

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.