there is people and children walking up and down those roads almost every day so it's certainly a safety concern having you know, you know two hundred sixty-four people I mean under the set up to it could be eighty-eight units could be a hundred seventy-six cars. The other thing that we are happy to hear that the attempts to have a land trust property. The Meadowlily nature preserve has been recognized. I want to remind Council that this development is surrounded by three ESAs. So you've got Highbury Woods, Meadowlily Woods and the TTLT nature preserve and we are always available to talk to anyone that on this matter. You know we're very concerned with the land and the animals and the visitors that we have down here in the park. Thank you very much for the opportunity. Have a great day.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you Sir. Who's up next?
- Cathy Saunders: Mr. Shannon is next.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Melanie Muir: Through you Mr. Chair, Mr. Shannon as part of Dillon.
- Councillor P. Squire: Yeah, the names that are given are actually Dillon, Johnson, Richter and Riley are all members of the applicant.
- Cathy Saunders: I apologize we have no way of knowing.
- Councillor Squire: No that's fine.
- Cathy Saunders: Let me check Mr. Johnson is also.
- Melanie Muir: Yes.
- Cathy Saunders: Next is Richter, R. I. C. H. T. E. R.
- Councillor Squire: Yeah, again the names with Dillon are Shannon, Johnson, Richter, and Riley.
- Cathy Saunders: Rosemary Boyd.
- Rosemary Boyd: I'm here watching from home.
- Councillor Squire: Okay did you want to speak to us?
- Rosemary Boyd: Probably just the obvious that I'm an avid hiker in the area I'm very familiar with it and I really hope that you know we'll all be gone some day and I think that keeping these lands free from development period would be a really nice legacy for our children. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Alright thank you very much.
- Cathy Saunders: Next is Mr. Weir.

- Dennis Weir: Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: Yes, thank you.
- Dennis Weir: Yes, I spoke originally at the October meeting. I'm very much against this proposal as with the previous speaker I think we need to look to the future and maintain the ecosystem. This is so close to a nature preserve this development which sadly distracts from the protected area it's just a disaster waiting to happen. It's just too dense of a population proposed the hazards in the wintertime, increased traffic, the potential for accidents with pedestrians with increased number of the homes in that area. I think most Londoners visit this area would really like to see it kept the way it is. The minor changes that they've made since October don't really make any difference whatsoever with respect to that concern. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you Sir. Next.
- Cathy Saunders: Ms. Symington.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Barbara Symington: Mr. Chairman thank you and committee members. My question has to do with is there a heritage study attached to this development proposal especially you know there was a previous heritage study that focused on park farm on Meadowlily Road but there appears to be no heritage studies attached to this particular application. Are there any available? There is a neighbourhood tradition that there was a long house situated at 101 Meadowlily Road and so my question is what archaeological review will be undertaken to see if in fact this is indigenous lands previously. Also there have been things found in the adjoining properties early early nineteenth century artifacts including some military artifacts that seem to be connected to the War of 1812 so not only is this a very very important environmental gem in the City of London but I also think that we have to look at the historical importance and so much of our history unfortunately has been lost and developed over. And just speaking for myself I appreciate what the developer and what the consultant have said about that pumping situation but boy if anything can go wrong it will and you know that's a lot of sewage in that area. So, thank you very much for allowing me to speak and as I said I'd very much like to know if there will be an archaeological investigation prior to any development. Thank you again.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Who's next?
- Cathy Saunders: Mr. Richardson.
- Councillor Squire: Bruce Richardson spoke.
- Cathy Saunders: Melanie Oudshoorn sorry.
- Councillor Squire: Oudshoorn. Go ahead.
- Melanie Oudshoorn: Hi yes hello. I just wanted to comment on I'm surprised that development would be allowed in this spot just because of the ESA and the nature there so however disappointing that is the traffic will increase and I think

