

Planning and Environment Committee

Report

8th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
May 10, 2021

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

ALSO PRESENT: H. Lysynski and M. Ribera

Remote Attendance: Deputy Mayor J. Morgan and Councillor M. van Holst; I. Abushehada, J. Adema, A. Anderson, G. Barrett, M. Corby, P. Di Losa, M. Fabro, M. Feldberg, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, H. McNeely, T. Macbeth, C. Maton, L. Marshall, L. McNiven, S. Meksula, L. Mottram, B. Page, M. Pease, C. Saunders, B. Somers, M. Tomazincic, M. Vivian and P. Yeoman

The meeting is called to order at 4:00 PM, with Councillor P. Squire in the Chair, Councillor 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. Lewis

That Items 2.2 to 2.8, inclusive, BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

2.2 1620 Noah Bend (Block 95, Plan 33M-733) - (P-9338)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Kenmore Homes (London) Inc., to exempt Block 95, Plan 33M-733 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 May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at a future Council meeting, to exempt Block 95, Plan 33M-733 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of subsection 50(5) of the said *Act*; it being noted that these lands are subject to a registered subdivision agreement and are zoned Residential R4 Special Provision (R4-4(4)) which permits street townhouse dwellings;

b) the following conditions of approval BE REQUIRED to be completed prior to the passage of a Part-Lot Control By-law for Block 95, Plan 33M-733 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) the applicant shall provide a draft transfer of the easements to be registered on title;
- xiii) 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; and,
- xiv) in accordance with condition v), the applicant provide servicing drawings of municipal servicing to each of the blocks created within 1620 Noah Bend to indicate that all municipal servicing can be provide to each property/block created without conflict. (2021-D05)

Motion Passed

2.3 335 Kennington Way and 3959 Mia Avenue (33M-765, Block 1, RP 33R-20777 Parts 2 & 3) - (P-9304)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Prosperity Homes, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the

Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 2021 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 *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13*, for a period not exceeding three (3) years. (2021-D05)

Motion Passed

2.4 3964 Mia Avenue (33M-765, Block 2) - (P-9305)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Prosperity Homes, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 2021 to exempt Block 2, Plan 33M-765 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of Subsection 50(5) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13*, for a period not exceeding three (3) years. (2021-D05)

Motion Passed

2.5 146 and 184 Exeter Road – Middleton Subdivision - Phase 3 - Removal of Holding Provisions - (H-9294)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Sifton Properties Limited, relating to lands located at 146 and 184 Exeter Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 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 Residential R1 Special Provision (h•h-100•R1-4(29)) Zone and a Holding Residential R1 Special Provision (h•h-100•R1-13(7)) Zone TO a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-4(29)) Zone and a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-13(7)) Zone to remove the h and h-100 holding provisions. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.6 1639–1685 Brayford Avenue – Removal of Holding Provision - (H-9336)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Jefferson Homes Ltd., relating to lands located at 1639 to 1685 Brayford Avenue, legally described as Lots 12 to 15 Plan 33M-713 and Lots 13 to 17 Plan 33M-714, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 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 Residential R1 (h-37•R1-4) Zone TO a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone to remove the h-37 holding provision. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.7 2258–2334 Wickerson Road – Removal of Holding Provision - (H-9337)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Kape Developments Ltd., relating to lands located at 2258 to 2334 Wickerson Road, legally described as Lots 4 to 11 Plan 33M-713 and Lots 1 to 12 Plan 33M-714, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 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 Residential R1 Special Provision (h-37•R1-3(7)) Zone TO a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-3(7)) Zone, and FROM Holding Residential R1 (h-37•R1-4) Zone TO a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone to remove the h-37 holding provision. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.8 1284 and 1388 Sunningdale Road West - Kent Subdivision - Phase 3 - Special Provisions - (39T-04510-3C)

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

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 Foxhollow North Kent Development Inc., for the subdivision of land over Part of Lot 23, Concession 5, (Geographic Township of London), City of London, County of Middlesex, situated on the south side of Sunningdale Road West, between Wonderland Road North and Hyde Park Road, and on the north side of the Heard Drain, municipally known as 1284 and 1388 Sunningdale Road West:

- a) the Special Provisions, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Foxhollow North Kent Development Inc., for the Foxhollow North Kent Subdivision, Phase 3C (39T-04510-3C) appended to the staff report dated May 10, 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 May 10, 2021 as Appendix "B";
- 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

2.1 London Plan Appeals Update – Results of April 15, 2021 Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) Decision

