

Planning and Environment Committee

Report

The 5th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
March 29, 2021

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

ALSO PRESENT: A. Pascual, M. Ribera, and B. Westlake Power.

Remote Attendance: Councillors M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, J. Morgan, and M. van Holst; J. Adema, G. Bailey, G. Barrett, M. Corby, G. Dales, M. Davenport, L. Davies-Snyder, M. Feldberg, J. Hall, P. Kavcic, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, J. Lee, J. MacKay, C. Maton, S. Meksula, L. Mottram, B. O'Hagan, B. Page, M. Pease, J. Raycroft, A. Riley, M. Schulthess, M. Sundercock, C. Saunders, S. Tatavarti, M. Tomazincic, S. Wise, and P. Yeoman.

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

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That Items 2.1 to 2.13, inclusive, BE APPROVED.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2.1 1st Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 1st Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on February 24, 2021:

a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Notice of Planning Application, dated February 10, 2021, from S. Meksula, Senior Planner, related to a Draft Plan of Subdivision Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment for the properties located at 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West:

i) the above-noted Notice BE DEFERRED to the next Trees and Forests Advisory Committee (TFAC) meeting; and,

ii) S. Meksula, Senior Planner or delegate, BE INVITED to attend the next TFAC meeting, to give clarification and provide additional details on the above-noted Notice; and,

b) clauses 1.1 and 1.2, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4, 5.1 to 5.4, inclusive, BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed

2.2 2nd Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 2nd Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on March 3, 2021:

- a) the revised Discussion Primer for the Climate Emergency Action Plan - 2020 document, approved by the members of the Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE), as appended to the ACE Report, BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for review; and,
- b) clauses 1.1 and 1.2, 3.1 to 3.3, inclusive, 4.1 and 5.2, BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed

2.3 1st Report of the Agricultural Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 1st Report of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on March 17, 2021:

- a) the Urban Agricultural Steering Committee BE ADVISED that Steve Twynstra will act as the Agricultural Advisory Committee representative on the Urban Agricultural Steering Committee; and,
- b) clauses 1.1 and 1.2, 2.1, 3.1 to 3.5, inclusive, 5.2 to 5.5, inclusive, BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed

2.4 Bill 229 and Ontario's Flooding Strategy

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and City Planner, the staff report dated March 29, 2021 entitled "Bill 229, *Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020*, and Ontario's Flooding Strategy" BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-S08/D03)

Motion Passed

2.5 Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan – Loan Agreements – Delegated Authority By-laws

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", being "A by-law to approve and authorize the use of the Affordable Housing Development Loan Agreement template between The Corporation of the City of London (the "City") and Registered Owner of a property providing affordable rental units (the "Borrower") to provide for a loan for the creation of new affordable rental housing units and to delegate the authority to enter into such Agreements to the City Planner or delegate", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021; and,

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "B", being "A by-law to approve and authorize the use of the Additional Residential Unit Loan Agreement template between The Corporation of the City of London (the "City") and Registered Owner of a property providing affordable rental units (the "Borrower") to provide for a loan to address affordability of home ownership and to create more long-term, stable rental housing supply to help address low rental vacancy rates, and to delegate the authority to enter into such Agreements to the City Planner or delegate", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021. (2021-S11)

Motion Passed

2.6 Application - 122 Base Line Road West (H-9306)

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Goldfield Ltd., relating to the property located at 122 Base Line Road West, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Holding Bonus Residential R8 (h-5 *R8-3*B-69) Zone TO a Bonus Residential R8 (R8-3*B-69) Zone to remove the "h-5" holding provision. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.7 Application - 2725 Asima Drive (33M-699, Block 53) (P-9282)

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with respect to the application by Rockwood Homes, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to exempt Block 53, Plan 33M-699 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of Subsection 50(5) of the *Planning Act*, for a period not exceeding three (3) years. (2021-D25)

Motion Passed

2.8 Application - 335 Kennington Way and 3959 Mia Avenue (33M-765, Block 1, RP 33R-20777 Parts 2 and 3) (P-9304)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Sifton Properties Limited, to exempt Block 1, Plan 33M-765, RP 33R-20777 Parts 2 & 3 from Part-Lot Control:

- a) pursuant to subsection 50(7) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at a future Municipal Council meeting, to exempt Block 1, Plan 33M-765, RP 33R-20777 Parts 2 & 3 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of subsection 50(5) of the said *Act*, it being noted that these lands are subject to registered subdivision agreements and are zoned Residential R4 Special Provision (R4-6(10)) in Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which permits street townhouses, with special provisions regulating lot frontage, front yard setback, garage front yard setback and garages shall not project beyond the façade of the dwelling or façade (front face) of any porch, and shall not occupy more than 50% of lot frontage;
- b) the following conditions of approval BE REQUIRED to be completed prior to the passage of a Part-Lot Control By-law for Block 1, Plan 33M-765, RP 33R-20777 Parts 2 & 3 as noted in clause a) above:
 - i) the applicant be advised that the costs of registration of the said by-laws are to be borne by the applicant in accordance with City Policy;
 - ii) the applicant submit a draft reference plan to the Development Services for review and approval to ensure the proposed part lots and development plans comply with the regulations of the Zoning By-law, prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
 - iii) the applicant submits to the Development Services a digital copy together with a hard copy of each reference plan to be deposited. The digital file shall be assembled in accordance with the City of London's Digital Submission / Drafting Standards and be referenced to the City's NAD83 UTM Control Reference;
 - iv) the applicant submit each draft reference plan to London Hydro showing driveway locations and obtain approval for hydro servicing locations and above ground hydro equipment locations prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
 - v) the applicant submit to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office; any revised lot grading and servicing plans in accordance with the final lot layout to divide the blocks should there be further division of property contemplated as a result of the approval of the reference plan;
 - vi) the applicant shall enter into any amending subdivision agreement with the City, if necessary;
 - vii) the applicant shall agree to construct all services, including private drain connections and water services, in accordance with the approved final design of the lots;
 - viii) the applicant shall obtain confirmation from the Development Services that the assignment of municipal numbering has been completed in accordance with the reference plan(s) to be deposited, should there be further division of property contemplated as a result of the approval of the reference plan prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;

- ix) the applicant shall obtain approval from the Development Services of each reference plan to be registered prior to the reference plan being registered in the land registry office;
- x) the applicant shall submit to the City, confirmation that an approved reference plan for final lot development has been deposited in the Land Registry Office;
- xi) the applicant shall obtain clearance from the City Engineer that requirements iv), v) and vi) inclusive, outlined above, are satisfactorily completed, prior to any issuance of building permits by the Building Controls Division for lots being developed in any future reference plan;
- xii) that on notice from the applicant that a reference plan has been registered on a Block, and that Part Lot Control be re-established by the repeal of the by-law affecting the Lots/Block in question. (2021-D25)

Motion Passed

2.9 Application - 3964 Mia Avenue (33M-765, Block 2) (P-9305)

Moved by: S. Lehman
 Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Sifton Properties Limited to exempt Block 2, Plan 33M-765 from Part-Lot Control:

- a) pursuant to subsection 50(7) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, the proposed revised by-law appended to the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda, BE INTRODUCED at a future Municipal Council meeting, to exempt Block 2, Plan 33M-765 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of subsection 50(5) of the said *Act*; it being noted that these lands are subject to registered subdivision agreements and are zoned Residential R4 Special Provision (R4-6(10)) in Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which permits street townhouses, with special provisions regulating lot frontage, front yard setback, garage front yard setback and garages shall not project beyond the façade of the dwelling or façade (front face) of any porch, and shall not occupy more than 50% of lot frontage;
- b) the following conditions of approval BE REQUIRED to be completed prior to the passage of a Part-Lot Control By-law for Block 2, Plan 33M-765 as noted in clause a) above:
 - i) the applicant be advised that the costs of registration of the said by-laws are to be borne by the applicant in accordance with City Policy;
 - ii) the applicant submit a draft reference plan to the Development Services for review and approval to ensure the proposed part lots and development plans comply with the regulations of the Zoning By-law, prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
 - iii) the applicant submits to the Development Services a digital copy together with a hard copy of each reference plan to be deposited. The digital file shall be assembled in accordance with the City of London's Digital Submission / Drafting Standards and be referenced to the City's NAD83 UTM Control Reference;
 - iv) the applicant submit each draft reference plan to London Hydro showing driveway locations and obtain approval for hydro servicing locations and above ground hydro equipment locations prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;

- v) the applicant submit to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office; any revised lot grading and servicing plans in accordance with the final lot layout to divide the block should there be further division of property contemplated as a result of the approval of the reference plan;
- vi) the applicant shall enter into any amending subdivision agreement with the City, if necessary;
- vii) the applicant shall agree to construct all services, including private drain connections and water services, in accordance with the approved final design of the lots;
- viii) the applicant shall obtain confirmation from the Development Services that the assignment of municipal numbering has been completed in accordance with the reference plan(s) to be deposited, should there be further division of property contemplated as a result of the approval of the reference plan prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
- ix) the applicant shall obtain approval from the Development Services of each reference plan to be registered prior to the reference plan being registered in the land registry office;
- x) the applicant shall submit to the City, confirmation that an approved reference plan for final lot development has been deposited in the Land Registry Office;
- xi) the applicant shall obtain clearance from the City Engineer that requirements iv), v) and vi) inclusive, outlined above, are satisfactorily completed, prior to any issuance of building permits by the Building Controls Division for lots being developed in any future reference plan;
- xii) that on notice from the applicant that a reference plan has been registered on a Block, and that Part Lot Control be re-established by the repeal of the bylaw affecting the Lots/Block in question. (2021-D25)

Motion Passed

2.10 Application - 3087 White Oak Road, Block 73 (H-9271)

Moved by: S. Lehman
 Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application of Whiterock Village Inc., relating to the property located at 3112 Petty Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of 3112 Petty Road (formally known as 3087 White Oak Road) FROM a Holding Residential R6 Special Provision (h-h-71-h-100-h-161-h-227-R6-5(58)) Zone TO a Residential R6 Special Provision (R6-5(58))Zone to remove the h, h-71, h-100, h-161 and h-227 holding provisions. (2021-D29)

Motion Passed

2.11 Application - 3493 Colonel Talbot Road – Silverleaf Subdivision Phase 2 – Special Provisions

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and 2219008 Ontario Limited for the subdivision of land over Part of Lot 75, West of the North Branch of the Talbot Road (Geographic Township of Westminster), City of London, County of Middlesex, situated on the south side of Pack Road, west of Colonel Talbot Road, municipally known as 3493 Colonel Talbot Road.