that would be a really big concern for that area and just the taking away from that from the forested area there. I just wanted to mention my concerns so thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much.
- Cathy Saunders: Nancy Tausky.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. Hello? Ms. Tausky?
- Nancy Tausky: Hello. Am I unmuted?
- Councillor Squire: You are unmuted now.
- Nancy Tausky: I seem to have lost the visual aspect of this meeting but if you can hear me that's fine.
- Councillor Squire: Yeah, it's fine if we can hear you.
- Nancy Tausky: Okay. I want to say that I appreciate the attempts that the developer has made to meet some of our other, our earlier complaints and also I want to commend the LACH report based largely on the HIA for this development and I think it's very good and I want to commend all of its recommendations. I have three points I want to make myself and they'll go a bit further first I do agree with the people who are saying that there should be no development here. I think that surrounded as it is by natural areas and two important historical sites three of one includes the remains of the mill that it's on it's not the right place for a development of this size. I prefer to see no development here if there were, if there is to be one, I think it should be a development of much lower density. If there is going to be a development here I think that the designers are losing an opportunity to do something original and very interesting and trying to make the development more suitable for its rural site. As it is with the density and the spacing there's really quite a strong urban flavour to the development and also when that is I think rather depressing the development there's a sameness about all the buildings especially the individual buildings the ones that are designed to house a one family and even though they've added some historical detail to the buildings they still have a strong urban flavour. If you look around the picture of the road, the interior road it looks more like an urban institution than it does a series of rural houses and I think there is, there would have been lots of room to do something more interesting both in design and spacing and if we're going to keep it there which I'd prefer that we didn't I'd really like to see it substantially rearranged. My second comment has to do with the relationship to the road, Meadowlily Road is very old, it was the path used to bring people to the mill from south of London of very early in the nineteenth century and although it's no longer simply a dirt path, it still is a road that retains a strong urban character with its narrowness, its lack of curbs, the growth on both sides of the road and it's if we put in curbs widening the road that rural character and that historic quality is going to be entirely gone. I would like to see stronger buffering on the west side of the road. The view of the townhouses shown in the proponent's presentation again has a much more urban character than a rural one. I'd like to see buffering in second set in the east side of the road. And finally I really can't understand the logic that decided there should be an urban development in this site of any any sort surrounded as it is by historical and natural protected sites. I'm not against density and increasing the density in London I think the idea of increasing the density to make, to protect agricultural and natural and important natural lands is

very good one but I don't understand why this is not a protected natural land. I know it's late in that process to make this observation I have made it from the beginning and so have many other people and I don't suppose that accepted our dreams there's any chance of going back to making it a natural site but if there were any way that the City could help the developer relocate on some other site I will, I and many other people thousands I think would very much appreciate it. Thanks for listening to me although you might think from this last comment that I've been cooped up too long.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. We've all been so cooped up so long so don't worry about that. Who's next to speak?
- Cathy Saunders: Erika Boody.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Erika Boody: Okay thank you. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: Yes, we can hear you.
- Erika Boody: Perfect. I'm a resident of London as well and I also am against this proposal. I'm in agreement of private family homes that this site because it's more in keeping with what's already on site on that road. I also appreciate the attempts to mitigate the effects of the development but disagree that these measures are sufficient changing to low density residential from urban reserve community growth designation. I just had a couple of questions I was wondering when this site was actually designated urban reserve community growth, when it was given to be a mix of urban uses in the future. Basically, we wanted to declare a climate emergency so I don't know when this designation was taken into effect but even more recent than that was the climate emergency declaration, and I don't think you know we should be taking the word emergency lightly. It means immediate action and so we're actually going against that. Also, the report to the Planning and Environment Committee states that London's growth and development is well planned and sustainable over the long term it also says that the development will be serviced by new private roads access for Meadowlily Road South and will include thirty-one visitor parking spaces on site. This is so close to a nature preserve and an Environmental Significant Area and it doesn't meet the requirements of a sustainable city. The requested amendment is to permit a vacant land have eighty-eight units the mitigation measure was what, to decrease it by one unit it's nothing and a half of floor and what about the bird population right next door. I don't think that was really taken into consideration an increased visitor parking spaces is great for the residents of the complex, but it also means more urbanization. The city is expanding and we're clogging the land not letting the water penetrate into the soil the more water we use the more waste we produce and so as like you know I know that it sounds like they're putting a lot of effort into making a stormwater management plan but unfortunately these designs aren't always fail-proof. Our own pollution plants overflow whenever there's heavy rains and it's outputting into the Thames River. We need effective stormwater management to manage quality and quantity and so and also how are these pumps running is this going to be, are they going to be run by renewable energy. Even if we put in permeable concrete here permeable concrete is not as effective in these winter climates that we that we have here in London and they also require a lot of maintenance. And yeah the forty kilometre an hour speed limit is not a big accomplishment it's a very steep