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, the staff report dated May 10, 2021 entitled "London Plan Appeals Update - Results of April 15, 2021 Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) Decision", with respect to an update on the status of London Plan Appeals, BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-L01)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 192-196 Central Avenue, 193-197 Central Avenue, and 200 Albert Street (TZ-9316)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with respect to the application of Farhi Holdings Corporation relating to the properties located at 192-196 Central Avenue, 193-197 Central Avenue, and 200 Albert Street, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), by extending the Temporary Use (T-70) Zone for a period not exceeding three (3) years;

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

- a communication dated May 3, 2021 from M. Smith, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 4, 2021 from K. Langdon, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 4, 2021 from G. Anastasiadis, by e-mail;

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 extension to the Temporary Use (T-70) Zone is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020;
- the recommended extension to the Temporary Use (T-70) Zone conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to, the Temporary Use By-law policies;
- the recommended extension to the Temporary Use (T-70) Zone conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to, the Temporary Use Provisions;
- the recommended extension to the Temporary Use (T-70) Zone does not compromise the ability to achieve the long-term goals of Our Move Forward: London's Downtown Plan;
- the recommended extension to the Temporary Use (T-70) Zone is appropriate to help maintain an adequate supply of parking to service businesses in the Downtown and on Richmond Row pending the gradual transition away from the use of surface commercial parking lots as transit ridership increases and as alternative parking spaces are provided; and,

- the parking lots have existed for periods ranging from 15-28 years and have achieved a measure of compatibility with the surrounding land uses. (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: E. Holder

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.2 2631 Hyde Park Road and 1521 Sunningdale Road West – (O-9190)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Auburn Developments Inc., relating to the property located at 2631 Hyde Park Road and 1521 Sunningdale Road West:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 2021 to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM an Open Space designation TO an Urban Reserve Community Growth and Environmental Review designation;
- b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 10, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 25, 2021 to amend The London Plan to change the Place Type of the subject lands FROM a Green Space place type TO a Future Community Growth place type and Environmental Review 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 request to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM an Open Space designation TO a Low Density Residential designation BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

- i) the proposed amendment is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 as it does not ensure an appropriate process can be undertaken prior to development which will allow for the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs, ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available;
- ii) the proposed amendment does not conform to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Secondary Plan policies, Urban Reserve Community Growth policies and Environmental Review policies;
- iii) the proposed amendment does not conform to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions and Secondary Plan Policies;
- iv) the requested amendment is premature. The site needs to be considered through a larger planning review process (a secondary plan) to determine its integration within a larger future neighbourhood, the applicable vision and character for the new neighbourhood, what an appropriate land use pattern is for the area, and other technical requirements;
- v) the subject site is at a key location within the broader planning context and its designation and potential future development without consideration of the surrounding lands is not “big-picture” or long term thinking and if designated in isolation of these lands, it could result in future land use, servicing, and road network issues;
- vi) the subject site has not been reviewed for urban land uses which would have taken into account servicing demands/road networks and schooling/public service facility requirements for the subject site within the larger context of the Fox Hollow Community Plan;
- vii) the proposed amendment in isolation of the surrounding lands could result in an inefficient development and land use pattern and create issues with the future expansion of the settlement area as the current amendment may ultimately conflict with the vision and goals of the future Secondary Plan in the area; and,
- viii) the lands were originally designated and zoned for the sole purpose of a cemetery use;

d) the request to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM a Green Space place type TO a Neighbourhood place type BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

- i) the proposed amendment is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 as it does not ensure an appropriate process can be undertaken prior to development which will allow for the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs, ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available;
- ii) the proposed amendment does not conform to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Secondary Plan policies, Urban Reserve Community Growth policies and Environmental Review policies;
- iii) the proposed amendment does not conform to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions and Secondary Plan Policies;

- iv) the requested amendment is premature. The site needs to be considered through a larger planning review process (a secondary plan) to determine its integration within a larger future neighbourhood, the applicable vision and character for the new neighbourhood, what an appropriate land use pattern is for the area, and other technical requirements;
- v) the subject site is at a key location within the broader planning context and its designation and potential future development without consideration of the surrounding lands is not “big-picture” or long term thinking and if designated in isolation of these lands, it could result in future land use, servicing, and road network issues;
- vi) the subject site has not been reviewed for urban land uses which would have taken into account servicing demands/road networks and schooling/public service facility requirements for the subject site within the larger context of the Fox Hollow Community Plan;
- vii) the proposed amendment in isolation of the surrounding lands could result in an inefficient development and land use pattern and create issues with the future expansion of the settlement area as the current amendment may ultimately conflict with the vision and goals of the future Secondary Plan in the area; and,
- viii) the lands were originally designated and zoned for the sole purpose of a cemetery use;

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

- a communication dated May 6, 2021, from S. Stapleton, Vice-President, Auburn Developments; 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;