- a) the Special Provisions, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and 2219008 Ontario Limited for the Silverleaf Subdivision, Phase 2 (39T-14504-2) appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix “A”, BE APPROVED;
- b) the Applicant BE ADVISED that Development Finance has summarized the claims and revenues appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix “B”; and,
- c) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions.(2021-D12)

Motion Passed

2.12 2021 Post-Development Environmental Impact Study Monitoring

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Development & Compliance Services and Chief Building Official, the staff report dated March 29, 2021 entitled "2021 Post-Development Environmental Impact Study Monitoring" BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-D12)

Motion Passed

2.13 Building Division Monthly Report for January 2021

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That the Building Division Monthly Report for January 2021 BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-A23)

Motion Passed

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 Downtown Community Improvement Plan - Performance Measures and Indicators of Success (O-9286)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and City Planner, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021,

as Appendix “A”, being “A by-law to amend the Downtown Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to add an Appendix that sets out performance measures and indicators of success for the CIP”, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated March 25, 2021 from C. Butler, by email, with respect to this matter;

it being noted that no individuals spoke at the public participation meeting associated with this matter;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS). The PPS encourages the vitality and regeneration of settlement areas as critical to the long-term economic prosperity of communities, and, where possible, enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and mainstreets;
- the recommended amendment conforms with the Planning Act, as the loan and grant programs meet the requirements set out in Section 28 related to community improvement;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including the Key Directions, Urban Regeneration, and Community Improvement; and,
- the recommended amendment conforms to the policies of Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan and the Downtown Community Improvement Plan. (2021-D19)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.2 Old East Village Community Improvement Plan - Performance Measures and Indicators of Success (O-9285)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and City Planner, the proposed by-law, appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021, as Appendix "A", being "A by-law to amend the Old East Village Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to add an Appendix that sets out performance measures and indicators of success for the CIP", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated March 25, 2021 from C. Butler, by email, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS). The PPS encourages the vitality and regeneration of settlement areas as critical to the long-term economic prosperity of communities, and, where possible, enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and mainstreets;
- the recommended amendment conforms with the Planning Act, as the loan and grant programs meet the requirements set out in Section 28 related to community improvement;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including the Key Directions, Urban Regeneration, and Community Improvement; and,
- the recommended amendment conforms to the policies of the Old East Village Dundas Street Corridor Secondary Plan and the Old East Village Community Improvement Plan. The recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS). The PPS encourages the vitality and regeneration of settlement areas as critical to the long-term economic prosperity of communities, and,
- the recommended amendment conforms to the policies of the Old East Village Dundas Street Corridor Secondary Plan and the Old East Village Community Improvement Plan. (2021-D19)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.3 Application - 1414 Dundas Street (Z-9276)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Humane Society London & Middlesex, relating to the property located at 1414 Dundas Street:

a) the request to amend Zoning-By-law No. Z.-1 to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Commercial Recreation (CR) Zone and a Regional Facility (RF) Zone TO a Restricted Service Commercial (RSC2) Zone, BE REFUSED for the following reason:

i) the site layout depicting a surface parking lot between the proposed building and the treed allée, does not conform to the form and urban design policies found within the Council approved London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan (LPHSP);

b) the proposed revised, attached by-law BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2020 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan for the City of London (1989), the London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan and The London Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Commercial Recreation (CR) Zone and a Regional Facility (RF) Zone TO a Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision (RSC2(_)) Zone; it being noted that the revised by-law will provide for parking to be permitted between the treed allée and any building and the provision of a 10.0 metre wide landscaped buffer;

it being noted that the following heritage mitigation measures and recommendations were raised during the application review process:

i) landscaping treatments be implemented for areas between the treed allée and the building to minimize impacts;

ii) further consideration to enhance the gateway function of the treed allée where it intersects with Dundas Street by the Humane Society London & Middlesex;

iii) vehicular access routes to the new Humane Society London & Middlesex facility should be sensitively planned to protect the treed allée; and,

iv) staging and construction activities should be planned to ensure protection of all trees which form the treed allée and appropriate tree preservation measures are in place to that the root systems are fully avoided within the tree protection area;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a staff presentation with respect to this matter;

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;

c) pursuant to section 34(17) of the *Planning Act, RSO, 1990, c.P. 13*, the Municipal Council DETERMINES that no further public notice is to be given with respect to this application as the changes to the proposed by-law are minor in nature;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) which direct municipalities to ensure development provides healthy, liveable and safe communities, and encourages settlement areas to be the main focus of growth and development to provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the London Psychiatric Hospital Lands Secondary Plan that promotes the evolution of the area incorporating elements of sustainability, mixed-use development, heritage conservation, walkability and high quality urban design;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan including but not limited to, Our City, Key Directions, and City Building, and will facilitate a built form that contributes to achieving a compact, mixed-use City;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the objectives of the London Psychiatric Hospital Lands Secondary Plan policies which encourages redevelopment in this specific Transit Oriented Corridor;
- the recommended amendment will facilitate an enhanced form of development in accordance with the London Psychiatric Hospital Lands Secondary Plan Urban Design policies;
- the recommended amendment is appropriate for the site and surrounding context and will assist with the revitalization of a portion of the London Psychiatric Hospital Lands; and,
- the recommended amendment to the Zoning By-law with special provisions will provide for an appropriate development of the site. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Nays: (1): A. Hopkins

Motion Passed (5 to 1)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That the matter of Application for 1414 Dundas Street BE REFERRED back to Civic Administration in order for additional discussion with respect to parking location and reduction and the landscaped buffer with the applicant.

Yeas: (2): P. Squire, and A. Hopkins

Nays: (4): S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Failed (2 to 4)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.4 Application - 1870 Aldersbrook Gate 39CD-20514

Moved by: E. Holder
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of LOCO Ventures (Aldersbrook) Ltd., relating to the property located at 1870 Aldersbrook Gate:

a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium relating to the property located at 1870 Aldersbrook Gate;

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-D07)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

3.5 Application - 101 Meadowlily Road South 39CD-20502 (OZ-9192)

Moved by:

That it BE NOTED that the Planning and Environment Committee was unable to reach a majority decision with respect to the application of 2690015 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 101 Meadowlily Road South, and pursuant to Section 19.3 of the Council Procedure By-law, the matter is hereby submitted to the Municipal Council for its disposition;

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. Koscinski, 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)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Hillier

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 by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held 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 by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held 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 that the amendments will come into full force and effect concurrently with Map 1 and Map 7 of The London Plan;

- c) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2020 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;

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;

f) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include the HIA with any recommendation and continue to consult with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) on future approvals for this matter and to consult with the LACH on HIA related matters.

Yeas: (2): A. Hopkins, and E. Holder

Nays: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Motion Failed (2 to 4)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the following be added to the recommendation:

f) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include the HIA with any recommendation and continue to consult with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) on future approvals for this matter and to consult with the LACH on HIA related matters.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.6 Application - 1153-1155 Dundas Street (O-9207 / Z-9198)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Zelinka Priamo Ltd., relating to the property located at 1153-1155 Dundas Street:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM a Light Industrial (LI) designation TO a Main Street Commercial Corridor (MSCC) designation; and,

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "B", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the 1989 Official Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Light Industrial 2 (LI2) Zone TO a Business District Commercial Special Provision (BDC(_)) Zone; and,

c) it being noted that Site Plan matters have been raised through the application review process for consideration by the Site Plan Approval Authority;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a staff presentation with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

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

- the recommended amendment to Zoning By-law Z.-1 is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) which encourages the following: accommodating an appropriate range and mix of employment; promoting economic development and competitiveness; supporting long-term economic prosperity; promoting the vitality and regeneration of settlement areas; supporting and promoting active transportation, transit-supportive land uses; supporting energy conservation, improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and climate change adaptation; supporting and promoting intensification and redevelopment to utilize existing services; and, conserving built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes;
- the recommended amendment to Zoning By-law Z.-1 conforms to the Main Street Commercial Corridor policies of the 1989 Official Plan;
- the recommended amendment to Zoning By-law Z.-1 conforms to the in-force policies of the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type polices of The London Plan and implements Key Directions of the Plan;
- the adaptive re-use of the subject lands supports Council's commitment to reducing and mitigating climate change by making efficient use of existing infrastructure, focusing intensification and growth in already-

developed areas, and re-using/adapting an existing structure;

- the adaptive re-use of the existing building supports the conservation and enhancement of a listed heritage building in an area identified in Heritage Places 2.0 as having potential to be a Heritage District; and,
- the subject lands are an appropriate location for a mixed-use development. The recommended amendments are consistent with and appropriate for the site and context and will support with developing opportunities for cultural and economic activity both on the site and in the area and will provide a transit-supportive development. (2021-D08)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.7 Temporary Outdoor Patio Expansion (Z-9300)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and City Planner, based on the application by The Corporation of the City of London, relating to seasonal outdoor patios, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend the Zoning By-law Z.-1 to add regulations related to Seasonal Outdoor Patios;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated March 23, 2021 from D. Szpakowski, CEO & General Manager, Hyde Park Business Improvement Association, with respect to this matter;

it being noted that no individuals spoke at the public participation meeting associated with this matter;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages the vitality and regeneration of settlement areas as critical to the long-term economic prosperity of

communities;

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the 1989 Official Plan, which encourages the management of land and resources to promote economic development; and,
- the recommended amendment is consistent with The London Plan, which encourages economic revitalization and enhancing the business attraction potential of urban main streets. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.8 Application - 1478 Westdel Bourne 39T-20503 (Z-9278)

Moved by: S. Lewis
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Townline Orchard Property Ltd., relating to the lands located at 1478 Westdel Bourne:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM an Urban Reserve UR3 Zone TO a Holding Residential R1 (h•R1-4) Zone; a Holding Residential R1 (h•R1-5) Zone; a Holding Residential R6 Special Provision / Residential R8 Special Provision (h•h-54•h-209•R6-5()/R8-4()) Zone; a Holding Residential R4 Special Provision / Residential R5 Special Provision / Residential R6 Special Provision / Residential R8 Special Provision (h•h-54•h-209•R4-6(11)/R5-7(9)/R6-5(61)/R8-3(5)) Zone; and an Open Space OS1 Zone;
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Subdivision submitted by Townline Orchard Property Ltd. relating to the lands located at 1478 Westdel Bourne:
 - i) traffic control,

- ii) noise and lighting concerns;
- c) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that Municipal Council supports issuing draft approval of the proposed plan of subdivision as submitted by Townline Orchard Property Ltd., prepared by Stantec (Project No. 161413921 Drawing No. 1), certified by Robert Wood O.L.S., dated October 13, 2020, as red-line revised, which shows a total of 39 low density residential single detached lots, 2 medium density residential blocks, 1 future development block, 1 park block, 1 road widening block, and 2 reserve blocks, served by 2 new streets being the extensions of Fountain Grass Drive and Upper West Avenue, SUBJECT TO the conditions contained in Appendix "B" appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated March 25, 2021 from H. Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, as it achieves objectives for efficient and resilient development and land use patterns. It represents development of low and medium density forms of housing, including single detached dwelling lots, townhouse and cluster forms of housing, and low-rise apartment buildings taking place within the City's urban growth area and within an area for which a secondary plan has been approved to guide future community development. It also achieves objectives for promoting compact form, contributes to the neighbourhood mix of housing and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities, supports the use of public transit, and increases community connectivity;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Neighbourhoods Place Type, Our Strategy, City Building and Design, Our Tools, and all other applicable London Plan policies;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the Low Density Residential, Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential, and Open Space designations;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the Riverbend South Secondary Plan, its vision and its principles of connecting the community (through a multi-use pathway, pedestrian connections and street network), providing a range of residential housing types and densities (from single detached dwellings to townhouses and low-rise apartment buildings), promoting healthy living and active transportation (neighbourhood park for passive recreation and a highly connected cycling and pedestrian network), and promoting environmental sustainability (diversity of uses, density and street pattern to facilitate viable public transit); and,
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning represents the third and final phase of the Riverbend South community. In terms of use, form and intensity the proposed subdivision plan is considered appropriate and consistent with the Council-approved plan for guiding community development. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.9 3080 Bostwick Road - 39T-18502 (Z-8931)