hill and yeah there's a lot of pedestrians using it especially the visitor parking is over full where are those people going to park, you guessed it they're parking on Meadowlily with all the other trail users and the other residents that already live on that, on that street and the buffer leaving minimal impacts on the ESA science says otherwise. Again, and again, it does not take a lot of effort to find articles proving this and I'm happy to send some your way if you'd like. The reduced height and setbacks are not enough considering the setting of this area. And one other question was about the Jefferson Salamander there's new technology using handheld point of need tool to sample extract and analyze the water ways, that is an endangered species, so I'd like to know more about the efforts made for Jefferson Salamander to identify if they are in this area or not but yeah, I respectfully disagree. Thank you for your time.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Next online speaker?
- Cathy Saunders: Mr. Chair that is the last person we have registered to join us remotely. I have a number of individuals who have joined us, they aren't registered nor am I sure how received the link perhaps the Chair would like to ask depending on whether they're here to speak to this matter.
- Councillor Squire: How would they do that? Do they have to indicate and notify you?
- Cathy Saunders: They could unmute and indicate if they are here for Meadowlily. If we don't hear anything, we can assume that you could go to the rooms.
- Councillor Squire: Okay I'm sorry mute.
- Cathy Saunders: If they could unmute and indicate.
- Councillor Squire: Okay, is there anyone else watching right now who wishes to speak if so let me know and we will allow you to speak for up to five minutes. Okay thank you very much so there being no other online speakers we will go to in person in the breakout rooms I think there's Committee Rooms 1 and 2, and 5. Let's go first to Committee Room 1 and 2, is there someone there that wishes to speak on this matter? If we could just get your name and address if possible and then you'll have five minutes.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Hi my name is AnnaMaria Valastro. I'm at 133 John Street. The staff report states that public comments opposing this development haven't changed even with the revisions and you've heard those grievances again today, tonight. I don't understand how one applicant can change the entire character of an area despite the collective voices of those that travel across the city to experience a rural country road charm of Meadowlily. The design is jolting it doesn't even trying to embrace the cultural heritage value of Meadowlily, all it offers is to hide behind cedar hedges and I don't understand why this committee doesn't uphold these values and insist on integrating this design into the natural and rural characteristics of the area because it's back now a second time. There are no demands placed on the applicant to utilize low impact development techniques, to lessen the load of run off into the Thames River. This development needs its own pumping water station and its own stormwater which is an indication that is it means it is an over intensification of the site. Why is the Planning Committee why as a Planning Committee you cannot set a higher standard and point to values that have been identified and at Official Plans, the

Provincial Policy Statement and by Londoners to achieve a less intrusive design and respect the fact that land Londoners want this area preserved. I'm under the impression that this committee must approve this application as is because somehow it meets the regulatory rules. The natural heritage inventory report from 2013 that helped identify the boundaries of Meadowlily ESA Master Plan did not appear to survey this parcel of land for natural heritage features for wildlife or vegetation the trees you can see through binoculars you can see this on the maps and the City's environmental management rights are from 2003 and the Official Plan is from 1989 and the environmental impact statement only dealt with buffers, stray cats, and bird strikes. The natural heritage section of the Provincial Policy Statement was updated in 2014, it was controversial at the time because it wakened protection for the North and strengthened protection for Southern Ontario by using stronger language such as shall a term that removes exemptions unless explicitly stated in policy and the inclusion of ecological function which cannot be fulfilled easily by prescriptive guidelines like a pumping station, white cedar hedges. The city's regulatory rules are old they're too old to adhere to the new rules of the Provincial Policy Statement. The provincial significant wetland was confirmed in the inventory in 2013 commissioned by the City of London that's your responsibility to make sure that no harm comes to that wetland. The Provincial Policy Statement clearly states that in 2.8 development site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features in areas identified in 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and has been demonstrated that there would be no negative impacts on the natural features and other ecological functions. You haven't done that which is required for you to meet the above criteria. The survey is only is already 8 years old it was only an inventory it did not measure ecological function as stated above and the cookie cutter approach to the City's environmental management guidelines are old.