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

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2020 as it ensures an appropriate process can be undertaken prior to development which will allow for the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs, ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Secondary Plan policies, Urban Reserve Community Growth policies and Environmental Review policies;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Secondary Plan Policies, Future Community Growth and Environmental Review policies;
- the recommended amendment ensures that the subject site is reviewed through a comprehensive review process along with the surrounding lands to ensure the efficient expansion of the settlement area and comprehensive review of land use and servicing needs for the area; and,

- the recommended amendment prevents ad-hoc planning and prevents future compatibility issues with the surrounding lands in regards to land use impacts, servicing constraints and sufficient public service facilities being able to support the proposed development. (2021-D08)

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Nays: (2): S. Lehman, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 2)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman

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: E. Holder

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)

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the application by Auburn Developments Inc., relating to the property located at 2631 Hyde Park Road and 1521 Sunningdale Road West BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration to accept an application by Auburn Developments to:

a) amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM an Open Space designation TO an Urban Reserve Community Growth and Environmental Review designation;

b) amend The London Plan to change the Place Type of the subject lands FROM a Green Space place type TO a Future Community Growth place type and Environmental Review 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) to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM an Open Space designation TO a Low Density Residential designation; and,

d) to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM a Green Space place type TO a Neighbourhood place type;

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

- a communication dated May 6, 2021, from S. Stapleton, Vice-President, Auburn Developments; 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: (2): S. Lehman, and E. Holder

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

Motion Failed (2 to 4)

3.3 3557 Colonel Talbot Road (SPA20-063)

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of 2749282 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 3557 Colonel Talbot Road:

a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Site Plan Approval to facilitate the construction of the proposed residential development:

- i) the lack of consultation with the property owners on the west side of the property;
- ii) potential runoff on the west side of the property;
- iii) the impact of the removal of the three mature evergreen trees; and,
- iv) the potential impact of the retaining wall and any potential impact of that on the cedar hedge; and,

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council does not have any issues with respect to the Site Plan Application, and Council supports the Site Plan Application;

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-D11)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Nays: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 1)

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: 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)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 Councillor M. van Holst - Meadowlilly ESA

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

That, the communication from Councillor M. van Holst with respect to the preserving environmental heritage near the Meadowlilly Environmentally Significant Area 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

5.1 (ADDED) 3rd Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

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

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 3rd Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee from its meeting held on April 28, 2021:

a) Municipal Council BE ADVISED that the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee recommends that road narrowing be a priority for the Neighbourhood Street Renewal Program projects, to maximize the space for trees and sidewalks within the right of way;

it being noted that a verbal presentation from D. MacRae, Director, Roads and Transportation, with respect to this matter, was received;

b) the following actions be taken with respect to the Veteran Tree Incentive Program:

i) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to explore options to target recipients who genuinely need additional financial support in order to maintain their veteran trees;

ii) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to consider and compare, during its review of the above-noted program, its cost-efficiency relative to the canopy cover that is expected to be gained; and,

iii) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to seek to prioritize low canopy neighbourhoods and non-invasive species for the above-noted program, given that funding is limited and not all of the veteran trees can be maintained;

it being noted that the presentation, as appended to the added agenda, from S. Rowland, Urban Forestry Planner, with respect to this matter, was received;

c) the final 2021 Trees and Forests Advisory Committee Work Plan, BE APPROVED;

d) the following actions be taken with respect to the communication, as appended to the added agenda, from J. Kogelheide with respect to tree care communications:

i) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to implement the Trees and Forest Advisory Committee's recommendation with respect to the distribution of promotional materials related to tree care practices including:

- A) proper tree mulching;
- B) watering newly planted trees; and,
- C) not travelling with firewood;

it being noted that the above-noted communication, with respect to this matter, was received; and,

e) clauses 1.1, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2, inclusive, 5.1 and 5.2, inclusive 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)

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:43 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 192-196 Central Avenue, 193-197 Central Avenue and 200 Albert Street (TZ-9316)