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 731675 Ontario Limited (York Developments Inc.), relating to the lands located at 3080 Bostwick Road:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix 'A', BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM an Urban Reserve UR4 Zone and an Environmental Review ER Zone TO a Holding Residential R9 Bonus (h•h-100•h-221•h-222•R9-7•B-()•H45) Zone; a Holding Residential R9 Bonus (h•h-100•h-221•h-222•R9-7•B-()•H45) Zone; an Open Space OS2 Zone; an Open Space OS4 Zone; and an Urban Reserve UR Special Provision (UR4()) Zone;

the Bonus Zone applying to Block 2 in the proposed plan of subdivision shall be enabled through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of a 189 unit residential apartment building with a maximum height of 18 storeys, and sixteen (16) stacked townhouse dwelling units with a maximum height of 15 metres, and a maximum overall density of 205 units per hectare, which generally implements in principle the site concept and elevation plans appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law, with further refinements to occur through the site plan approval process, in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

i) high quality architectural design (building/landscaping) including a common design theme applied to street boulevards. Design elements are to have regard for the Urban Design Guidelines prepared for 3080 Bostwick Road;

ii) underground parking to reduce surface parking requirements. Surface parking spaces are to be largely dedicated for visitor parking;

- iii) large caliper boulevard tree planting with a minimum 100 mm caliper and a minimum distance of 10 m between tree planting for the extent of the site frontage for Bostwick Road and both sides of Street A as early as site construction allows;
- iv) construction of one accessible electric vehicle charging station located on the Bostwick Community Centre lands or in a publically accessible location of Block 2;
- v) construction of one transit shelter along the Bostwick Road frontage, or the commensurate financial equivalent for the feature;
- vi) construction of ten (10) publicly accessible bicycle share facilities/spaces;

the Bonus Zone applying to Block 6 in the proposed plan of subdivision shall be enabled through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of two (2) residential apartment buildings having a total of 387 dwelling units, with a maximum height of 17 storeys, and a maximum density of 320 units per hectare, which generally implements in principle the site concept and elevation plans attached as Schedule "2" to the amending by-law, with further refinements to occur through the site plan approval process, in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

A) Provision of Affordable Housing

- i) the affordable housing shall consist of a total of thirty (30) rental apartment dwelling units, which shall include nineteen (19) one-bedroom units and eleven (11) two-bedroom units;
- ii) rents shall be set at 85% of the CMHC Average Market Rent (AMR) for the London CMA at the time of occupancy;
- iii) the period of affordability will be identified as being thirty (30) years from the point of initial occupancy;
- iv) the Proponent shall enter into a Tenant Placement Agreement (TPA) with the City of London to align the nineteen (19) one-bedroom units and eleven (11) two-bedroom units with priority populations;
- v) these conditions shall be secured through an agreement registered on title with associated compliance requirements and remedies;

B) high quality architectural design (building/landscaping) including a common design theme applied to street boulevards. Design elements are to have regard for the Urban Design Guidelines prepared for 3080 Bostwick Road. Underground parking to reduce surface parking requirements;

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting held with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Subdivision submitted by Townline Orchard Property Ltd. relating to the lands located at 1478 Westdel Bourne;

c) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that Municipal Council supports issuing draft approval of the proposed plan of subdivision relating to the lands located at 3080 Bostwick Road as submitted by 731675 Ontario Limited (York Developments Inc.), prepared by MHBC Planning (File No. 1094 'B' Drawing No. 1 of 1), certified by Terry Dietz O.L.S., dated July 25, 2018 and updated March 27, 2020, as red-line revised, which shows 2 multi-residential development blocks, 1 park block, 1 open space block, 1 walkway block, 5 road widening blocks, and 1 reserve block, served by 3 new streets; SUBJECT TO the conditions contained in Appendix "B" appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, as it achieves objectives for efficient and resilient development and land use patterns. It represents development taking place within the City's urban growth area and within an area for which a secondary plan has been approved to guide future community development. It also achieves objectives for promoting compact form, contributes to the neighbourhood mix of housing and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities, supports the use of public transit, and increases community connectivity;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Neighbourhoods Place Type, Our Strategy, City Building and Design, Our Tools, and all other applicable London Plan policies;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, High Density Residential and Open Space designations;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, and the intent, purpose and function for high intensity, transit oriented forms of development within the Bostwick Residential Neighbourhood; and,
- the provision of facilities and matters in consideration of the proposed height and density bonus are considered reasonable, result in a benefit to the general public and/or an enhancement of the design of the development, and are considered warranted. The height and density bonuses received will not result in a scale of development that is incompatible with adjacent uses or exceeds the capacity of available municipal services. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

3.10 611-615 Third Street (Z-9268)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Prince Antony, relating to the property located at 611-615 Third Street, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on April 13, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Neighbourhood Facility (NF) Zone TO a Residential R8 Special Provision Bonus (R8-4()*B-) Zone;

the Bonus Zone shall be enabled through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of a high quality residential apartment building, with a maximum height of 4-storeys, 20 dwelling units and a maximum density of 96 units per hectare, which substantively implements the Site Plan and Elevations appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

i) Provision of Affordable Housing

The affordable housing shall consist of:

- i) a total of three (3), three-bedroom units and one (1), one-bedroom unit, including one (1) accessible three-bedroom unit and one (1) accessible one-bedroom unit;
- ii) rents for the three (3), three-bedroom units and one (1), one bedroom unit be set at 80% of the CMHC Average Market Rent (AMR) for the London CMA at the time of occupancy;
- iii) that the period of affordability be identified as being thirty (30) years from the point of initial occupancy; and,
- iv) that the Proponent enter into a Tenant Placement Agreement (TPA) with the City of London to align the three (3), three-bedroom units and one (1), one-bedroom unit with priority populations;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation and Near-Campus Neighbourhoods; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of a site within the Built-Area Boundary with an appropriate form of infill development. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.11 Masonville Draft Secondary Plan (O-8991)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, the draft Masonville Secondary Plan, appended to the staff report dated March 29, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE RECEIVED for information; it being noted that the draft Masonville Secondary Plan will serve as the basis for further consultation with the community and stakeholders, and that the feedback received through this consultation process and the outcomes of supporting studies will result in a revised Masonville Secondary Plan and implementing Official Plan Amendment that will be considered at a future public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee;

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

- a communication dated March 23, 2021 from R. MacFarlane, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Rock Developments;
- a communication dated March 24, 2021 from R. MacFarlane, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Choice Properties; and,
- the staff presentation;

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)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 3rd Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

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

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 3rd Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from its meeting held on March 10, 2021:

a) the following actions be taken with respect to the 101 Meadowlily Road South Working Group Report, from its meeting held on February 23, 2021 related to the Revised Notice of Application, dated December 17, 2020, from M. Corby, Senior Planner, with respect to a Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments related to the property located at 101 Meadowlily Road South:

i) the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), dated December 13, 2019, from T. Dingman BE RECEIVED and the recommendations, contained therein, BE ACCEPTED;

ii) the revised Conceptual Development Plan, dated November 11, 2020, from Dillon Consulting, as appended to the London Advisory Committee on Heritage Report, BE RECEIVED and the revisions made in keeping with the mitigation measures in the HIA BE SUPPORTED as follows:

- removal of all direct access from Meadowlily Road from the townhouse blocks;
- a minimum of 6 metre setbacks from the road widening, together with internal block in front of townhouse blocks, on the west side of Meadowlily Road; and,
- a maximum building height of 2.5 metres;

iii) the following matters BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration for further review during the Site Plan Approval process:

- a Landscape Plan for a naturalized buffer to be located on the proposed block within the condominium plan on the west side of Meadowlily Road;
- entrance feature design and location; and,

· fencing, walls and stormwater facilities, if any, along the west side of Meadowlily Road;

iv) the developer BE ENCOURAGED to revisit the townhouse block elevation for the units facing Meadowlily Road in order to achieve a design more harmonious with the rural setting as recommended by the HIA; it being noted that this appears to have been achieved by the conceptual elevation facing Meadowlily Road for the single units (units 1 and 36);

v) the above-noted Working Group Report BE FORWARDED to M. Corby, Senior Planner; and,

vi) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) on future approvals for this matter and to consult with the LACH on HIA related matters.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4.2 2nd Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 2nd Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on March 18, 2021:

a) the 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West Working Group comments, appended to the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee Agenda, BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for consideration;

b) the Victoria on the River, Phase 6 (1934 Commissioners Road East) Working Group comments, appended to the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee Agenda, BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for consideration;

c) the 435-451 Ridout Street Working Group comments, appended to the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee Agenda, BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for consideration;

d) the following actions be taken with respect to the Kelly Stanton Environmentally Significant Area Ecological Restoration Plan Working Group comments:

i) the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) commends both the City of London and the report authors for their liaising with and involvement of local naturalists in the initial field work and community groups as part of follow-up plans; and,

ii) the Working Group comments, appended to the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee Agenda, BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for consideration;

e) a Working Group BE ESTABLISHED consisting of R. Trudeau (lead), L. Banks and S. Levin, with respect to the properties located at 3095 and 3105 Bostwick Road; it being noted that the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee reviewed and received a Notice of Draft Plan of Subdivision Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment dated March 10, 2021 from M. Corby, Senior Planner and the associated Environmental Impact Study;

f) the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee is supportive of the revised, Medway Valley Conservation Master Plan Phase 2 mapping, as appended to the EEPAC Report; and,

g) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 to 3.3, inclusive, 4.4, 5.2 and 5.5, BE RECEIVED for information.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:49 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Old East Village Community Improvement Plan – Performance Measures and Indicators of Success (O-9285)

- Councillor Squire: If I could just ask for the staff presentation to go ahead that would be great.
- Good afternoon. It's Mr. Bailey again. This is for file O-9285, it's going to be the same as two minutes ago so I don't know if you want a whole presentation just for the sake of the recording but if not just let me know. So the purpose of this file is to have an.
- Councillor Squire: Sorry. Go ahead and make it the shorter version unless somebody.
- Councillor Squire: Technical questions from the Committee? Yes Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. My question is regarding boundaries; how are they established, the CIP boundaries, what is that process that we undertake look like?
- Graham Bailey, Senior Planner: It's Mr. Bailey. I'll take a first stab at and someone else can chime in if they want. So, generally it starts with a study area that is often picked by, by staff. I'm just thinking back to my days of when I did the more recent Hamilton Road Community Improvement Plan. Staff, we decided on a boundary that we thought was appropriate and then we took that out to the community for feedback and in this case of the Hamilton Road one, for example, we determined that it was actually a good idea to add a little bit more of Hamilton Road in into that CIP through the public consultation. If you're more thinking about how the Old East Village Community Improvement Plan was, was selected that was back in, I believe 2004, it was primarily focused along the original boundaries, primarily focused along the Dundas Street corridor between Adelaide and I believe Egerton and then in 2005 it was expanded to Charlotte Street along Dundas. Again, that's a public process through the *Planning Act*, it's a public participation meeting, there's circulation, it would be considered an Amendment to the Official Plan or to the Community Improvement Plan and to the to the Community Project Area so there's a formal public process that would have to happen.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you, for, for that. I think that's good information to have when it comes to boundaries, that public process has to be followed. I, I guess, and we've just more or less established the CIP's within the past ten years. If there was a reason to change the boundaries would that come from the public? How would that look like?
- Graham Bailey, Senior Planner: Through the Chair, it could come from the public there's definitely been interest from the public any time a file like this comes before Committee and Council. If that's the case, I think staff would likely need direction from Council to undertake that Study, we can also look at it during the comprehensive CIP reviews that we do periodically to help them for multi-year budgets, so that would be another option to undertake a Study.