- Councillor Squire: You have thirty seconds remaining.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: This application needs to be sent back until it embraces a low impact approach to avoid ecological damage and integrates into the cultural heritage values of Meadowlily. This one application should not be so dominant that it disturbs the very pleasure of visiting Meadowlily ESA and I really think this land should be expropriated. The City has expropriated a lot of land for traffic the least you can do is expropriate to expand green space. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Other speakers in the committee rooms? Please come forward if you wish to speak today. Could I get your name please and your address if you like?
- Dorothy Stolarski: My name is Dorothy Stolarski, my address is 416 Wellington Street in Ingersoll Ontario. I'm advocating for 147 Meadowlily Road South as I was, that is my family home and my mother still lives there so I am making just a presentation and pivoting a bit from the you know the letters that you're receiving today but I do echo and support the previous speaker. So, I'm going to just change things a little bit I'm going to read a poem it's entitled "I am Green" (please see attachment). So, that's a poem just to summarize what we're going through with this application for the condo development meeting in another way to get through the City Council what Meadowlily means to the people of London. I fought for many years between 2008 and 13 and we've done a lot and now it's time for the residents to speak up and I have, I appreciate your time in hearing me today. Thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any other speakers in the committee rooms? Is there anyone in Committee Room 5 I should ask or we, am I just looking at the one room. We'll go ahead.
- Clerk: There's no one in Committee Room 5.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Go ahead Ms. McKeating.
- Kelly McKeating, ACO London: Okay thank you and I'm hoping that you can hear me through the mask. My name is Kelly McKeating, I live at 329 Victoria Street and I am speaking on behalf of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario's London Region Branch. We made a presentation at the PPM last October and while there have been a couple of positive changes here I think that we still have a number of concerns as do many citizens of London. People may not believe it but both ACO London and I are big supporters of urban intensification so long as it's in the right location Meadowlily Road isn't the right location in my opinion. This proposal to put a development squarely in the middle of one of the last remaining rural landscapes in the city is in our view the antithesis of urban intensification and the London Plan's emphasis on growing our city inward and upward. As other people have mentioned this is a proposal to put eighty-eight residential units within a U shaped bounded on three sides by nature preserve protected land. Of concern in all of this is the precedent that could be set because I understand that there is another property on Meadowlily Road where there's also potential for development in the near future. I think that this is a place that should remain natural and if it doesn't remain natural the density should be a lot lower than eighty-eight houses. If the proposed development does proceed then I think that the buffering that is being proposed should be made stronger rather than the manicured land, lawn that we see in the renderings very dense brush, trees and bushes on the City road allowance that basically make the townhouses invisible from the road would be a great idea. While two access points is certainly an improvement over sixteen access points, a single access point at the south end of the development would be preferred. One of the concerns that I have with this proposal is not just what the developer is proposing but also the collateral damage that the City might actually inflict on the area afterwards. The staff report makes reference to the road widening dedication and while I understand and hope that road widening is not in the immediate future for Meadowlily Road I think the reality is that if you let these eighty-eight housing units be built with a hundred and seventy six or so people who live in them there's going to be more traffic and eventually someone's going to say it's not safe we've got to widen the road we've got to remove some trees to improve the sight lines we've got to plow through and get rid of that blind curves and you know very soon the magical place that is Meadowlily Road and Meadowlily Woods will not be there any longer. The Development Services heritage planning staff's recommendation that the property owner consider design refinements including articulated massing and rooflines and different needs heights to de-emphasize the dense urban character of the repeated four unit townhouse block and I'm reading doesn't appear to have been heeded so we've got a very dense development being proposed in the wrong place of the wrong design and I certainly hope that Councillors decide to nix this in its current proposed form. Thanks.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Our next speaker in the committee room?

- Carol Richardson: I hope you can hear through the mask.
- Councillor Squire: Could I get your name please?
- Carol Richardson: Carol Richardson, I live on 1200 Riverside Drive in London right and I am a member of the executive of Friends of Meadowlily Woods.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Carol Richardson: I'd like to begin my comments by saying that I support any reduction in the number of units that could be considered, hoping for a lowering of the R6 zoning. My opening question of the design as presented is what will this look like? This development is being represented as low density, but it will increase the population of Meadowlily Road by over two hundred percent. Based on input from the previous public participation meeting there have been definite improvements especially lowering the numbers of driveways directly off Meadowlily from sixteen and I thought it was one but apparently, it's two and I don't know why there isn't just one road with egress and entrance. I'm sorry excuse me now I'm just making a note last Thursday I turned left onto Meadowlily Road from Commissioners Road and I was quickly met by an older lady in a motorized wheelchair moving along the east side of the road in a southerly direction. Some children also use this road to walk to school or the YMCA located on Hamilton road. I often encounter people rollerblading and many times pedestrians pushing baby strollers that was really evident during the warm weather. Cyclists often use this as the transportation corridor to get to downtown and return. Can there be warning signs for both people and vehicles near this specific subdivision driveway warning them of how little space there is to share the road specifically at that location and then I think the City should be honest and Planning and answer this question is there a provision to widen the roads because that's been brought up by Kelly as well. Since this is a rural setting the developer has proposed shielding the view of the subdivision by a buffer with trees planted side by side so they're trying hedging as much as possible, but you won't retain the rural feeling with that kind of cedar intense hedge. Surely there is a native species of trees that would fill in to provide a visual barrier and not plant it at all in a row like soldiers but in a way that each, perhaps alternatively, so that each tree has room to spread its branches. I'm sure there's good tree consultants that are available to the City to advise in order to allow future growth of each tree and which trees would thrive in that area. Also, that buffer along Meadowlily Road is really narrow compared with the buffer to Highbury Woods and I'm just wondering if there's any way that that could be adjusted with you know way, way wider buffer on the road side and maybe somehow if they could adjust it with the other side so that it would be of greater value to the neighbours. And then I was asking my question, and then I'll leave my presentation because I appreciate the Chair saying that some of our questions can be answered we didn't expect them all to be answered today but I just wondered what the different buffers were and I heard tonight I believe it's a thirty five meter buffer with Highbury Woods but I know it's narrower for the road. I am requesting tonight that the Planning and Environment Committee make a motion that City Council directs staff to include the following in any approval of the subdivision plan. That one native tree be planted for each residence and that some kind of native thicket hedges of one to two meters be planted along all shared boundaries with the Meadowlily Nature Preserve and Highbury Woods. This would be a way to prevent residents from throwing their garden waste over the fence into the natural areas. This has been

