

Appendix D – Relevant Background

Council Resolution – OZ-8624



London
CANADA

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

May 31, 2017

2431602 Ontario Limited
c/o C. Wiebe
MHBC
630 Colborne
London ON N6B 2V2

I hereby certify that the Municipal Council, at its meeting held on May 30, 2017 resolved:

10. That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of 2431602 Ontario Limited, relating to the property located at 420 Fanshawe Park Road East:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 23, 2017 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 30, 2017 to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject lands FROM a Low Density Residential designation TO a Multi-family, Medium Density Residential designation;
- b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 23, 2017 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 30, 2017, 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 Residential R1 (R1-7) Zone TO a holding Residential R1 Bonus (h-5'R1-7*B-_) Zone subject to the completion of a development agreement that substantively implements the site and building design appended to the staff report dated May 23, 2017 as Appendix "1";
- c) the Bonus Zone shall be implemented through a development agreement to provide for an apartment building of 14.6m (48 ft) with an increased density up to 100 units per hectare in return for the provision of the following services, facilities and matters which are described in greater detail in the proposed by-law:
 - i) a high quality development which substantively implements the site plan and elevations appended to the staff report dated May 23, 2017 as Appendix "1", with minor revisions at the discretion of the Managing Director of Planning and City Planner;
 - ii) a contemporary building design with a mix and articulation of building materials including brick, metal panels, concrete, wood veneer and vision and spandrel glass;
 - iii) the provision of individual entrances to ground floor units on the south façade, with operable and lockable front doors, pedestrian scale features such as lighting and weather protection, and private amenity areas designed as courtyards enclosed with a combination of planters and decorative fencing;
 - iv) the provision of all but 18 required parking spaces below grade generally located under the building footprint;
 - v) the provision of enhanced universally accessible features such as barrier-free access to all floors, and wide routes, paths and corridors which provide adequate width for persons using wheelchairs, scooters, pushing strollers;

The Corporation of the City of London
Office 519.661.2500 x4856
Fax 519.661.4892
hlaysnsk@london.ca
www.london.ca

- vi) the location of all service and loading facilities within and behind the building and not visible from the public street;
 - vii) the enhanced provision of landscaping and retention of mature trees in a park-like setting at the north of the site with a minimum 60% landscaped open space; and,
 - viii) the provision of a commemorative garden and/or signage to acknowledge the historic affiliation of the property within the landscaped open space towards the north of the site;
- d) the Site Plan Approval Authority BE REQUESTED to consider the following design issues through the site plan process:
- i) the provision of privacy fencing along the east and west property boundaries;
 - ii) the provision of enhanced landscaping along the east and west property boundaries for screening; and,
 - iii) restrict any fencing proposed for the north boundary to wrought iron or similar visually permeable fencing material;

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

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications, with respect to this matter;

- a communication dated May 17, 2017 from P. Barmby, 528 Sandybrook Drive;
- a communication dated May 8, 2017 from W. and C. Merryweather, 1559 Phillbrook Drive; and,
- a communication dated May 4, 2017 from K. Sui;

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

- the recommended amendments are consistent with, and will serve to implement the policies of the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2014* which encourages infill and intensification and the provision of a range of housing types, compact urban form and efficient use of existing infrastructure;
- the recommended Official Plan amendment is consistent with the policies of the Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation and will implement an appropriate medium density form in accordance with the greater Official Plan policies;
- the subject lands are of a suitable size and shape to accommodate the development proposed, and have access to municipal infrastructure, public transit facilities, nearby commercial nodes and open space;
- the recommended Bonus Zone provides appropriate regulations to control the use, intensity and form of development, and will allow for a higher density in return for the provision of such bonusable features that will provide for an enhanced development which is of a compatible scale and height to the existing development in the area;
- the proposed development will provide a positive development which is oriented to, and enhances the character of, Fanshawe Park Road East without the use of noise walls; and,
- the proposed residential uses and scale of development are generally consistent with the London Plan. (2017-D09) (10/10/PEC)



C. Saunders
City Clerk
/lk

cc. J. M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner
M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning

A. Vlasman, Executive Assistant
S. Wise, Planner II
J. Nethercott, Documentation Services Representative
External cc List in the City Clerk's Office

The Corporation of the City of London
Office 519.661.2500 x4856
Fax 519.661.4892
hlysynsk@london.ca
www.london.ca