- Councillor Hopkins: Ok. thank you for that.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any other technical questions? There being none then I will go to the public. Is there anyone online or in either of the rooms who wishes to speak to this matter?
- Mr. Chair, it's Cathy Saunders I just let Valerian Marochko in.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Hello?
- Valerian Marochko: Good Afternoon.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Valerian Marochko: Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can. This is the Chair, Phil Squire, and just so you know we have, you have five minutes to speak so go ahead.
- Valerian Marochko: Yes, reviewing the document it's a great program. As the property owner of the Cross Cultural Learning Center we didn't know about the program about the façade so but you see participation in the program could be improved with better advertising of the existing programs would be including somehow in the performance measures of the program because some of the people like us we might have considered but didn't know about it so that's the only comment I have.
- Councillor Squire: Alright I think that's a fair comment. Perhaps staff could either reply now or indicate you'll, you'll consider some advertising of these programs.
- Graham Bailey, Senior Planner: Through the Chair I can just make a quick comment. We do try to advertise, in Old East Village we work closely with the BIA, they are partners in this and they help us a great deal, get the word out to their, to their, you know, the business owners and the property owners in, in their area. We also tried to get the brochures and those kinds of things in, into like the Building Division so people know if they go in for permits it's available but a good idea would maybe be a mail out or, or something like that to, you know, to all the property owners and tenants along Old East Village or some of the other Community Improvement Project Areas to just let them know that these are available.
- Councillor Squire: Yeah and I think their points well taken for the gentleman that the Business Improvement Association is always a good source of everything that's going on in, in your area so that's, that's a good place to get information. Thank you very much for your, for your question. Anybody else wishing to speak? It appears not so I'll need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

Appendix A

Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)
2021

By-law No. Z.-1-21 _____

A by-law to amend By-law No. Z.-1 to
rezone an area of land located at 1414
Dundas Street.

WHEREAS Humane Society London & Middlesex have applied to rezone an area of land located at 1414 Dundas Street, as shown on the map attached to this by-law, as set out below;

AND WHEREAS this rezoning conforms to the Official Plan;

THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

- 1) Schedule "A" to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by changing the zoning applicable to lands located at 1414 Dundas Street, as shown on the attached map comprising part of Key Map No. A108, from a Commercial Recreation (CR) Zone and a Regional Facility (RF) Zone to a Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision (RSC2()) Zone.
- 2) Section Number 28.4 of the Restricted Service Commercial Zone is amended by adding the following Special Provision:
 -) RSC2() 1414 Dundas Street
 - a) Regulations
 - i) Front Yard Setback 36.5 metres (119.8 feet)
(Maximum)
 - ii) Parking area permitted between the treed allée and any building
 - iii) 10.0 metre (32.8 feet) landscaped buffer area adjacent to the west interior side yard parallel to the treed allée

The inclusion in this By-law of imperial measure along with metric measure is for the purpose of convenience only and the metric measure governs in case of any discrepancy between the two measures.

This By-law shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with Section 34 of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P13*, either upon the date of the passage of this by-law or as otherwise provided by the said section.

PASSED in Open Council on April 6, 2021.

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading – April 6, 2021
Second Reading – April 6, 2021
Third Reading – April 6, 2021

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 1414 Dundas Street (Z-9276)

- Councillor Squire: Go ahead with the staff presentation, please. It looks like we have lost someone. Is there someone else that can present this matter or what's. We heard the first little bit and then you were muted so go ahead. Just to clarify before we go to technical questions, am I right for listening to you that the one issue that remains outstanding for the Committee today is the parking lot adjacent to the tree allée that staff is not endorsing?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: So there's the three special provisions that we are putting forth; there's specific policies with orientation to the building along Dundas Street; noting that the irregular, that the property's kind of an irregular shape, that it's got the CN Rail running along it. They are satisfied that the applicant has provided to the best they can to meet this policy. That is why we're including of the 36.5 meter front yard setback just to make sure that they don't go farther setbacks because we know looking at their layout that they can come up that close, if that makes sense. The second provision is we are including no parking between the treed allée and the, any building because it's very specific in the Psychiatric Secondary Plan, the London Psychiatric Secondary Plan that that policy states there is to be absolutely no parking between the building and the treed allée which is a cultural heritage feature and then the last one is the applicant has provided a lovely landscaped, a long skipping area along the treed allée, looking at the London Psychiatric Secondary Plan it does have a specific policy in there that requires a five meters so staff have also recommended in our special provisions that there, that that five meter at least be there.
- Councillor Squire: Alright so that that'll enable the applicant to know hopefully the issues they have to address in their, in their presentation. So thank you. Any technical questions, Committee? Sorry I just thought I would clarify where, what the issues were. There being none then we will go to the public. Is the applicant here to make a presentation? I know there are some representatives. Mr. Campbell.
- Well Mr. Chair, can you hear me? It's Matt Campbell here.
- Councillor Square: I can hear you now. Did you listen to the earlier part of the meeting?
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Yes I did hear the staff presentation.
- Councillor Squire: Right, so hopefully you can direct yourself to the issues at hand. We understand what the building is and what's staff agrees on, hopefully you can direct yourself to the areas of difference. Thank you.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Yes. Absolutely. So thank you very much Mr. Chair and members of Planning Committee. My name is Matt Campbell from Zelinka Priamo Ltd and with us today in our meeting we have Steve Ryall of the Humane Society as well as Tom Tomljenovic from SBM. We can answer any questions that the Committee may have. So the first thing to keep in mind with this proposal is that this is a highly desirable use for the City of London; we think this is a wonderful thing and in terms of, of planning, you know this is one of these feel good projects that everyone loves to see and we're very excited to

bring this to the floor of Planning Committee. Now we'll get right to the chase, the issue at hand is the, is the policy which, which speaks to parking between the building line and lands adjacent to the cedar lane and we did provide a letter that I believe was circulated to Committee Members that offers our interpretation for how this proposal is consistent with that policy. Now I believe the, the comment from staff was that there's absolutely no parking allowed in that location. We disagree with the assessment there because the, the actual policy makes reference to parking adjacent to the heritage, cultural heritage landscape area which is that treed allée and we are proposing a fairly wide landscape strip there, ten meters which is well in excess of what it otherwise would be permitted or not permitted, proposed. That feature allows us to have this interpretation that the parking is far enough away from that feature that we can comply with that policy. The other thing to keep in mind here is when we're, when we're talking about addressing this policy is that this is a highly unique site; this is a highly unique use with very, very specific goals in terms of site layout and if time permits I'm sure Steve from the Humane Society can elaborate but in simple terms what we need to do with this site is ensure that there is spatial separation between the publicly accessible areas which would be that parking area and, and front doors and the, the private areas and animal care areas. I know the Humane Society has had issues with people trespassing and trying to get to animals back when, when they really shouldn't as well as you know people just wandering into animal care areas and the proposed design of this site speaks specifically to addressing those functional needs. That's why when staff originally brought this to our attention we looked at different arrangements for this site and concluded that unfortunately this site cannot be configured in, in a way that staff were suggesting and also meet the unique functional requirements of the Humane Society. What we're talking about the treed allée I think it's also important to note that the comments from heritage planning staff were in agreement with it and we're also in agreement with the Heritage Impact Assessment that we submitted along with the application demonstrating that they were satisfied that the cultural heritage features would be protected. Now, we did, we provided the letter for the Committee's consideration and we certainly would request that the, the Committee would endorse a amended Zoning by-law that would be brought forward so that specifically would be to amend, I understand there is the amendment to Roman numeral one which I believe Alanna already mentioned and we're also requesting that Roman numeral two to that by-law be removed entirely. If we have a little bit of time, I will invite Steve to say a few words about how the Humane Society is excited to, to be on these lands and the prospects for moving forward.

- Councillor Squire: You have one minute left.
- Steve Ryall, Humane Society London and Middlesex: Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. It's Steve Ryall, the Executive Director of the Humane Society London and Middlesex. The Humane Society has been in the in the community for over one hundred and twenty years now sitting on a site that's just under one acre and nine thousand square feet. The new facility will move us to a thirty-seven thousand square feet (eleven acre) property that will allow us to really fulfill all the requirements for animal welfare in today's standards. One thing I want to really push is that we're not just building a shelter here, we're building a community center. This community center will offer the opportunity for kids camps in the summertime, school programs during the school year, there's a large public event hall that will be rentable and also used for, you know, that that rehabilitation of older animals during the day where they can actually get out and move around a little bit, with our winters that's made it sure tough over the years. The Education Center will be also opportunity for groups, local groups, to meet in and have different meeting rooms at different times of the day and, and really just a neighbourhood regeneration program here. The public support has been huge

and I would like to talk about the layout of the building. I've been to twenty-nine Humane Society shelters across North America in the last two years and, you know, it's built for that and its designed in that way for our partnerships and agreements with provincial animal welfare services and the London Police Services, the building and the layout provides an excellent opportunity to protect those animals from the general public and also from the general public from them in certain situations and so that, that eastern portion of the property would be fully fenced with runs inside of it that the animals would be able to use as long, as well as trails and trees around.