a significant challenge in other subdivisions in spite of the best efforts by the City of London with pamphlets and signage discouraging this degradation of natural areas by introducing plants that can be invasive and can crowd out the natural species. This measure would also help prevent wildlife from invading the subdivision itself as there's a significant deer population in that area and it would also provide a haven for smaller wildlife some of whom will be displaced by construction of this subdivision. All of these measures.

- Councillor Squire: You have, excuse me, you have thirty seconds left.
- Carol Richardson: Okay, some of the people have mentioned this but I wondered whether earth-friendly approaches could be taken, bird friendly lighting, solar used for hot water heating, LED lighting, anything like that and my question is which municipal building codes have changed to make these earth-friendly options mandatory. Thank you sincerely for the opportunity to speak at the public participation meeting.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Anyone else wishing to speak at the meeting?
- Andrew Stolarski: Hello my name's Andrew Stolarski, I live on 1140 Pond View Road which is just as beautiful as Meadowlily Road it's located by Westminster Ponds. Single low-density residential homes are there, it's something possibly what I was hoping Meadowlily would be twelve to sixteen homes to coincide with the homes on top of the hill but I only have one quick question I submitted to ReThink Zoning that Meadowlily Road South be included in that and I hope that it is put on the record because I think we have a lot of problems when it comes to zoning and I think you need basically citizens to speak up and what they want for London and how they want to develop it. I remember ten years ago when we did ReThink London and we were proposing what was going to happen to Meadowlily and surrounding areas, I think it was Mr. Fielding was our planner at that time and I remember we were given tables and we did cut-outs and a lot of us from Friends of Meadowlily Woods proceeded to put homes similar to what was already there running down to the bridge and I wonder what happened to that. Didn't anybody see that? That's all I have to say thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Anyone else in Committee Room 1 and 2 wishing to speak? Okay. Last opportunity for public participation calling once, twice we're going move to close the public participation meeting.
- Cathy Saunders: There is someone. Mr. Grant has raised his hand on the remote attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Alright Mr. Grant.
- Brian Grant: Hey can you hear me alright?
- Councillor Squire: Yes, I can hear you. Go ahead.
- Brian Grant: Yes, thank you.
- Councillor Squire: We can't hear Mr. Grant anymore.
- Cathy Saunders: I've asked him to unmute.

- Briant Grant: Okay there we go. You got it?
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Could you start again?
- Brian Grant: Yeah no problem. We don't like it. I think it's clear the citizens of London are not behind this idea. I've sat in on quite a few meetings now and I don't see opposition to other developments I mean what's going to happen, is this it? It just gets accepted. I don't understand why. I know all the valuables in the city and Meadowlily is called a gem, it's a gem it's a wild area. There are thirty people living on the row and I don't know how many of you people have actually walked on this road, it is a steep steep hill. One of the speakers talked about strollers and roller blade or some runners and cyclists that's how it's used. There are 30 people living there. The base, at the base of the hill there's the footbridge you guys had a ceremony ten years ago or fifteen years ago when the bridge was reopened the City of London is aware of the character of this neighborhood. They celebrated it and so it's, having ninety new homes in the tiny country lane it's it just doesn't make sense not from a neighborhood point of view I mean lots of people are already talking about environmental impact, I'm not even going to weight in on that just from a safety and neighborhood point of view it doesn't belong here. Nobody likes it, we don't want it. You know they've filled out their applications properly, but I think the citizens have been clear that they don't want it. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you Sir. Anyone else now after Mr. Grant? Can I ask again anybody wishing to speak once, twice. We'll close the public participation meeting.