- Councillor Squire: Staff report on this matter, please. Thank you very much. Any technical questions only, please, Committee? There being none we will go to presentations. Is the applicant making a presentation?
- Good Afternoon Mr. Chair, it's Scott Allen from MHBC Planning.
- Councillor Squire: Good afternoon.
- Scott Allen, MHBC Planning: Yes. I will make a very brief presentation on behalf of the applicant. With me today, I should mention, representing the applicant, Muky Pundaky, and he's available to answer any questions as well. At this time, we'd like to express our support for the findings and recommendation of the Development Services report as presented by Ms. Maton. In particular, we agree with the finding that the proposed extension of the temporary commercial parking permission to these properties would help address local parking demands in the near term and not undermine the long-term redevelopment potential of the lands. This finding also reflects commentary provided in our planning justification report which was submitted in support of this application. With that in mind, Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank the Committee for its consideration and will gladly answer any questions that members may have.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any other delegations from the public? I shouldn't say delegations, speakers. Are there any?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, we do have some members of the public who wish to speak.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: The first would be Mr. Rajani.
- Heenal Rajani: Hello. Good afternoon.
- Councillor Squire: Good afternoon. You will have five minutes to speak sir so you can start right now.
- Heenal Rajani: Thank you very much Mr. Squire. First I am speaking. I am a downtown business owner and I live close to downtown and in the Piccadilly Street area with my family, four children and I understand the need for, for parking in downtown, I understand the need in a specific area and with regard to the Official Plan and the Talbot area and I just think how the by-law extension needs more consideration and I think the Committee members will have seen the representation from members of the public especially their concerns. I think there are more voices out there, more members of the public who maybe not writing letters and are communicating concerns in other ways, other forums and you know and I hear the representations and from staff and I see in this report it says that extending temporary use T-70 zone for additional three years will have no impact on the potential for long-term redevelopment at the site. You know, however, I think, at the same time there has been an extension, extension, extension on these temporary things with three years and three years for some of these sites for over twenty years and I think it's just not really a fair way of saying it's really temporary when we, when we recognize there is a need for development downtown, we recognize that these are underutilized sites and

what's in the report. These measures, you know, while they are outside the downtown parking strategy area, the gradual phasing out of surface commercial parking lots is recommended to avoid parking shortages while the Strategy comes to fruition. The short-term extension would continue to provide parking in the core so that area residents businesses which we absolutely need but this has to be short-term, you know, and I saw last year that, last April, because of Covid, there's conversations around having a new parking structure develop as part of understandably the financial uncertainty those conversations had to be shelved by the City and I think, you know, if we keep giving these three year extensions then that's not really encouraging those kinds of projects that we absolutely need, the development of better alternatives to parking, you know, and that is budgeted for, I know you have, there's a budget there for sustainable city that London is looking at infrastructure to built, maintained and operated to meeting the needs of the community and replacing surface parking with efficient, convenient and cost effective public parking, business person social activities in the downtown and I think you have got to think about that and so I'm I understand your, this Committee's unlikely to go against the recommendations of staff on this matter I just invite you to consider whether a three year extension is appropriate, whether it could be a shorter period of time, even slightly shorter, you know, just send the message that this is not a carte-blanche to keep getting these extensions and not doing anything to develop these sites while integrating parking into those developments and as well with parking as much as there is a need you don't have to consider this because this is not a new policy as such but to think about this Climate Emergency Evaluation tool and to think about what is the climate emergency you know, what's the climate impact of this and is there a better way of doing this and how can we be encouraging more other forms of transportation than cars and I think that has to be considered at the same time as when you are doing anything with parking.

- Councillor Squire: You have one minute remaining.
- Heenal Rajani: Thank you very much. Those are the things I invite the, this Committee to consider. I think there's, there's, I know you are probably unlikely to vote against this but to say could it be less than three years, how can we re-examine more parking matters coming up shortly in the next weeks, months, how can we encourage those difficult parking to be better, transportation. Thank you for your time. Appreciate the opportunity to share this with you today
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much for coming to speak to us. Very much appreciated. Next speaker.
- Catharine Saunders: Mr. Chair, this would be Ms. McKeating.
- Councillor Squire: Yes.
- Hi there. Can people hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can certainly hear you.
- Kelley McKeating: Oh dear, maybe I should talk quieter.
- Councillor Squire: No, no, it's okay. I have, you can start now and it will be five minutes.
- Okay. Thanks a lot. I am Kelley McKeating and I'm speaking today on behalf of the London Region branch of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and like the prior speaker, I'm also, and we as an organization, are opposed to yet another round of renewal of these temporary parking zoning amendments. I