- Councillor Squire: Mr. Ryall, you're running up close to six minutes. I'm trying to indulge you a little bit but if you could wrap up that would be great.
- Steve Ryall: I'm good and appreciate the extra minute. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Are there any other public presentations that we're aware of in either of the rooms or online? I wasn't aware of any. Does not appear so. So I just need a motion close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 1870 Aldersbrook Gate 39CD-20514

- Councillor Squire: Just for the Committee's benefit this matter may take a little - presentations. After that is my intention to call a brief recess so the Committee can have a break, now, not overly long but just a brief recess. So public presentation, go ahead or the staff presentation, go ahead please.
- Sorry Mr Chair, Mike Corby here. So just to clarify that this is the staff presentation for Meadowlily, right?
- Councillor Square: It is yes.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Sorry and just before I start that there is a location.
- Councillor Squire: Whoa, whoa, whoa. I'm sorry, it's Aldersbrook Gate. I'm sorry. Everybody looks at me like, like I just made a small error there folks, a small slip up so we're going to do Aldersbrook Mr Corby. So that was my mistake which I quickly became aware of.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Thank you. I was a little confused.
- Councillor Squire: Alright, there is no staff presentation I understand so I'll turn this matter over to the Committee.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Because I don't think there's any public presentations? No. Alright, applicant do you wish to make a short presentation?
- Katelyn Crowley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: That's okay. Sorry, this is Katelyn with Zelinka Priamo Ltd. on behalf of the owner. We have read the staff report and believe that we can agree to the conditions. That's it. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Great. Turn it over to the Committee at this point in time. Is someone prepared to move the recommendation or any. The mayor is moving the recommendation. Oh, we haven't closed the public participation meeting. We need a motion to close the PPM.

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 intense 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.

I am Green

I am not white or black or red or blue. I am Green.

I am Green. I surround you. You come to me when you have when you have sorrow or when you need to breathe. I am Green.

I am Green. You come to me when you want shelter, I am here for those that are caretakers of my being. I shelter the wise ones from rain, wind and snow. I am Green.

I am Green. The foolish rip my foundation, overwork me and their folly remains unnoticed.

I wait for the caretakers because they are wise to advocate for me. My voice is but a whisper because I am Green.

I hear the caretakers' sorrows and give them breath because I am Green.

The caretakers come to advocate for me in my name, as I have many--- one being Meadowlily.

Now is the time for leaders to see through the lens of the foolish and through the lens of the caretakers. For I am Green and only speak in whispers. Not all hear me but those that can heed my call and know what I am saying.

I am Green.

Written by Dorothy L. Stolarski
Friend of Meadowlily-

Submitted on March 29, 2021

RE: FILE NO. 39CD-20502/OZ-9192

APPLICANT : 2690015 Ontario Inc. c/o Azhar Choudhry

101 MEADOWLILY RD. SOUTH

1. What is the minor variance that is requested for this application?
Urban Reserve R6.
2. I would like to begin my comments by saying that I support any reduction in 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 Rd. by over 200 per cent.
3. Based on input from the previous Public Participation Meeting, there have been definite improvements – especially lowering the number of driveways directly off Meadowlily from 16 to 1. (Hopefully the Transportation Staff at City Hall can determine the best location for entering and egress (as egress will simply be a right-hand turn onto Meadowlily Rd. South, whereas the subdivision entrance will require cars to make a left turn.) (Note – last Thursday, I turned left onto Meadowlily Rd. from Commissioners Rd. and was quickly met by an older lady in a motorized wheelchair, moving along the East side of the Rd. in a southerly direction. Some children do use this road to walk to school or the YMCA located on Hamilton Rd. I often encounter people rollerblading, and many times pedestrians pushing baby strollers. Cyclists often use this as a 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?
4. * Question – is there any provision to widen this road and provide a pedestrian walkway of some kind?
5. 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 to - as much as is possible - retain the rural feeling with natural hedging

- P. 12
6. Is there a native species of trees that would fill in to provide this visual barrier – perhaps planted alternatively - in a way that each tree could have room to spread its branches, as opposed to the side-by-side as presented in the drawing. (I am sure a good Tree Consultant Company could advise on this in order to allow future growth of each tree.) Also, It seems a fairly narrow buffer compared to the buffer with Highbury Woods...is there any way this could be adjusted to give perhaps one or two more metres buffer to the roadside location where it would be of great value to those living nearby?
 7. * Question: - what are the current measurements of roadside buffer vs Highbury Woods buffer? Can this be adjusted to provide a wider buffer with Meadowlily Rd.?
 8. I am requesting tonight that the Planning and Environment Committee make a motion that City Council direct Staff to include the following in any approval of the Subdivision Plan:-
 - a) One native tree to be planted for each residence (a combination of 88 native deciduous and native evergreen trees within the subdivision itself.) . I am sure City Environmental Staff could advise on which native trees would thrive in that specific area.
 - b) That some kind of native "thicket hedges" of one to two metres 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 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 is a significant deer population in that area. It would also provide a haven for smaller wildlife, some of whom will be displaced by construction of this subdivision. All of these measures would help with London's Climate Change commitments.
 - c) That the Subdivision Plan require bird-friendly lighting so as not to cause disruption of migration pathways already established.
 9. Councillor Hillier mentioned on the news that this development needs "more Nature".
 10. *Question – Has the Developer proposed any other earth-friendly approaches, such as solar hot water heating, led lighting within units, and low-flow toilets, etc. etc.

11. *Question – which Municipal building codes have changed to make these earth-friendly options mandatory?

Thank you sincerely for the opportunity to speak at this Public Participation Meeting.

Carol Richardson, member of Executive of Friends of Meadowlilly Woods,
2-1200 Riverside Dr., London, Ontario. N6H 5C6

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 1153-1155 Dundas Street (O-9207 / Z-9198)

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Staff presentation please. Thank you very much. Any technical questions from the Committee? There being none then I will look to any comments from the public. I don't have anyone listed. I don't know if the applicant wanted to make some brief comments. Oh, there is someone. I'm sorry. Go ahead sir.
- Michael Pearson: Good evening Councillors, Mr. Mayor. My name's Michael Pearson. I live on 1195 King Street. I have a concern with the craft brewery. Craft breweries used to be quaint establishments that you know older men that would stir big vats of brew but basically they are bars now; most of them and we already have two other bars in that area within a stone's throw; one on Ashland and Dundas and then the powerhouse brewery, Paradym Spirits. There's an outdoor patio and bar so that would be three drinking establishments with one to two would have outdoor drinking within a stone's throw. Most of that area is residential and yes their input has always been commercial but that would, that would definitely change the on the nature of the, of the area. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much sir. Anybody else in committee room 1 and 2? Go ahead.
- Susan Pearson: Hello. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I have concerns that, well, first of all I'm, I'm really glad that something's being done with that building; there's been a lot of graffiti and drug gangs and stuff like that and so I'm glad that something's been done with that; however, I do have concerns with a bar, a patio basically with people drinking. There's already issues, concerns with prostitution, drug dealers, people being stabbed; there was a man just this year stabbed half a block from my house and that that was just outside the pub that my husband mentioned so I have witnessed, we've been there for 15 plus years and I see problems with prostitution and I really have a concern with another facility like this and all that it brings to the neighborhood. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any other members of the public? Oh sorry I need to get your name. Excuse me. The person that just spoke I need her name. Sorry to bring you back up.
- That's okay. It's Susan Pearson and I live at the same house as my husband Mike.
- Councillor Squire: There you go. Thank you. Any other members of the public? Alright. I don't know if the applicant wishes to speak or perhaps address the issue that was raised by the two members of the public if you could.
- Ben McCauley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Good evening Chair, Committee Members. My name is Ben McCauley, I am with Zelinka Priamo Ltd. representing the property owner. To address the concerns that were just brought to our attention from the public, I would just like to thank them for coming out and providing us that feedback. Compared to the existing range of uses that are in the building we believe that the proposed range of uses will be a positive addition to the community and in terms of the concern about outdoor establishments or areas

that are relevant to this proposal in a form there has been a maximum of two hundred and twenty-five square meters established here as part of our exemption from the outdoor patio space from, from the parking requirement so in, in a form here without, we would have to basically provide more parking if we were to go over that two hundred and twenty-five square meters and we don't have an intention to go over that two hundred and twenty-five square meters and may even be less so that's just a way to, I guess, try to alleviate some of the concerns of the outdoor space.

- Councillor Squire: Okay maybe you could just, so that I understand when you seem to say it's only two hundred twenty-five metres is, I mean it's a small, would be a small patio compared to say the ones in the other areas such as the group pub at Kellogg's?
- Ben McCauley: In, in comparison it would be smaller. It's the intent here is for the property to be associated with a restaurant use, it's not necessarily exclusively a restaurant use and nor will the parking area be a large patio.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. I think there's no other speakers then we could close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – Temporary Outdoor Patio Expansion (Z-9300)

- Councillor P. Squire: Is there a staff presentation?
- Britt O'Hagan, Manager, City Planning: Through the Chair if I may I'd like to introduce Jasmine Hall who is a new planner who recently started with the City back in December. This is her first time presenting to the Committee and we don't have any slides but Jasmine is happy to provide a very brief overview of the recommendation that's before you.
- Councillor Squire: Welcome to the Committee Jasmine and brief is good. So, go ahead without pressure put on you go ahead.
- Jasmine Hall, Planner II: Great. Thank you so much. Good evening everyone the item before you is a city-wide zoning by-law amendment to allow seasonal outdoor patios as a permitted use. COVID-19 social distancing rules greatly reduced the interior capacity for businesses, so the AGCO and the City allowed for the expansion of licensed establishments. The London Recovery Network and the Back to Business groups heard support for more permanent regulatory changes to allow for temporary patio expansion. The current zoning by-law allows for outdoor patios for restaurants and taverns and has regulations for capacity, location, loading, lighting, and parking. Parking is required for that outage gross floor area from the outdoor patio space at the same gross ratio as the interior GFA. The proposed Zoning By-law amendment 9300 allows seasonal outdoor patios as a permitted use. Regulations include that they are only permitted between March 15th and November 15th, there's a minimum six-meter setback from residential only zones, there's no additional parking required, seasonal outdoor patio spaces are permitted within spaces designated for commercial uses and not permitted in areas for residential parking and all other outdoor patio regulations still apply to seasonal outdoor patios. Staff recommends that the proposed by-law be introduced at the Municipal Council meeting on April 13th 2021 to amend Zoning By-law Z-1 to add regulations related to seasonal outdoor patios. Staff is now prepared to answer any questions the committee may have.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any technical questions only?
Councillor Lehman.
- Councillor S. Lehman: Through you to staff. Would this apply city-wide or just to certain BIAs?
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Jasmine Hall: Through the Chair, this is a city-wide by-law amendment. Thank you for the question.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you very much so I don't have any indication of pre-registration for delegation so is there anybody in any of the rooms or online?
- Cathy Saunders: City Clerk: Mr. Chair there's no one online regarding this matter.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you and nobody in the, nobody standing up okay so I think we can close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.8 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 1478 Westdel Bourne 39T-20503 (Z-9278)