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Property located at 420 Fanshawe Park Road East (OZ-8624)

- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning – see [attached](#) presentation.
- *(Councillor Turner indicates that Mrs. Wiebe, MHBC Planning, showed the rendering of the site and the tree retention on one of the slides, as did Ms. S. Wise, Planner II. In Ms. Wise's comments, she talked about the Donnybrook aspect that the trees would be retained, believing that Ms. Wiebe mentioned that but it shows new plantings there and does not show a retention of the trees; showed some wispy parts, maybe some evergreens.); Mrs. Wiebe responding that the answer is yes, the existing trees that you can see in the photos, those will be retained and then there will be additional new planting to augment these; pointing out, also, not sure if the Councillors have been out to the site but there is an existing row of some mature trees but under those trees there is a lot of thorn bush and some other plant material that has to be cleaned out but that is intended to be augmented with new plant material; (Councillor Cassidy indicating that currently on the east and west side there is a rather large hedge and in the presentation Mrs. Wiebe shows some cedar plantings and some trees; wondering if that current hedge will be removed and new cedars put in.); Mrs. Wiebe responding that after their second neighbourhood meeting, that question came up and she did follow up with both their landscape architects and their arborist and they went out on site and they said actually that, with a little bit of pruning and trimming the existing hedge can remain because it is quite high in certain areas but what they are proposing is to plant an understory of new cedars along the base of that existing hedge so it would remain; (Councillor Hopkins requests an explanation about how the underground parking will work as well as the above-ground parking.); Mrs. Wiebe showing the site plan; the parking would come in off of Fanshawe Park Road East, turn and you can see a line where the ramp starts to go down so the cars would come down and then they would turn in the underground parking so the door to the underground parking at this level would be one full level underground but around the ramp there would be a low wall which would both also help to shield the headlights that are coming along this section of the driveway because this will be at grade and they do not actually start to go down until this point so this wall will help to shield any headlights from this direction and it will also help to muffle any sound from the garage door, but this is both the entrance and the exit to the underground parking; (Councillor Hopkins enquires if that is one level or two underground.); Mrs. Wiebe responds that it is one level underground; (Councillor Hopkins enquires about how many above-ground parking spaces.); Mrs. Wiebe responds that she believes that there are just the eighteen here and this is intended to be just for visitor parking and all of the underground parking that is required by by-law is provided as well as the bicycle parking requirements under the by-law are being satisfied; (Councillor Park asks what the diversity is among the one hundred forty-two units between one to two to three bedroom units.); Mrs. Wiebe indicates that she does not know the exact range because a lot will depend on what the feedback from the consumer is but this building is primarily targeted to an older demographic so it would probably be predominantly one bedroom plus den and two bedroom with or without a den so that is the demographic, an empty nester retiree individual so it is not likely that there will be a lot of three bedroom units, probably a majority of one and two bedrooms.*
- Dr. Stan Brown, 75 PineRidge Grove, President, Stoneybrook/Uplands Community Association – see [attached](#) presentation.
- Bruce Curtis, 99 Wendy Crescent – see [attached](#) presentation.
- Shauna Roch, 26 Donnybrook Drive – see [attached](#) presentation.
- David Nenonen, 9 Donnybrook Drive – see [attached](#) presentation.
- Mohan Vasudharini, 1 Wendy Crescent – wondering how she, as a City Councillor, would think about this project; sharing a couple of thoughts on that; talking about intensification and as a community; indicating that this entire community is welcoming of new neighbours into the neighbourhood; wondering what is appropriate intensification; stating that that is the main question, this ties in with the intent of this project; wondering what the City really