don't know how many parking spots there are in the downtown and adjacent to downtown area as compared to ten years ago, I can certainly think that in recent months there was a demolition at York and Talbot Streets if I recall correctly which expanded the parking, the surface parking lot availability downtown. There was also a demolition, a number of years ago at 199 Queens Avenue. I think that if there is another zoning amendment allowed here, there is absolutely no motivation for a property owner to ever develop the land or sell the land to somebody who does want to do an appropriate development. The denial of these in similar applications would certainly motivate the owner to either develop or sell and then the land would no longer be underutilized in the words of the Planner. The other thing that a denial of these applications would do is put less pressure on developers to demolish heritage property when they do want to develop, it would be really nice if more vacant land was available to them. I would also question whether these parking spots truly are needed. I work very close to a large parking lot at Piccadilly and St. George Street and pre-pandemic, my observation when I was walking out during the work day is that that parking lot is not close to being completely full and it's only three or four blocks away from these parking lots and that's all I have to say today. Thank you for listening.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming to speak to us today. Any other speakers?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, the last person on this item is Charlene Jones.
- Councillor Squire: Great.
- Charlene Jones: Hi. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Hi. You have five minutes to speak starting right now.
- Ok. Good afternoon. I'm the owner of Artistic Spa, I'm a downtown business and property owner. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak today. When I started my business thirty-three years ago, Richmond Row was full of beautiful boutiques, salons and restaurants, all thriving businesses. We didn't have these parking lots, only a pleasant shopping experience. Today it's a very different feel, it doesn't have the same vibe, it's not a good experience anymore, it's no longer thriving with people shopping, we now rely heavily on eight months when the students living in the area come to shop, eat and drink but they are walking or taking cabs, they're not usually driving. I wonder what this area would have been like today had we voted for residential development several years ago. I do know pre-Covid these parking lots were not all full utilized and now with people working from home we certainly won't need all three lots. Downtown needs people, we need people living downtown to support the businesses, especially now with the housing shortage in London, now's the time to encourage and help property owners with new development. I'm not sure what another three years of empty lots would look like for the future of downtown. Currently the lots are attracting drugs, crime and homelessness all which discourages people from wanting to come downtown. We need change, we need to create a whole wonderful shopping experience again. That's all I, that's my input.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. It's very much appreciated. Thanks for speaking to us today. Any other speakers today? No.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, we have no members of the public on the list or on the call.

- Councillor Squire: Great. Thank you very much. Could I get a motion to close the public participation meeting?

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 2631 Hyde Park Road and 1521 Suningdale Road West (O-9190)

- Councillor Squire: Staff report. Just to be clear Mr. Corby, we're trying to be more precise about this stuff, it's on page 304 of the Added Agenda? Am I right?
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: I don't have the Added Agenda up, sorry, I just have my.
- Councillor Squire: I think that's correct so Committee Members don't expect to see it on your screen. It's in paper form. Am I right? So Councillor Hillier do you have this?
- Councillor Hillier: Yes, I do. It's in the e-mail. Sorry, if you are on escribe, it's in the attachment, it's the last one down, added presentation. If you click on it, it's a very nice presentation you can look at.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. I just wanted to make sure that because I've been a little lax on this in the past, making sure that all Committee Members actually have the presentation and are looking at it as we move ahead. Sorry Mr. Corby. Go ahead now that we are done that. Thank you very much. Technical questions only please. Councillor Hillier. Technical questions please.
- Councillor Hillier: Yes. Thank you. I'm just looking at the isolation of this lot and I'm wondering can the adjacent or sorry the adjacent storm sewers and waste sewers support this?
- Councillor Squire: Staff?
- Matt Feldberg, Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions): Thank you and through the Chair, so there is, through the OPA review, we have looked at it but our Engineering staff are looking for holding provisions to be placed over top of the property as the ultimate capacity for the area has not been addressed through this particular application.
- Councillor Squire: Again, technical questions only. Councillor Morgan. By the way, you are here because this property is within your Ward so I just thought I would give you that introduction.
- Deputy Mayor Morgan: Thanks for the introduction Chair. My technical question is about the presentation, in a section of the presentation, Mr. Corby mentions the possibility of the Urban Growth Boundary review and he said that was scheduled in, I heard 2020 so I'm wondering if he can clarify the date that he intended that would happen and then I have a couple of questions about that process if that's appropriate at this time, Mr. Chair.
- Mike Corby, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair, I will clarify. That is 2022, my apologies, when I was typing it out I knew I was going to say 2020 but I thought I said 2022 so sorry it is then.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Deputy Mayor Morgan: Mr. Chair I will ask your advice on this, I have a couple of questions about that part of the process. Would you prefer I wait until after the public participation or do you see that as technical?