- Councillor Squire: This is, this is when you'll have to keep an eye on me because as I get going quickly on what so please keep your eye on me as we move forward. Staff presentation please? Thank you very much. Any technical questions only from the Committee? Councillor Hopkins. Go ahead.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have a technical question around the two medium density blocks that are, appear. Do we know what's going in these two blocks?
- Larry Mottram, Senior Planner: Yes Madam Chair, the, the block with that is proposed redevelopment it would be zoned for cluster townhouses as well as low rise apartment buildings, concept plans that were provided in, that accompanied the application indicated a four storey, four story apartment building and the, the density would be around one hundred and thirty and one to hundred and thirty-three units; if it were townhouse it would be approximately sixty to sixty-five units.
- Councillor Squire: Sorry, I misinterpreted that. Any other technical questions only? Alright that being done I have one indication of one speaker from the public, Natalie and Arthur Craig, I don't know if it's one of them who wishes to speak. I don't know if they're on the line.
- It's Natalie Craig.
- Councillor Squire: Welcome.
- Natalie Craig: Oh, thank you. Yeah, we are concerned with regards to the quantity of home, not so much the homes, but the four storey walk up. There's a tremendous amount of traffic currently on Westdel Bourne even without this development occurring and we've lived here for thirty-nine years and, of course, have witnessed from a small, you know, community, gravel road and peaceful, tranquil, to now my husband and I are fortunately now retired and one of the things about retirement is being able to possibly sleep in in the morning for a change which is absolutely impossible already at this point, it is so noisy on this road, the traffic basically from 6 AM until about 9 AM you cannot sleep because it is just so, so loud. The speed at which the truck affect flows far surpasses the posted sixty kilometer per hour zone, we certainly think that speed limit should be reduced but more so policed if you don't have police officers out here trafficking and, and providing traffic tickets people will just take advantage of it and go double the speed limit or even more. We are concerned about possibly, you know, when you go to pull out of the driveway right now it's difficult and it's going to become even more dangerous once that development occurs because the traffic will be substantially increased. Also, our driveway is right in front of Fountaingrass Drive so again, there's going to, I'm sure, be traffic stopped in backups to turn. There, in the Sifton development, there is a school that's going in there as well so there will be cars that will be utilizing Fountaingrass Drive to also get to the school to pick up their children or whatever so besides what's occurring at the 1478 there will be, I think, a lot of traffic to access some of the other things like I said like the school, so we're very concerned about that, we're concerned about our home that we've worked so hard and long to stay here will not be a property that people will want to even purchase in the future because of the noise and also the amount of traffic in front of our home and, and the light so we have spoken with Craig Linton and expressed our concern and he does seem to be very cooperative and understanding and we're hoping that the City also realizes that, you know, they need to look at speed limits, enforcement of police and also I would like to see rather than perhaps a four storey unit with out I, I'm

not sure exactly how many a hundred and sixty eight or whatever number you quoted perhaps townhouses would be a better option, it's still a lot but it's, it's certainly better than the alternative. So that's kind of what our concerns are.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Very much appreciated that you came to speak today. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this matter? I don't, I didn't see anyone else online.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, Barry and Rita Neigel are online.
- Councillor Squire: Great. Welcome. Go ahead. Hello?
- Rita Neigel: Yes. Good evening.
- Councillor Squire: Good evening. Welcome.
- Rita Neigel: Yes. Good evening. Rita Neigel from 1499 Westdel Bourne. Thank you for letting us speak this evening. I will be very brief. I concur with everything that Natalie has just proposed. We understand that the development is inevitable but we do feel that perhaps lower density would be more suitable for this neighborhood. I spoke with Karl Grabowski, the Transportation Design Engineer last June with concerns regarding the noise and how deafening it was just in front of our yard. Prior to us moving here in 2011 we do, we understand that the City redesigned Westdel Bourne and raised the road which has created a tremendous amount of noise, traffic noise and so we feel that ,yeah, we have just cause to complain about this, and possibly a review, yes, lowering traffic speed would be one solution that would be very helpful but I don't believe that increasing height or medium density, you know, would help this neighborhood at all. I know that it's one of the concerns even though there's only two of us speaking this evening that it is a general concern on this street, is the speed and the noise as a result of this traffic increase. Also I just want to point out something that I was quite impressed when I was listening to the Meadowlily Road Committee, you know, we have a lot of wildlife around here as well, we're on the outskirts of town we're, you know, and that needs to be considered as well and I appreciate, all the people that jog and bicycle and it could be in real dangerous situation, the more we keep growing in this area so, so if we want to keep that in mind it's got to be pedestrian friendly and cyclist friendly as well. So increasing, increasing medium density I don't think is a good solution in this area at this time. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Is there anyone else online or in the room who wish to speak?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Yes.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Linton is joining us remotely.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Linton.
- Councillor Squire: Okay and Mr. Linton is, I heard his name mentioned, he's the applicant. Okay. Mr. Linton I wonder if, thank you for joining us, I wonder if you would like to speak? I wonder if you could address the concerns that were raised by the residents in particular.
- Craig Linton: Yes. Good evening everyone. Thank you. Through the Chair to the rest of the Committee Members and members of the public in attendance thank you. You know, this this plan is, is consistent with the Riverbend South Secondary Area Plan and quite frankly if I would have brought anything forward that was different it would have been rejected by staff so this is really the last, the very last, small piece of the Riverbend South Secondary Plan puzzle so to speak

so it is the last fifteen acres in what is probably over two hundred acres worth of development on that, on that southeast corner of Oxford and Westdel Bourne. With respect to the concerns about the medium density, it is medium density, it's designated as medium density and the proposal put forward is in keeping with that, it is at the top end of what it would be considered to be medium density but we do need to make sure that generally speaking we are building to the highest and best possible use on every site in this city and I'll just leave it at that for right now. I'll entertain any questions as necessary.

- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you. Anybody else at this point in time? Every time I ask that we get one more person so I'm, I'm taking my chances here. Is there anybody online or in one of the rooms? Alright. That being said we'll look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.9 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 3080 Bostwick Road - 39T-18502 (Z-8931)

- Councillor P. Squire: Is there a public presentation on this matter or that I should say staff presentation on this matter please?
- Larry Mottram, Senior Planner: Thank you Mr. Chairman again I have a verbal presentation. This won't be long. This is an application by York Developments for lands located at 3080 Bostwick Road. This request is for approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision consisting of two high-density residential blocks, one neighbourhood park block, one walkway block, one open space block and three new streets as well as for approval of Zoning By-law amendments associated with the proposed subdivision plan including bonusing for increased density and height applying to the two high-density residential blocks. So, the first block is Block Number 2 identified on the draft plan and this is the residential component propose for this block consists of 189-unit apartment building having a height of eighteen storeys and two blocks of stacked townhouses consisting of sixteen units in three and a half storeys in height. Parking would be provided underground with surface visitor parking. This apartment building would be located close to the street frontage along Bostwick Road with the transition of building form and intensity to a low rise stacked townhouses fronting onto Street A and oriented to the neighborhood park and open space corridor on the opposite side of Street A. The other block is Block 6 identified on your draft plan. Here there will be two residential apartment buildings which are proposed consisting of a seventeen storey two hundred thirty-eight-unit building located on the southerly portion of the block and a fifteen storey one hundred forty-nine unit building on the northerly portion positioned close to the frontage along Street B and oriented to the Bostwick Community Centre. All parking is located behind the building in underground parking facilities with some resident and visitor parking on the surface located in the rear portion of the site in order to minimize the visual impact on the public realm. Building density and height is generally consistent with the proposed intensity of an adjacent developed lands to the north which will include a seventeen storey two hundred- and eight-unit apartment building which is currently under development. With respect to the natural heritage features there is a narrow stream corridor that's known as the Thornicroft Drain which flows from north to south through the site and it's regulated by the UTRCA. Further to the south which is lands outside the limits of the draft plan, the stream corridor leads to a large woodland patch containing a wetland feature. There is also a small area of ponding which is considered a wetland on the westerly half of the site. Further discussion with the City is required regarding opportunities for potential relocation and compensation of that wetland to the south adjacent the woodland patch. An Environmental Impact Study was submitted and reviewed by the City and UTRCA as part of the application review process. The response received from the Conservation Authority indicated that there are outstanding concerns on the EIS but they can be addressed in the final report addendum as a condition of draft plan approval. The response from the UTRCA also indicated that there are outstanding concerns with respect to maintaining groundwater flows from the site to the Thornicroft Drain and the natural heritage features to the south. Further discussions to resolve those concerns have led to an agreed upon solution to utilize the applicants lands to the south of Street C for groundwater recharge to be incorporated into a future buffer zone adjacent the woodland and wetland patch. Therefore, the UTRCA has requested conditions of draft approval to that effect and that a final hydrogeological and water balance study be prepared to the satisfaction of the UT RCA. Within the limits of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, development is not proposed adjacent to Thornicroft Drain with the exception of the neighbourhood park, four-meter-wide walkway block and the

Street C crossing. Buffers along this stretch of the drain corridor have previously been agreed upon in conjunction with the EIS work that was prepared for the community centre in 2014. The plan location of the proposed Street C crossing is aligned with the recently completed stormwater outlet located on the east side of the drain. Just to summarize the bonus zoning provisions with respect to Block 2 a bonusing is being given consideration for high quality architectural design having regard for urban design guidelines prepared for 3080 Bostwick Road, provision of underground parking, provision of boulevard tree planting along Bostwick Road and Street A and other facilities including a publicly accessible electric vehicle charging station, a bus transit shelter and ten publicly accessible bicycle shared-facility spaces. For bonusing for Block 6, consideration is being given for provision of affordable housing consisting of thirty rental apartment dwelling units including nineteen one bedroom units, eleven two bedroom units with rents set at eighty five percent of the CMHC average market rent at the time of occupancy for a duration of thirty years from the point of initial occupancy as well as consideration for a high quality architectural design that has regard for the approved urban design guidelines for 3080 Bostwick Road. And these concept plans for the building designs have been vetted through the Urban Design Review Panel several times. The provision of facilities and matters in consideration of the proposed height and density bonus are considered reasonable, will result in a benefit to the general public and an enhancement of the design of the development and are considered warranted. So, the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, the draft conditions, the recommended zoning and holding provisions are appropriate and conform with the 1989 Official Plan, the London Plan. The proposal also conforms with the Southwest Area Secondary Plan and specifically the policies for the Bostwick Residential Neighborhood which are intended for high intensity transit-oriented forms of development. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If there are any questions.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any technical questions from the committee? There being none we will go, there is one speaker from the public I have on my list which is Mohamed Mousa. Mr. Mousa are you online?
- Cathy Saunders, City Clerk: No, he is not Mr. Chair we do have Mr. Allen on the line.
- Councillor Squire: Okay, go ahead sir.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: Good evening Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. Scott Allen from MHBC. At this point I would just like to thank Mr. Mottram for his report, advise Council or the Committee that we're supportive of the findings and recommendations of that report and thank staff for their hard work through this process. It's been a lengthy draft plan review given that the scope and nature of this project and we are satisfied with the direction moving forward. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any other speakers online or in any of the rooms? No and we're going to need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 611-615 Third Street (Z-9268)