wants out of this project and what does the developer want out of the project; how we, as a community, will work around and integrate this into our day-to-day existence; once we figure out that this is the intent, we can then say that these are the drivers, one of them is economics, one of them is growth, one of them, as the developer mentioned, is a combination of dwelling units that they have spoken about; wondering if this project is achieving these things; that is something to be a part of; pointing out that speakers ahead of her have already pointed out to the Committee that perhaps it is not meeting those yard sticks; advising that another thing is, is this sustainable, at the end of the day, the Committee is going to be putting a lot of pressures on existing infrastructure; indicating that there was a single family residence in this unit and now we are going to have one hundred forty-two families living in the very same patch of land; wondering if these infrastructures surrounding this piece of land are elastic in nature, she does not think so and that is where the challenge comes from, which has been so capably pointed out by Mr. D. Nenonen who spoke ahead of her in terms of the traffic flow, in terms of why they have concerns about traffic, why we worry about the safety of the Jack Chambers kids who are going down the street to the school which is already a very well-populated school; advising that these are concerns which are flashing through the minds of the community; stating that the community has worked together as a unit, which is one of the reasons we really wanted four of them to have the time to speak to Council and bring forward their concerns; indicating that this is going to be precedent setting; indicating that this project, if approved, is definitely going to set a precedent; pointing out that her property backs onto Fanshawe Park Road and there was an intention of having a deep back lot because they were supposed to be away from city traffic, at least that is what she was given to understand when she migrated into this country and she bought that property in 2001; commenting that there are six properties on Wendy Crescent and there is nothing stopping them from joining hands and approaching a builder and looking for a similarly intensified property because they will be in a better place than this current situation, we are right on Fanshawe Park Road and they can be a commercial node; wondering if that is a direction that City Council wants to go, is that a box they want to open up; she does not know, it could well be; indicating that if you look at a pro's and con's analysis her plea to the Committee is not to just look at the policies, procedures, by-laws, the number of feet, the number of units, intensification, bonusing, all of these are policies and procedures; at the end of the day, it is human lives that we are talking about here and you have to keep in balance and she knows that their job is a hard job but it is a balance between growth, economic prosperity, appropriate optimum return on investment, not a greedy return on investment, no one is opposing development here; all we are saying is reduce the number of units so that it is sustainable within the context of this community; keeping these things in mind, she truly pleads of the Committee, please keep this human element and stretch that envelope in the right direction; applying existing policies, easy peasy, but seeing beyond that and seeing the human behind that, that is a tough job; please deliver on this and she is sure that the Committee is not going to let us down.

- Martin McGavin, 34 Jennifer Gardens – indicating that his son went to Jack Chambers and he is now at A.B. Lucas, but while at Jack Chambers he had classes in portables that were very hot in the summer and very cold in the winter; believing both Jack Chambers and A.B. Lucas are good schools but they currently have three students sharing one locker; reiterating that it is three students per locker; so the schools are crowded; pointing out that the Civic Administration states in their report that the enrollment is expected to decline at Jack Chambers over the next five years; indicating that he does not know what the source of that data is but he does not see enrollment going down in the schools; pointing out that the developer also was non-committal about the size of the units that were going to be built as well so they are not sure how many families and children will be in there; outlining that one thing that also came to his attention as he was viewing the presentation, we all see the pictures in the summer time, winter is another issue, snow removal for the property; pointing out that we see that narrow laneway that they have to enter from, snow plows have to come in and out of that place and it looked to him like there was no room for snow to actually be deposited on the grounds of the property; thinking that is all going to have to be picked up and carried away and that is going to make a lot of noise for the people who are only thirty feet from that property line; advising that that is another issue that needs to be considered for the developers as well.