- Councillor Squire: I think that's probably technical if you would like to do it now. Thanks for asking. Most, this, Members of this Committee never ask my permission to do anything so it's a really nice change.
- Deputy Mayor Morgan: Well you're welcome for that. I know the basis of the staff recommendation is grounded in the idea that you can do a Secondary Plan on a larger block of land and my understanding is that the lands adjacent to this are considered Tier 1 lands and I would like to confirm that with our staff and I guess I'd also like to understand, you said when the review would happen in 2022 but how long does it actually take if you were to go through this process to get to an application like this with a Secondary Plan. What's the estimated time frame that we would be looking at on that?
- Paul Yeoman, Director, Development Services: Through you Mr. Chair, it's Paul Yeoman. Happy to answer those questions. The first is that the City actually doesn't have defined tiering of lands for lands outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. We did have a review that was done, I believe it was in 2013 which actually did look at some candidate sites outside of the Urban Growth Boundary if Council was interested at the time of taking lands out of the Urban Growth Boundary and bringing others in. Lands to the immediate East of these lands were identified as a candidate opportunity at that time and we know there's a significant demand in the Northwest part of the city. In terms of the broader perspective, the Urban Growth Boundary discussion is likely to take a year or a little bit longer than that more than likely. Secondary planning process is about a year as well, two, if not a little bit more to so again it would be looking at the lands wholistically as the piece within the greater whole.
- Deputy Mayor Morgan: I think that's it for my questions at this part. Thank you Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes Mr. Chair. I understand we are still on technical questions.
- Councillor Squire: We are.
- Councillor Hopkins: On Councillor Morgan's question about the review of the Urban Growth Boundary, so that's going to take place in 2022. I just want to understand the process. Is there a Terms of Reference that would come to us to open up that review and when would that happen?
- Paul Yeoman, Director, Development Services: Through you Mr. Chair I'm happy to answer that one as well. Yes, there definitely will be a Terms of Reference coming to Council for consideration about whether or not a boundary review is something that Council would like us to pursue. We actually do not have direction on that yet. I should also clarify with my previous comments, the results of an Urban Growth Boundary review would not necessarily indicate that lands in this immediate area would be included or not. I just was saying that there's a previous review that's indicating that the lands to the immediate East were good candidates for the future but that's not necessarily the outcomes that would be resulting from an Urban Growth Boundary review.
- Councillor Squire: Any other technical questions? I have a technical question because I'm confused. My understanding is that this property is currently within the Urban Growth Boundary and the properties, what you are.
- Mayor Holder: You are on mute Chair.

- Councillor Squire: I am? I don't think so. Am I on mute? I don't think I am Mr. Mayor. Can you hear me now? He's not answering so I don't, can other Councillors hear me? Is that better? Can you hear me now? Thank you. Thanks for pointing it out Mr. Mayor. Just from a technical point of view, this property is within the Urban Growth Boundary and you are talking about a boundary review to determine if other properties would come within the Urban Growth Boundary and in fact, within the Urban Growth Boundary and you are talking about a boundary review to determine if other properties would come within the Urban Growth Boundary and, in fact, possibly whether this property might get thrown out of the Urban Growth Boundary. Is that what we are looking at because that wasn't the impression that I had initially.
- Paul Yeoman, Director, Development Services: Through you Mr. Chair what we are recommending is sort of an Urban Reserve Growth designation for the lands or future growth place type as part of The London Plan. The Urban Growth Boundary review is a separate matter. What we are saying with our recommendation is that there's not a sufficient amount of land here associated with a broader neighbourhood so, for example, this isn't a straight-forward matter where there is a clear geographically defined pod for lack of a better term where a neighbourhood would exist. It does continue into broader lands beyond this and needs to be considered comprehensively through that.
- Councillor Squire: I'm not sure that I understand that. Are the other lands that you are talking about possibly being part of this Secondary Plan, are they currently within the Urban Growth Boundary or outside of the Urban Growth Boundary?
- Paul Yeoman, Director, Development Services: Through you Mr. Chair, Mr. Morgan was asking questions about lands that were outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and that was the nature of his question, his line of questions.
- Councillor Squire: But I was talking about my question which was. Okay, I'm going to leave it there. I'm, I'm going to leave it there. I might ask questions later. Any other technical questions? Let's move to public participation then. Do we have the applicant here?
- Good afternoon Mr. Chair, it's Matt Campbell from Zelinka Priamo here. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can hear you if you just give me a second. Okay, go ahead.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Thank you Mr. Chair. With me today is also Steve Stapleton. I'm just going to have some brief comments and turn it over to Mr. Stapleton. We're here essentially asking Committee a simple question of whether these lands should be used for Neighbourhood land uses which are predominantly residential in the short term or not. I think the discussion just previous to this was getting to the root of the matter. If we adopt the staff recommendation these lands are essentially sterilized for development for the foreseeable future. We don't know when they would develop. The really important things for Council's consideration here is the lands are within the Urban Growth Boundary, they're available for use. All the technical matters and concerns that staff were discussing, those can all be dealt with and we're in the process of doing with that right now. These lands can be serviced, there is a cost associated with that which Auburn is well acquainted with and they are prepared to do and this is an application that is very much in the public interest and we can confirm that there has been school board interest in putting a new public school on this site and those comments were provided in the IPR process

that we undertook with the City. I will leave my high-level comments there and will invite Mr. Stapleton to speak as well.