- Councillor P. Squire: This is not a matter that will have a staff presentation, but I still need to open a public participation meeting. Is there any technical questions from the committee? Thank you there being none, I don't have any speakers from the public unless the applicant wishes to say something? Is this a public number who wishes to speak? Yes, go ahead.
- Maneesh Poddar, Poddar Planning: Thank you Chair. My name is Manish Poddar with Poddar Planning. I'm the planner for the proponent who is here tonight, and I just wanted to thank staff, Development Services staff for all their hard work and we agree with the recommendation and obviously wanted to thank Housing Development Corporation staff as well, as well as Councillor Mo Salih who helped facilitate proactive engagement with the members of his constituency that had any questions. So, thank you very much and happy to answer any questions. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Any other members who wish to speak? We'll now close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.11 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Masonville Draft Secondary Plan (O-8991)

- Councillor Squire: Alright, so before we, I just want to remind everyone that this is not a decision point tonight of approving the Masonville Plan; in other words, we are not voting on its approval. What we're seeking is public input to inform the process moving forward so that's, that's where we are at this point so for the benefit of all of us and the public we will not be just saying yay or nay to the Masonville Secondary Plan tonight but we certainly wish to receive input so that being said we will, I will turn it over for the staff presentation. Thank you very much. Technical questions from the Committee? There being none we will go to public participation and it looks like Mr Kirkness the agent for the applicant is up. Mr Kirkness.
- Laverne Kirkness: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much and Committee Members. We, we are here for Westell Development Corporation who is the owner of the Richmond Hyland Center which basically occupies the northwest quadrant of Fanshawe and Richmond and, and basically consumes that whole quadrant of the of the Transit Village place type. There is construction going on there now, they've owned the place for about two years and they're trying to kind of update and improve it. I think when we came across this the, when we were introduced to the Masonville Secondary Plan I think the first thing that they were seeking is flexibility in the framing of the policies. We also were proposing a tower last, mid last year, at North Centre and Fanshawe Park Road. We did a pre-consultation and we were asked if we would prepare a master plan of our site, which we have been working on and we attached a sketch of it with year's on different building pods, this was all distributed to you and the tower that we're speaking of, we're hoping to get to next year 2022. We also are proposing towers in the opposite corner throughout this decade and two more towers as you get towards the intersection. We know that would be the commercial banks, we think that's what's going to happen but we do know that we research this and it's all over the map as to how people are going to shop whether it's big box, little box, online and whether people want to live in high density communities is another question. So we're asking the team that's developing the Masonville Secondary Plan to use flexible language and show us how you could accommodate that flexibility within the Plan. The second point we wanted to make was that we think the Plan is light on how the BRT will serve it or whether the BRT will serve it and asked if there could be more on that as well as how it would serve the Masonville Community and this is because there is a goal to try to have this village be mostly, mobility through it is mostly by walking or pedestrians and public mass transit, public transit and the automobile seems to be very much discouraged and in the concepts there's really no really no surface parking so we're just not sure whether that can happen in the future realistically. So the second point is about BRT and how the Masonville community will be, will be served. The Master Plan that we have prepared has a couple of conflicts in it, one, one is that we were seeking a high density in our northeast corner at North Center and Richmond Street so that we can kind of equal what Tricar had approved on their corner which is the northeast corner of North Center and Richmond Street; we note that the Plan shows a medium rise dense height there which is, I think, eight storeys and we asked the team to, to consider high density I know there's transition there and we're prepared to build that into our architecture to some extent but would appreciate consideration of the multi or the high rise designation in that corner. On the public parkland we, in our Master Plan, have been proposing a park or a public square. We also would propose some green with it whether we can achieve point five hectares or not we don't really know at this time and the Plan seems to be very specific about that and

wonder if we can at least make the point five hectare in the northwest quadrant a target as opposed to a stipulation and we'll try to work towards it. The last point was really about residential character streets which North Center in our area is to be and as much as we want to try and work with that we, we kind of feel that the policies are light on, on the components that are maybe not the amenity, the loading areas and the servicing areas that would serve the commercial as well as the residential and the policy seems to indicate that they're to be hidden from private streets and to be hidden from public streets and we're just wondering well, how would you get to the is loading areas.

- Councillor Squire: You're just over, you're just over five minutes Mr Kirkness. If you could wrap up.
- Laverne Kirkness: Yes. I know it's been a long night for you and I do intend to wrap up. In any case, our submission is basically there in front of you. In terms of the five points, the Master Plan that we have got so far and we hope that the Masonville staff team will take that into consideration in finalizing the report. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you Mr. Kirkness and just to repeat I don't think we'll be looking for detailed answers tonight necessarily because it's just this is for input for everyone involved you'll have a chance to raise your concerns so thank you very much and I just want to welcome the two Ward Councillors who are most involved in this, Councillor Cassidy from Ward Five and Councillor, Deputy Mayor Morgan, I can't get used to that Deputy Mayor Morgan so I'll make mistakes. I did it with the other Deputy Mayor Helmer, from Ward Seven so these are the two Councillors who are very involved. It's very good of them to join us and ensure comfort for the people who are making presentations that the two Councillors who are most acquainted with this development are here to, to listen also so thanks to you. The next person is Aaron Liu. Mr. Liu. Go ahead, sir. Your name's Aaron Liu, you can provide your address if you'd like or not.
- Aaron Liu, my address is 70 Sunnyside Drive, it's just beside the library. I'd like to attend here to get more detailed information about what the new development Plan looks like. I heard that we have some planning for apartment or condo, apartment building and just all sides is complex such as on their parking spots on Masonville Mall, I just want to get some clarification about all the planning going to be on. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Okay, so just for your benefit the information and the supporting documents for this meeting will be, would be, are online and also there was a presentation, brief presentation from staff but if there's something else maybe you could just follow up with one of your Councillors or, or planning staff that would, that would be your best avenue. Okay?
- Aaron Liu, 70 Sunnyside Drive: Okay. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: You're very welcome. Terry McManus is next. Mr. McManus? Is Mr. McManus there or we don't know?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. McManus is here, he's just unmuting now.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead Mr. McManus.
- Terry McManus, 70 Sunnyside Drive: Okay. Thank you. I'm at 70 Sunnyside Drive as well and if the Committee would look down at the general plan.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. McManus we're, I'm having some trouble hearing you I don't know with the volume or.
- Terry McManus: Let me let me crank it up here a little bit. How's that?
- Councillor Squire: That's much better. Thank you.

- Terry McManus: Okay so if the if the committee would take a look at the outline of the Plan for, for this area down in the lower right hand corner is Masonville Mead which is the, which are the condos that the previous gentleman was just referring to and something that's quite unique in this whole Plan and indeed in everything I've listened to tonight is that the public is able to make their way from Sunnyside Drive to North Center by cutting through the condo through our street and it happens all the time and it's happening, well I'll say that with COVID it's been less but whenever there's any type of traffic jam which North Center and Sunnyside are really famous for people come tearing through and it's just going to get worse so what I'd like to do is I'd like to get the staff out in front of this whole issue and meet with some of the residents and perhaps our, our representatives and take a look, take a walk through the condo corporation and see what could be done to prevent this from happening. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much sir. Next is Mary and I hope I pronounce this, is it Stopar?
- Mary Stopar: Stopar is correct.
- Councillor Squire: Ok. Go ahead.
- Mary Stopar: Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Masonville Secondary Plan. We've been residents on Fawn Court for twenty years we purchased the house because of the core location and the close proximity to schools, shopping and recreational paths. We feel very fortunate to be able to do most of our shopping, banking by foot and enjoy the easy access to the paths in Stonybrook and Uplands whenever possible. We would like to retain this quality of life in the character of our street for many years to come. The Masonville Secondary Plan would certainly improve the use of the land in the existing commercial areas and it would be nice to see a mix of buildings, parkland and fewer paved parking spots. We are concerned; however, at the high density proposed given the existing road congestion on Fanshawe and Richmond Streets and to see the changes are proposed to our existing street and neighborhood even though we are technically located outside of the boundary study area. We are not in support of the changes proposed to adjacent to Fawn Court. We do not want to see direct pedestrian access or road access from Fanshawe Park Road or from Fawn Court to new development at the commercial plaza. We already enjoy easy pedestrian and bike access to the Uplands Trail by going to Hastings or North Center Road, crossing safely at the existing traffic lights. Residents of Fawn Court already have easy pedestrian and bike access to the Masonville area using the existing walkway off Robinson leading to the library, it's already good, so convenient for residents of our street to walk to these areas that we very rarely choose to drive. Adding these additional connections will not significantly improve the walkability or connectivity of our neighborhood to the Masonville area but it could have drastic negative impacts on the character of our existing street. Furthermore, other residents of the neighborhood who live beyond Concord would have very little reason to utilize these additional connections if constructed, it would still be more convenient for them to continue to use the existing walkways and bike trails off Robinson by the Masonville Library as this is a more direct connection to the commercial area and transit. Residents of the new developments could be provided other routes to Upland Trails as part of the design process and there's no need for access through Fawn Court directly. It's not clear in the proposal if the current fence that divides Fawn Court and part of Robinson Lane and the current strip mall would remain. We would like to see the current fence remain so that residents of Fawn Court could retain current privacy levels, security and limited traffic. These types of core locations usually come with higher purchase costs and opening up the street would change the dynamic immensely and reduce the value of the homes, it would also completely change the character of

our street where all neighbors know each other, where it's common for neighbours to spend time together on the front yard and where the street is often used by residents and their children grandchildren for outdoor activities like tennis and road hockey. Limiting the lot, the height of buildings adjacent to the fence to two storeys would further reduce the impact to the residents. The current wooden fence sits on a large berm planted with trees. The original developer planted multiple pine trees on the berm adjacent to the road. Over the last eight years residents of Fawn Court have personally planted approximately sixteen additional trees along the stretch to increase the tree canopy in the hot summer months in the future and further improve the quality and aesthetic of the street. Some of the trees are planted to mark special occasions celebrated by residents. The residents take pride in this area and will mow the lawn, rake and sweep as necessary as the service provided by the City is very limited.