- Jean Anne Goldrick, 1261 Hastings Drive – advising that she and her husband moved into their residence in 1969 and they have seen traffic as it has progressively become more difficult but they settled on Fanshawe Park Road; stating that the section in Mrs. S. Roch's presentation, which was very good, showed you an example number one of infill that is just behind St. Jude's Church that could be picked up and set into the Poole property; noting that they still think of it as the Poole property; pointing out that there is also Roland Court which is zoned R1-8 that could be picked up and put into that property; advising that when you look at all the slides that were put up on the screen, all you saw in the area that was designated single family dwelling were single family dwellings; now we are proposing to put in a unit that is four storeys high; stating that if you approve this, she wants to know what guarantee that the Committee can offer that it will not end up taking advantage of bonusing and being six storeys high because that has already happened in the area; advising that the one hundred forty-two units were presented when the building was six storeys high and although there were some stair stepping of the backs of some of the levels, it does not account for bringing it down to four storeys and taking away that once terrace that would have been on the top of the third level so she does not know where the one hundred forty-two units are going to be able to fit in the same square footage; believing that we need to keep the neighbourhood looking the same as the neighbourhood was designed; outlining that when people move into the new neighbourhoods like Sunningdale Road and they build their big three storey three car garage homes, that is fine, they know that down the street there are going to be two or three twelve storey apartment buildings or condos, whatever you want to call them as well as multi-family dwellings in the form of townhouses, they know that moving in; advising that when they moved into this area, they moved in thinking that this was going to be a single family dwelling area as was proposed plan; thanking the Committee for having this meeting.
- Lori McNichol, 19 Donnybrook Road – indicating that she is the exact neighbouring property in the northwest corner; noting that she is the one storey house that was referred to in an earlier presentation; advising that she is eleven metres from that property; indicating that as a resident directly affected by this proposed development she would like to express her concerns regarding the proposal; reiterating that her home abuts 420 Fanshawe Park Road East on the northwest corner; indicating that her home is noted on all diagrams and photos, in fact, her home is the one mentioned as being eleven metres away from this proposed development; pointing out that the ramp and subsequent garage door to the underground parking will be outside her back deck; with the number of units and ultimately an outrageous number of vehicles that garage door will never stop; expressing concern about the noise, the headlights and the exhaust fumes at all times of day and night; her kitchen, family room and two of their three bedrooms will no longer be able to have their windows open, not to mention what the impact of the increased traffic volume will have on the residents around this block, namely Hastings Drive, Donnybrook Drive and Phillbrook Drive; Donnybrook Drive is already too busy and she believes that the three hundred forty cars that has been estimated on peak times is inaccurate; the privacy of her yard will no longer be what it has been; for 22 years her family has called this their home; eleven metres; respectfully, she asks everyone in this room, including members of Council, how would you like this proposed development of one hundred forty-two units to be built within eleven metres of your home.
- Nicole Lanthier, 1590 Hastings Drive – thinking that there are a few inaccuracies that are presented in the proposal and she urges everyone really to recognize that maybe some of these assumptions or presentations should be looked at, there are conflicting statements about the water table issue from credible sources; advising that one of the rationales presented in the recommended amendment is that the proposed structure is of a compatible scale and height to the existing development in the area; advising that she does not think that most people would agree that that is in fact the case; pointing out that the area is currently single family homes of one to two storeys, to say that it is of compatible scale and height seems very questionable; outlining that the change from R-1 Residential to R-8 bonus is too dramatic of a change, it is not that people are against development, this is a dramatic change, it is not just an alteration, it is a dramatic change particularly with the bonusing which really kicks you into high density and let us recall again that this is mid-block, it is not a corner, it is not a node, it is mid-block; please consider that strongly;

indicating that it is creating a substantial conflict and issue for the existing property owners; it will change and degrade the quality of residential life in this area; a few cosmetic upgrades do nothing to reduce the noise, the loss of privacy and the traffic issues for those living near this large and dense development; having two tones of brick or a historical plaque in no way reduces those impact so why that is a point in favour for bonusing is lost to her; one does not ameliorate the other in any way; one hundred forty-two households on a lot that is suited to many fewer residences in this neighbourhood and the fact that travel through a low density neighbourhood central to this plan should be very strongly considered; stating that it is not that this neighbourhood is anti-development, this is not the right development for that site in any way; urging the Committee to please consider that some of the statements tabled in the proposal, although presented as factual, there seems to be some evidence that maybe further scrutiny is required.