- Councillor Squire: Go ahead Mr. Stapleton.
- Steve Stapleton, Auburn Developments: Sorry I had to unmute there. Thank you Mr. Chair for the opportunity. First of all I would like to apologize for our divergent position from staff, it's not our preference to have so many dissenting positions on a file and that's why we require this Committee and Council's guidance to bring this application forward. As the staff have identified this is a small piece of land, approximately forty-seven acres, well over forty percent of the lands are unconstrained from a natural heritage point of view and the lands are serviced through infrastructure that's already built south of Sunningdale Road. The OPA to change the land use to Neighbourhood does not prejudice the City's decisions in the future or the adjacent development of lands outside of the growth boundary nor is it premature. The OPA signals to Neighbourhood, signals a desire to implement the policy growth. That's what the application is for. At the beginning of this we agreed with staff that we would bring forward the OPA in advance of the Plan of Subdivision to get the principle of development established. The opportunities associated with this obviously outweigh any perceived negatives that can be addressed through subsequent processes. We've provided the justification and we believe that the subsequent Plan of Subdivision process can deal with any of those additional issues that the City highlights on connectivity, additional parkland linkages and things of that nature and we've already initiated that process and have the pre-consultation comments and believe strongly that we can deal with all these issues. There's no need to delay this OPA for, in my words, down designate the lands to a community growth position. The Board decision in 1999 identified the area for community growth and then the subsequent Foxhollow Community Plan because of the landowner being a cemetery user, identified it for cemetery purposes. We've provided the justification for the change, the hydrog report highlights the high water table that makes it not conducive for burial plots and hence the sale of the property to Auburn. We do believe the issues on connectivity and we have provided that to staff; however, it's not in the report ahead to you. We just don't believe that this land should be sterilized for a number of years. I take issue with the two year estimate from Mr. Yeoman quite frankly. If that was the case I don't think we'd be here with a negative report because it will take two years to get a subdivision approved. We therefore request that this Committee and Council weigh the public benefit that is in front of you with regard to public schools and parks and the ability to add supply to the housing market that is obviously constrained it is significant the increase in prices and the process itself limits the availability in a timely way. We put this in front of you, we ask for your support of our OPA to Neighbourhood because it is the beginning of the process, it's not the end of the process, there's a number of issues that we can address through subsequent processes, a subdivision that will deal with most of, if not all of the issues that were raised by staff in their presentation on road patterns. I must highlight that the road patterns to the South and the collector roads have been built to Sunningdale Road so those connections to the North will be initiated through that. There really is no unknowns with regard to the development of this property and we would look for your support in advancing to the next stage. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any other presentations? Public presentations?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, we have Richard Cracknell joining us.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Cracknell?

- Richard Cracknell: Good afternoon and thank you. I have a prepared statement I would like to make.
- Councillor Squire: You have five minutes and you can start now.
- Richard Cracknell: I should be about three. To start I would like to acknowledge the assistance and guidance that has been provided to me by your Senior Planner Mike Corby. He's done an outstanding job. After reviewing the report from the Deputy City Manager of Planning and Economic Development, I agree with all of the recommendations that are contained within it. Although I'm not an Engineer it's apparent to me that submitted documents that allowing this planning application would not be the most effective and efficient use to taxpayer resources as stated in the report. I've noted that even in the applicant's documents there are costs that have been identified, unfortunately, the party responsible for the payment is not. As I have stated previously before in communications, the land was not included in the Urban Growth Plan, I should say was included in the Urban Growth Plan as a greenspace cemetery. It was never considered a potential source of residential lots when the Foxwood Development was being considered. As a result, no infrastructure planning was considered for the land. I would like to add further comment though about my concerns with respect to providing safe access to public education for elementary students if the proposed development is allowed. Thames Valley School Board has a policy of not providing transportation to elementary students who live within a 1.6 geographical kilometers of their home school. It is my understanding and I checked today on the web and the assigned school for the students would be Arthur Currie Public School, the geographically closest public school. I would also like to point out that most residential units proposed would fall within the 1.6 kilometer circumference of the school. A school that has nine portables and as I understand is at capacity now. My main concern though is with those elementary students that would live within the 1.6 kilometers of the school and would have to walk across Sunningdale Road West, a major city artery. I think that for safety reasons bussing would be required for those students which would be an added cost to the property tax payers of London. To conclude, if this proposal is allowed, there is a choice to be made either we have an increase in property taxes to provide safe access to public education via bussing or students are put at risk by having to cross a major artery which at the present time is eighty kilometers per hour and there's no crossing point. I'd also like to say that I feel some of the development costs associated are being transferred to the taxpayer. Unfortunately those costs are unknown and they are not disclosed. To move forward with unknown costs in my mind is irresponsible of Council and I'd like to thank you for your time.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much sir for coming and speaking to us today. Other speakers?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, Stephen Romano.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Romano? Go ahead.
- Stephen Romano: Sorry I'm just attending this meeting to hear the other participants. I don't have anything to say at this time.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you very much. Anyone else?
- Catharine Saunders: Mr. Chair, Laura Regnier.
- Councillor Squire: Mrs. Regnier? Hello? Mrs. Regnier?