- Councillor Squire: You have one minute remaining.
- Mary Stopar: Retaining the current fences and trees will reduce the impact of the adjacent future Masonville development on the residents of Fawn Court. We appreciate the opportunity to highlight our concerns to Council and staff and request that the Secondary Plan be revised to ensure that the character of our street is retained. We would like the policies to be revised to be clear that the additional trail and road connections will not be permitted to the existing residential area, that existing landscaping including trees, berms and fencing be retained and the buildings immediately adjacent to the fence are a maximum of two stories high. We look forward to reviewing a revised draft Secondary Plan future. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much and there's also listed Vladimir Stopar.
- Mary Stopar: I spoke on our behalf together. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Thank you very much. Next speaker is Mike Concan. Go ahead sir.
- Mike Koncan: Thank you for the opportunity of addressing you. I've been a resident of Fawn Court for the last twenty-eight years. We originally bought the property due to its dead-end street, peacefulness, lack of through traffic and walking distance to shopping and the schools. It is actually quicker for us to walk to the mall and stores than to deal with traffic and at certain times of the year fight for parking spots. I do not agree with the direction the Secondary Plan takes with Fawn Court. I have reviewed the Plan and I agree that there are areas where some infill with additional housing makes sense. I do not agree with the building height allowances; however, I do have some other areas of concern namely population density, schools, green space, traffic, bicycle paths and parking. The area under discussion as disclosed in the Plan is composed of two hundred nineteen acres of land which is the equivalent of .9 square kilometers, simple math puts the proposed ultimate population density at fourteen thousand seven hundred people per square kilometer, this is equivalent to certain regions in Toronto; however, Toronto has the advantage of wider and better road systems along with the extensive transit system servicing those neighbourhoods. This is an increase of 4.5 times current density or ten thousand people. In order to make this density it appears that the Plan calls for the removal of all existing buildings and a complete rebuild. With this type population increase school desks must be given due consideration. I do not believe the City should proceed until a review has been completed with both Boards of Education. Given that low-income housing is proposed for twenty-five percent of the units I believe that children will be living in this area and school desks must be considered. We do see parks in the plan; however, I presume that these are people parks and not dog parks. In a London downtown apartment building the ratio of dogs to apartment units is one dog for every ten units. Will there be a consideration for a

dog park? Forcing dog owners to drive to the closest dog park on Adelaide Street North where the existing parking lot is at times overflowing is not logical. Given our biggest issue traffic, for twenty-five years I dropped my wife off in downtown London while on my way to work every day and picked her up for the return ride home. In those years traffic, whether it was Adelaide Street or Richmond Street has gotten worse as new home construction north of Fanshawe Park Road has increased, construction is ongoing and the additional traffic from this area will only aggravate the current situation further. Pre-Covid the traffic flowing south from Richmond from Sunningdale to the University gates in the morning was bumper to bumper, during the peak times in the evenings it would take a half hour to travel north on Richmond from Windermere to home, a distance of three kilometers. Travelling north, the intersection of Western Road and Richmond is the current inch point. Our current traffic situations are also aggravated, as you know, by two large destinations in the area namely University Hospital and the University of Western Ontario. I believe this Plan needs to include a comprehensive discussion on how all traffic, present and in the future, will be dealt with. Grid lock is not an option and it will be much harder to fix the problem once the buildings have been constructed. As a comparison, the current mall owners are already proceeding with similar infill proposals at Sherway Gardens on the western edge of Toronto. Sherway Gardens is supported by a road system on three sides where each road is made up of six or eight lanes of traffic, these roads are the Queensway, QEW and 427. The fourth row, the West Mall, is four lanes of traffic. Consequently, Sherway Gardens is surrounded on all four sides with super roads or highways to support its residents. Our single four lane Richmond Street and Fanshawe Park Roads are no match, there is a current proposal for Fanshawe to widen.

- Councillor Squire: You have, excuse me, you have one minute remaining.
- Mike Koncan: Thank you. From Louise widened to six lanes from Louise to North Centre Road. I struggle to understand how this will resolve our current north, south, east, west traffic problems let alone allow us to add more traffic in the near and distant future. Further expansion of both Richmond and Fanshawe above this proposal are a must; however, the challenge now is to fit additional lanes of traffic plus bus lanes and bicycle lanes into the existing road allowances; for example.
- Councillor Squire: Thirty seconds.
- Mike Koncan: The building housing Starbucks on Fanshawe west of Adelaide appears to be too close to the road allowance, Sunningdale and Adelaide may also need consideration for expansion. I do have other points on bicycle plan there are no bicycle paths south of the library and a question on parking. We have fifty-two hundred public parking spots available in the Plan area, during the peak periods the majority of these spots are taken and many a driver is frustrated at not finding a spot. Given the Plan calls for an increase in commercial, office and civic spaces by fifty-two percent this will only result in a further increase in parking requirements.
- Councillor Squire: If you could just wrap up, you're at five minutes and twenty seconds.
- Mike Koncan: Right. In conclusion I do not believe that Council should accept the Plan as drafted until such time as all of these issues are addressed to Council's satisfaction. I would be happy to help and to answer any questions. Thank you for your time.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much for your thoughts. Next is Tony Nicoletti.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, the next individual is Paul Orrick.

- Councillor Squire: I'm sorry.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Paul Orrick.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Mr. Orrick.
- Paul Orrick: Yes, can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can hear you, yes. Go ahead.
- Paul Orrick: Okay. Some of my points are going to mirror what the last speaker just said. I have two comments on traffic and density. At the corner of Fanshawe Park Road and Richmond Street it could be best described as a parking lot. Currently with the lower traffic flow from the pandemic we see less traffic but as soon as all businesses open back up and shopping resumes at Masonville Mall it'll probably be worse than before due to pent up demand. In the evening three lanes of traffic going north from Windermere Road to Fanshawe Park is basically dead stopped over two kilometers from bumper-to-bumper cars, all stop from 4 PM to 6:30 PM every night, on weekends it shifts to an east west parking lot along Fanshawe Park Road as traffic goes shopping along Fanshawe. Cars are backed up all the way up the hill to Louise Boulevard on the east side of Richmond and all the way past the Shell gas station on the west side of Richmond. It can only be described as daily chaos. In 2016, I went to a meeting that was hosted by the City, a public information meeting at the retirement home discussing the changes to the intersection up to six lanes and supposedly better turning ability. I repeat 2016, so how much planning was in before 2016 and since then nothing has been done. I am told the changes to the BRT, shelved the plans because of the LRT that was planned for Richmond Street and it was moved. So here's a traffic plan discussed on 2016 density numbers probably planned long before that so far we have been included is six hundred apartment building on Richmond Street, Masonville School is doubled in size with no bus parking or school parking, traffic at the corner of Hillside and Richmond is a bottleneck with everybody trying to get out, Canada Trust and Masonville Mall all flow onto Hillside. My comment is the City has not planned on the traffic flow and here we are talking about probably doubling the density of this whole area. My comments on density, there are at least four properties in this area on Richmond Street that have plans for redevelopment from single family homes to medium density there're currently bonusing provisions for higher density this is known as the developer flip the guys that currently own it promised to do improvements to get the higher density and then sell it to the new guy that has no intention of honoring the bonusing provisions. I commend the City that they stopped one that went downtown because of that but this is a known thing, the bonusing flip. If, if the mall and I, there was a developer I think he said he was from Westdel saying they're going to put three apartment buildings by the Best Buy plaza and then Masonville Mall wants to put three more apartment buildings, we're talking about fifteen hundred apartments to seventy-five hundred apartments. There is no plan on moving these people around, we can't even move what we have now. I think this Plan is ill conceived and should be put on a moratorium to be stopped immediately until the traffic flow has been, the intersection has been built, traffic flow then monitors on what we have now let alone doubling the density of the Masonville Plan Area. I think this is an ill-conceived plan without the traffic flow being addressed. Nobody from City has talked about traffic flow at all. Thank you for my time.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much Mr. Orrick. So where am I on the list now because I skipped a whole bunch of people so.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair we're on the the last member of the public in attendance and it's Deeny Lemeer.
- Councillor Squire: I'm sorry, you're talking about online?

- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes. There's no members of the public in the committee rooms.
- Councillor Squire: Okay so I'm sorry, go ahead. If I could just get your name because I'm not sure I have it. Hello?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: I'm just waiting for him to unmute.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: I have asked him to unmute. They appear to have problems Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. I understand. We'll wait a moment and I don't want to close the public participation meeting if there's someone else wishing to speak.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: They are not unmuting.
- Councillor Squire: Alright, is Patricia Forster there?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, we have no other members of the public joining us. Oh, yes, sorry, Patricia is there.
- Councillor Squire: Ok. Ms. Forester, are you there?
- Patricia Forster: Yes. Good evening. I have really nothing to add. I think several previous speakers have spoken to my husband and my concerns. We've been in the Masonville area for over thirty years. Traffic is definitely our main concern and Mr. Orrick, I believe, proposed that a moratorium be put on building the residences until the traffic congestion problem has been fully addressed and solved. That's all I have to say. Thank you for your attention Councillors.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much for taking the time to speak to us tonight. Is there anyone else or is that it?
- John Lesaux: Hi.
- Councillor Squire: Who is that?
- My name is John Lesaux. I work with the Old Masonville Ratepayers Association.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much Mr. Lesaux. I'm meeting new people on the telephone all night, it's, it's great so I'm going to ask you to go ahead then and you have five minutes.
- John Lesaux: I've been here all night, too, since 6:15.
- Councillor Squire: Really? I'm sorry for that.
- John Lesaux: I reside at 71 Shavian Boulevard and Jane and I have lived here since 1984. I spent my career in real estate finance with London Life, first in Montreal and then in London and when Great West acquired London Life we shook hands and I joined Scotiabank in Toronto. I've been involved with the Old Masonville Ratepayers Association for too many years I guess but, principally my involvement stemmed from an application for a twenty-seven, five to six bedroom townhouse development, attached townhouse development, on the west side of Richmond almost across just north of Shavian. The City approved that application, we went to the OMB spent a considerable amount of money and lost at the OMB but all is well that ends well in that the applicant was not a real estate developer but rather a land speculator, an ill conceived plan that fortunately no London developers opted to acquire from him and so what we have today now on the site is a new seven story quality student residence known as Masonville Yards, underground parking, the building is nicely positioned away from the neighbours on Cherokee and no balconies to negate noise levels from those balconies and prevent incidences of things like furniture being tossed from

balconies similar to what has happened in Toronto. So this was a win-win for both the neighbourhood, being a quality project and for the City in terms of incremental property tax revenue relative to a twenty-seven unit five to six bedroom townhouse we now have almost three hundred units and a much more, much more conforming to the existing neighborhood. I think quickly Paul has summarized it best but there are two fundamental flaws to the Plan, one is the height of the proposed development and towers which make no sense against the existing landscape so you're talking now about a seven story building but you're offering would allow up to twenty-two storeys across the road therefore completely disregarding the current conforming environment and the second and this also a signal issue is the traffic congestion, particularly at or near the Richmond/Fanshawe intersection with vehicles backed up for a kilometer or more on, on Richmond, engines idling incessantly and as well as this negative feature people get resourceful, motorists get resourceful and decide how to figure out cuts through patterns in our neighborhood often at speeds that put pedestrians and children at the risk of injury. We met with the City approximately 5 years ago traffic volume measuring was undertaken by Dillon Consulting in 2015, a plan for the Richmond/Fanshawe area was, was constructed but sadly nothing tangible has ever materialized and on an immediate note of our neighborhood has been further aggravated by the significant expansion of the Masonville Public School.

- Councillor Squire: Excuse me, you have one minute remaining.
- John Lesaux: That school is almost doubled in size yet there has been no increase or discernible increase in the number of parking spaces on the site, there's no been no improvement in the access and egress for the incremental the school buses that deliver our children and there has been no enhancement of the sidewalk or bike path infrastructure in the school area. So that's our concern, they are, I think solid and strong objections and we urge you to revisit the Plan and perhaps look at just the impact of the density and the attendant traffic and public transportation infrastructure. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much and sorry you had to wait so long to, to speak to us. Is there anyone else waiting to speak either online or in any of the rooms?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, not that I'm aware of.
- Councillor Squire: Alright, so I will once for anymore public input, twice, they're being none I will last for a motion to close the public participation meeting.