- Monica King, 524 Bobbybrook Drive – indicating that she has been involved with this since the very beginning of the application and she has taken great pains to go over The London Plan, become familiar with it so that when she made comments they would be thoughtful about what The London Plan says and what the proposal is and what the Plan says; indicating that one thing that struck her is that in a number of the sections that she read in the Official Plan and the new Plan, over and over again they use the terms such as “projects should recognize the scale of adjacent land uses”, they should “reflect the character of the area”, they should “be sensitive to”, “compatible with” and “a good fit within the existing and surrounding neighbourhoods”; stating that there are probably over one dozen clauses that use those terms; advising that when she reviewed the proposal by the developer, as well as the Planning department proposal, she did not see anywhere where they have provided concrete proof or evidence as to how this apartment building succeeds in those things that are outlined in the Plan; wondering how does it fit, how is it sensitive to the area; reiterating that she does not see that addressed or proven in any of the information that she has been given; does not see that it fits with the Plan and the compatibility of the area; saying that it fits with the character and is compatible with the neighbourhood just does not make it so, you have to have the proof for that; trying to fit a square peg into a round hole by saying that it fits and is compatible because it has similar vegetation or the brick is the same as some of the surrounding buildings, that to me is not compatible; the proposal contravenes a number of clauses in the Official Plan and the current new Plan and she would put forth that there is no concrete evidence to say that it does fit and therefore it is not good planning; commenting that if a picture is worth a thousand words she would like to ask people to think about two things; the photos that were shown at the last of the representation showed the effect of the building and the affect it is going to have on the houses surrounding it; the photos that Ms. S. Wise put up about similar buildings where you saw the building and you saw the tiny little house beside it; that made her gasp and she does not know if other people in the audience felt the same about that poor little house, look at what is towering over it and think about how you might feel if you were that house and how the people here are going to feel.
- R. Osborne, 34 Donnybrook Road – stating that she has lived in the area for eighteen years and bought her current house eight years ago; noting that they followed the rules and went to Council to ask if it would remain a single family dwelling zone or low-density; indicating that they knew there would be a risk of infill but that they expected that it would happen at some point at a reasonable rate, not at the magnitude of a 4 to 6 storey unit; stating that they want infill and they want the property developed; noting that they wished the property would have been a heritage but that didn't happen; noting that they appreciate the Committees' time and that the community has worked so hard to voice their concerns; asking the committee to please listen to those concerns.
- R. Dunleavy, 86 Jennifer Gardens – indicating that he there with a lot of his neighbours; stating that he was diagnosed with blood cancer in 2011 and was told that he would not live the year; indicating that has three kids and that his daughter was 6 months old at that time and that it was the community that rallied behind his family and is part of the reason he is still here; noting that his daughter and her best friend, a neighbour that helped him run his first 10K and a crossing guard are the people he is thinking about; stating that his daughter's best friend lives across the street from the proposed development and what can he say to her in ten years', time if the community did not stand up and say something; noting that the developers want to develop it, but the community does too, with maybe a

single family dwelling; noting that with regards to his neighbour that lives behind him on Hastings, right across from Jack Chambers School, what we have right now is a ruined street, one of the worst streets in London; stating that he has called City Hall and they have come out to put asphalt down and it is a gong show right now because of a ton of traffic; stating that in the newsletter that comes out every month, where he lives on Jennifer Gardens, there is a proposal for the parents who drive their children to school to park on Jennifer Gardens or to park on Virginia; indicating that he counted the cars that parked on his street today and there were twelve; stating that he counted the distance from Jack Chambers School to Donnybrook and it is exactly half a kilometre; noting that it was discussed tonight about keeping people in the area and allowing seniors in the area and what he has seen, working as a mortgage specialist is that a lot of people moving out of the area are older and the people moving in are families that want their kids to go to Jack Chambers School; stating that if they put in 142 units and 142 older people move out and 142 families move in so their kids can go to Jack Chambers School, half a kilometre seems to be too far for these families to walk their children to school; noting that he is not judging or angry but that he suffered a spinal cord injury during his treatment and was issued a disabled parking pass and started running because he was tired of being judged; indicating that children will not walk, even a half of a kilometre so bringing more people into the area will just cause more traffic; stating that in regards to the crossing guard, she has a high demand job right now and adding 142 more units would just put more stress on her.

