

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1752-1754 Hamilton Road

- Councillor Squire: Staff presentation? Go ahead. Thank you very much. Just to change things a little bit we are going to have the applicant make their presentation and then I'll let the Committee make, ask technical questions of both the applicant and staff so that we're covering that off before we go to the public. Is there a presentation from the applicant?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, I do not have an agent for the applicant showing. I do have a member of the public in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Any technical questions then just of staff? Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yeah. Thank you and through the Chair, to Mr. Mottram, thank you for the presentation and a few questions. I have about the, I just hope I have the right application here. Municipal services to the area, is it, it's suggested that a holding provision may be applied but I'd like to know a little bit more if the, if there are municipal services that are adequate for this area. My second question is around the open space, just wanting to know what is being done to buffer the open space to this development as well.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Larry Mottram, Senior Planner: Yes. Sure. The servicing is available, all storm water, sanitary sewer and municipal water is available along Hamilton Road. There is a storm water management facility that has been constructed by the City to service this development and the engineering drawings are currently in their second submission of review which includes a detailed design for all of the servicing for development here including the subject lands. The open space lands have also been considered as part of the planning for the draft plan of subdivision and it includes the buffering for the delineation of the development limit. The identification of the environmentally significant area and the buffer have all been included as part of the draft approval plan and as part of the zoning so that includes lands that are just a little bit further to the east and north of the subject site that include ravine lands and it also includes the Thames Valley pathway trail which will run along the edge of the open space and through this Draft Plan of Subdivision we're able to incorporate that pathway project.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Alright, we're going to hear from one member of the public? Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes, Mr. Chair, Mr. Simm is here in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Mr. Simm. Are you there Mr. Simm?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Simm is on mute. We've asked him to unmute. Here he goes, he should be there now.
- Mr. Simm: Hello?
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Simm?

- Mr. Simm: Can you hear me there?
- Councillor Squire: I can hear you now. This is Phil Squire, I'm Chair of the Committee. You have five minutes to make your presentation starting now.
- Gary Simm: Thank you. My name is Gary Simm and my family owns the property beside 1752 Hamilton Road at 1764. My family has lived here for the last seventy years. 1752, our lot and the lot to the south, the original three lots, sold on this street were sold to veterans in World War II under the DLA sections *Land Act* which was formerly Westminster Township. 1752, as I said, was the first home on the street and we are opposed to its demolition and the creation of four lots. It should remain where it is, the streetscape does not really need to be altered. Many of the residents on this street feel the same way. I've outlined my comments further to Mr. Hillier, Ms. Pelosa and Mr. Lewis and some of the Councillors in a little less detail about my opposition to the applicants plan of design among other issues. I have spoken previously with other residents of the street, I would say most of them are adamantly opposed to altering the streetscape and, again, the creation of four lots. Many wanted to participate but they are either at work and kind of found this process difficult to navigate as well as did I myself although I do appreciate you guys taking the steps to do this. If I could say anything, it would be to take away here, I would like to see a vote of some sort among the neighbours and in conjunction with Council maybe put through post or at our local church here to have a further meeting about this site and what is going on on this street as far as development once the stay-at-home orders have lifted. Just in regards to my family's home at 1764 it is going to be impacted by vibration, it already has been across the street and what is going on everybody down here has had their homes shaking. I do realize that's, you know, part of what happens with infilling but we have a septic system, chimneys, outbuildings and ultimately this plan is going to reduce the value of our home, create further lack of privacy, issues with lights at night which are already happening across the road. Basically, if Council were to put this application through, we'd like to see a berm with trees, something like a spruce or juniper put from front to back just inside the applicant's property line to allow for further privacy as we have three acres and about a thousand foot deep property. It's basically being rendered useless which is more or less because of the creation of the subdivision at the back of our property, you know, you've got a thousand foot property that you've got no privacy now due to what they are going to build with roundabouts and so forth. We've kind of mentioned to the developer we do want to install a fence down the property line or just inside our property line but nobody on the street that I have spoken to thus far is happy about the plan. One thing I did want to note was is the City has lowered the road in front of our houses, kind of without notice back in 2018, 2017 and right beside the applicant's front driveway, our driveway, there's an island there that's been that way for, like I say, seventy years and the driveways are, the dimensions are not right and that is going to have to be corrected so I don't know how that will affect the applicant's plans but one of the comments that many neighbours are just a little upset about is, is that a lot of the trees in the front yard of 1752 have been taken out; mind you, that being said, a lot of the trees have been taken down at the rear of the property which got approval and further and other lands that they own on the street but the big bugaboo would be people are saying we're in a Tree Protection Zone and we're in this Environmentally Sensitive Area as anybody really in London like as Meadowlily, the amount of animals and wildlife that are back here it's tremendous really and so we are kind of just wondering, specifically with the trees at the front, why was the developer able to cut down these trees at the front when this plan, this file is Z-3914 has not been yet approved. That was kind of just baffling to us and I specifically.
- Councillor Squire: You have a minute remaining sir.
- Gary Simm: I'm just about done. I spoke to one of the developer's workers and they had just flat out told me that the developer had tried to get some of these trees

out earlier without permission, without permits and CTV has been doing a story about how, you know, we're not meeting the targets for trees so that's kind of baffling to us. Just in conclusion, I'm just about done, many people are pretty irate with what's gone one, you know, they work their butts off to be outside of a 30 x 50 lot and they've created lots here with mature trees and a large neighbourhood and, you know, now basically, two developers are carving up the neighbourhood and people have basically just said, I'm sorry, I'm just about done, the City doesn't really care about us, they'll do what they want, we're the east end and the neighbours on the street have had a meeting with the developers and the City in July of 2018 and have kind of said that a lot of our concerns have gone unaddressed and they are kind of left with what do I have to do, go to the media or an appeals board and our, like my family alone, like I've tried to.

- Councillor Squire: Okay. You did say, because you said you were about done I didn't interrupt you but your time is pretty much up. I'll give you ten seconds, okay?
- Gary Simm: Could I have, would it be okay if I had thirty seconds more? I'm just.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. Just as long as you stick to that sir.
- Gary Simm: Yes. Thanks sir. I've been trying to be respectful with the developer but we've had constant issues with the developer's sending their workers on our property the last three years, trespassing on our yard, verbally abusing my mother, members of the family, and due to the actions of this developer my mother was hospitalized, rendered unconscious a while back and it's just, we're left just shaking our head at this like how they're allowed to get away with what they get away with.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. That is your time sir.
- Gary Simm: Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Gary Simm: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Any other members of the public? Alright. We'll need a motion to close the public participation meeting.