- Laura Regnier: Hi. Sorry about that. We have nothing further to say at this time. Everything that has been submitted I think we've made all our comments and we support the Planning and Environment Committee recommendation.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. It's not the Committee recommendation yet it's staff's recommendations. You are saying you support the staff recommendation?
- Laura Regnier: Yes. The staff recommendation.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Anybody else?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair we have no other members of the public in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you very much. I just need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 3557 Colonel Talbot Road (SPA20-063)

- Councillor Squire: I will go to staff for a presentation. Thank you very much. Questions? Technical questions? Mayor Holder.
- Mayor Holder: I'm not sure this is a technical question but I recall the concerns expressed by residents in the area and have there been subsequent discussions with staff and residents since that time?
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead staff.
- Melanie Vivian, Site Development Planner: Through you Mr. Chair we received some comments from those members of the public that were involved with the rezoning process. The only comments that came forth that have pertained to the site plan application were the privacy and loss of trees. There were questions regarding the proposed decks but I will note that the decks along the Northern property boundary do comply with the Zoning By-law so essentially we have no control on reducing that.
- Mayor Holder: Sorry Chair my and I appreciate the answer, thank you. My question was I wanted perhaps a bit more specifics were there any of the residents that corresponded to you were they supportive of this application since our last meeting as a result of these changes. Please
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead staff.
- Mike Pease, Manager, Development Planning: I can advise that there hasn't been any outward support in that sense if that's the question at hand. Through you Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Mayor Holder: That was the question. Thank you Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Any other technical questions? If there aren't we'll go to the public. Does the applicant wish to present?
- Good evening Mr. Chair. Matt Campbell here from Zelinka Priamo. I would just like to say a couple of words if that's appropriate at this time.
- Councillor Squire: Sure.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Great. Thanks very much. I don't have a whole lot to add to staff's presentation but I will add this to the previous comment. There's been ongoing discussions with the neighbours. The zoning application for this, you will recall Council approved the zoning application to permit the development. That was subsequently appealed to LPAT. The developer was in consultation with the appellants, which were the neighbours, and they came to a resolution in order for the neighbours to withdraw the LPAT appeal which I understand largely dealt with landscaping and as part of that settlement process, the developer has incorporated a number of landscaping features into the site design which are largely reflected on the site plan that you have in front of you today. I can advise that we are doing everything we can to add more landscaping and really solidify the vegetative buffer there. Again, not a whole lot

more to add to staff's comments and looking forward to the public comments on this one.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any other public presentations? One more.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes Mr. Chair. Heidi Smith.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Smith? Hello? Ms. Smith?
- Heidi Smith: Sorry about that. I was just trying to find my unmute button.
- Councillor Squire: Listen we all have that challenge in these times. You have five minutes and you can start now.
- Heidi Smith: Okay. I have my husband Darren with me. We actually live on the, live in the property bordering the West side of this site and I understand from what Matt was saying and just some neighbourhood discussions that lots of consultation was happening with the neighbours along the North side of the property but we actually haven't had any conversation with the developers. We're very happy to see that the cedar hedge is staying, that was our primary concern, it does provide some, a lot of privacy and screening and we enjoy the wildlife in it but our other concern at the time that we came to the meeting last Fall was about the run-off along our side of the property and I guess looking at the plans and I have a hard time seeing it, I will be very honest I tried to put magnifiers on but it is really hard to see from the printed paper but the discussion sounds like there is a retaining wall and stormwater management has been incorporated. It just is a little unknown to us, it's not very tangible for us to picture what that's going to look like, that cedar hedge sits right on the property line between our property and the development site and there are three mature evergreen trees less than a meter from the property line which are proposed to be taken out to facilitate, I guess, the retaining wall going in and our concern is how close that is and the impact of that on that cedar hedge. It's great that it's going to stay, it provides great screening and privacy but is it going to survive the construction and the retaining wall and since we have no fence going up there and no enhanced landscaping or trees being put along there because the roadway comes so close to that cedar hedge that there would be no way to rectify that after the fact and then we are without recourse so that is our concern.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you very much. I'll try to get you an answer to that concern. We have about three minutes left for your husband. Does he want to speak?
- Darren Smith: No, I'm good.
- Councillor Squire: Good. Alright, any other public?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair there are no other members of the public.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Then I'll look for a motion to close the public participation meeting.