- Nancy Poole, formerly of 420 Fanshawe Park Road East – advising that since 1956 she has felt very much a part of the neighbourhood; indicating that she is here as a good neighbour; supporting her neighbours in their efforts to find an appropriate development for 420 Fanshawe Park Road East; stating that, at no time, did her husband and herself, when they realized because of age and health they had to leave their home did they intend to sell it to a developer and they were both so pleased when Dr. Chiu came with his wife and small son to meet them and to tell them that they would be living in their home; noting that that gave them great pleasure as this would be the fourth family that they would hope was going to enjoy living in that neighbourhood; stating that a little over a year later, she understands that things changed and a developer was then involved; advising that they felt betrayed and perhaps naive; enquiring about their totem pole as no one this evening has mentioned it; indicating that the totem pole is an indigenous artifact and it is governed under an *Act* and those rules are laws; wondering where their totem pole has gone because she has been told that it was taken down by a chainsaw, a car and a truck and it was taken away; asking the City what are your plans for their totem pole; reiterating that it is an indigenous artifact and governed under the *Act*; repeating her support of her neighbours and she is sure that the good thinking at City Hall and her neighbours can surely come to a happy resolution and a good use of the park that they developed on Fanshawe Park Road.
- Tanya Patry, 479 Jeffreybrook Close – commenting on a couple of points raised by the developer that she thought were of interest but seemed to not quite pan out with their belief, yes it works with their belief, but they were talking about the noise barriers that are there and how, if they developed this great building, it will be nice and it will be pretty there and it will detract from these noise barriers but the noise barriers are still going to be there, they belong there, they are not moving; pointing out that all you are doing is opening up the hole that is there already, which is fine, but do not use that as the reason that we should put this enormous building in your neighbourhood; commenting on the rapid transit, it is great that there is transit there but how many people really use the transit; reiterating that, as many people have previously spoken to, people do not even walk their kids to school in our neighbourhood half the time, it is all done by private vehicle; indicating that the developer also spoke about it being aging in place and her understanding is that it is not really written down so if they need to sell the units, these units will go to whoever will buy them because nobody wants to have an empty building, she totally understands that she obviously does not have the money to develop anything but she gets that you want your money back and you would not want a vacant building, when that happens it is going to go to students, it is going to go to everybody else and it is no longer going to be this aging thing so if that is what it is targeted as she would like to see it better described as that instead of what it is described as; with respect to safety in this neighbourhood you are

adding a lot more vehicles, there are several participation houses in their neighbourhood; stating that they took three years to purchase their home, it is an accessible home, they need it for their child as their child is bound to a wheelchair and he hopes that someday he will be able to use a mechanical chair much as one of their neighbours further down the street; if you have seen her, her name is Denise and she is a lovely woman, she is on our streets frequently she worries about her safety, she worries about her sons potential safety going down Phillbrook Road when he is older and hopefully able to do such things; these are some things that she thinks gets lost when our smaller roads are going to be overrun with all these vehicles and she hopes that is something that people consider.

- Kerri Hillis, 50 Donnybrook Road – speaking to what Mr. D. Nenonen highlighted on his slide, the large community area that accesses Donnybrook Road, page 25 of the staff report indicates that Donnybrook Road has three hundred forty vehicles a day; advising that she did her own vehicle study today and from 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM, in ninety minutes, eighty-eight cars went down Donnybrook Road; noting that that was not peak hours, peak hours in this report indicate 4:45 PM to 5:45 PM; stating that, roughly eighty-eight cars in ninety minutes, we are averaging one car a minute and now we are looking to add an additional one hundred seventy-eight cars to Donnybrook Road, which is now narrowed with all of the parking, which may happen on Donnybrook Road; advising that Donnybrook Road also has access to three school buses that use Donnybrook Road three times a day which will be challenging to get a bus down a street if all of the parking is taken up by cars; noting that, as a teacher, she interviewed just a couple of weeks ago at Jack Chambers Public School and it was interesting to hear the Principal speak highly of the school, which she agrees with and that is most sought after school in London; this is not word for word but a quote from the Principal, people shop to live in this neighbourhood for this school, people come from overseas to live in this neighbourhood to go to Jack Chambers Public School; believe that those people will be looking at this development to live in because quote from the Principal, people will do just about anything to live in this neighbourhood to access Jack Chambers Public School.
- Catherine Sunstrum, 47 Wendy Crescent – expressing appreciation to the Councillors for moving to a location that the area residents could join them and have time to speak with them tonight; indicating that this is not something that Mrs. N. Poole would be happy about and thanking Mrs. N. Poole for attending the meeting tonight because the property was always so beautiful and she has always done so much for London; expressing disappointment when she read some of the rationale in the package because she thought that there was no way this has all of the information and the fact that single-detached homes, single-detached development satisfies the definition of intensification, that is important; that is all we are asking is to be consistent and aligned with what you see in our neighbourhood; Mrs. Roch provided some excellent examples of wonderful infill, nice courts that fit and she is sure they would be happy to be there because it is true, so many people are trying to move into our neighbourhood and they cannot find homes, a nice little court in there would be something that is suitable and it would not take long to sell it; hoping that the Committee will not vote in favour of this proposal.
- Emily Hahn-Trinka, 1633 Hastings Drive – indicating that she is approximately five metres from the main parking lot at Jack Chambers Public School, on the main bus route with a driveway that is crumbling; advising that she shoveled fifty pounds worth of asphalt this morning; noting that the City has been out and repaired it but she has six more garbage cans for them to pick up tomorrow of asphalt because the driveway is in such bad repair; guessing we can all talk about the politics and the reasons for not having the development but as a resident who has kept her eyes closely on Jack Chambers Public School for eight years, stopped an arsonist on the playground, picked up twenty-seven wooden fish that have been painted to support an environmental initiative over the weekend; advising that one thing strikes her very clearly, we are a community, there are hundreds of us here tonight, hundreds of us replied that we are not in support of this development; looking at the bonusing on this property, she and her son go and explore on the property regularly; apologizing for trespassing but they enjoyed the totem pole up until last summer; indicating that fences, cedar hedges and board-on-board fences do not open this property up to the community; pointing out that a fence on Donnybrook Road that keeps them out, with “No Trespassing” signs, which is standard building protocol in the City of London does not open it up to them; indicating that she cannot even cut through on her bicycle because

she can guarantee you that there will be a "No Trespassing" sign for those of them going through to that bus stop or as a runner in the community, exploring the neighbourhood; asking the Committee to consider them, the neighbours, consider the community; noting that she is going to retire in this community and she is not going to be coming into that building; stating that you have hundreds of people in this auditorium here tonight that are thinking the exact same thing, they are looking at other alternatives because of the animosity that this project is creating; pointing out that she has some spare time on her hands right now and she is prepared to meet with other people in the community, entertain ideas, entertain solutions but make this a joint discussion, the Committee has heard that from the neighbours here tonight; advising that they do not want something that is one-sided and that is the piece that she would like to leave people with tonight, this is a two-way dialogue and we really need to think about that instead of us versus them or them versus us, let's make this a two-way proposition so that everyone can be happy with whatever that solution ends up being at the end of the day; bonusing is not a bonus for us; advising that we can come and talk traffic, kids, safety, cars, greenspace, trees, every driveway on that property cuts down all of the trees, she was just there this afternoon; reiterating her request to make this two-way and let's make this a community discussion versus a two-way, one way dialogue.

- Marg Seboa, 1150 Adelaide Street North – wondering how many trees are on the property now; wondering if anyone has done an inventory; indicating that there have been a number of other developments on Fanshawe Park Road that opportunity has been missed to save as many trees as possible; advising that she would like this development, whatever it is, to incorporate as many of the trees that are there now as possible; stating that she counted on the diagram approximately fourteen trees that would be retained; advising that she does not think that that is enough, there are far more trees on that property to maintain that park like setting, that would be perfect.
- Sarah Arabi, 1562 Hastings Drive – indicating that she attends Jack Chambers Public School, Grade 8; expressing concern about her school as there are a lot of students at the school, approximately eight hundred students, which translates to approximately twenty-five kids per classroom; indicating that if the Committee approves this development, what is going to happen is that classrooms will expand; noting that the school has expanded so many times already; remembering when she was in Grade 5 and there was an expansion then and there was an expansion before she went to Jack Chambers Public School; indicating that the school will have to expand more which will make the playgrounds smaller for kids because the expansions happen on the primary yard, not the intermediate because the intermediate yard has a hill; reiterating that it will leave less space for the younger kids to play; indicating that it will be expensive for the school, as well; indicating that most people who take transit go to schools like Central and most people go to A.B. Lucas so thinking that the transit will actually help will not really do anything.
- Annette Markvoort, 31 Wendy Crescent – thanking a number of people in this room because she has been following this for the last year and she is so incredibly impressed with the presentation that our community has put together; expressing her thanks to all of you, she has come this evening and she has supported with e-mails and talked in the neighbourhood but she has not put the time and effort that people have put into this to represent all of us and especially those who are most effected; reiterating her thanks for the incredible effort that the people have put forward, she is really impressed.
- Doug Osbourne, 34 Donnybrook Road – enquiring if it is a trust issue with a developer that puts through an application and then makes changes, he does not understand the process, he does not understand the bonus, all of a sudden you can have two extra floors; shifting the building five metres to the north, how is that going to affect shadowing; indicating that there is no access onto Donnybrook Road, traffic is only coming in off of Fanshawe Park Road East; wondering how long it is going to be before they put through an application that they want to put access through to Donnybrook Road; indicating that he is not sure if that is allowed, he would imagine that it is going to happen; advising that he does not know how many other issues, we are into ten foot floors now rather than eight foot floors; wondering how many more changes are going to happen.