

**11TH REPORT OF THE**  
**PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

Meeting held on May 7, 2013, commencing at 4:02 PM, in the Council Chambers, Second Floor, London City Hall.

**PRESENT:** Councillor B. Polhill (Chair), Councillors N. Branscombe, D.G. Henderson, P. Hubert and S. White and H. Lysynski (Secretary).

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mayor J.F. Fontana, Councillors D. Brown, J.P. Bryant and H.L. Usher, J.P. Barber, G. Barrett, E. Conway, M. Elmadhoon, J.M. Fleming, T. Grawey, B. Henry, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, B. Krichker, A. MacLean, N. McKee, D. Menard, L. Mottram, N. Musicco, J. Page, J. Ramsay, M. Ribera, A. Riley, C. Saunders, and J. Yanchula.

---

**I. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

1. That it **BE NOTED** that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

**II. CONSENT ITEMS**

2. Property located at 905 Pond Mills Road (H-8156)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, based on the application of the City of London, relating to the property located at 905 Pond Mills Road, the attached, revised, proposed by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 14, 2013, 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 Light Industrial (h-122\*h-123\*LI3) Zone **TO** a Holding Light Industrial (h-123\*LI3) Zone to remove the holding provision that requires a parking study be completed and a development agreement be entered into for the subject property with the City of London; it being noted that urban design will be addressed through the site plan approval process for these lands. (2013-D14B)

3. Property located at 530 Sunningdale Road East - Uplands North Subdivision - Extension to Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval (39T-05510)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports granting a three (3) year extension of the draft plan of subdivision, submitted by Z-Group Limited, relating to the property located at 530 Sunningdale Road East, submitted by Z-Group Limited, prepared by Donald A Riley RPP (Z-Group), certified by Jeremy C. E. Matthews, Ontario Land Surveyor (Drawing No. CAD:POWELL\_Redline, dated March 24, 2008) as red-line amended, which shows 12 single detached dwelling blocks, 1 medium density residential block, 1 possible school block, 1 open space block, 1 neighbourhood park block, 2 walkway blocks, and 2 road reserve blocks, served by the continuation of Canvas Way, 1 new secondary collector road (Superior Drive) and 2 new local streets **SUBJECT TO** the revised conditions contained in Appendix "A" as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013. (2013-D12)

4. Property located at 1602 Sunningdale Road West (39T-11503)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Planning, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Foxwood Developments (London) Inc., relating to the property located at 1602 Sunningdale Road West:

- a) the Ontario Municipal Board decision contained in Appendix "A" as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, relating to the Old Oak Properties appeal of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law **BE RECEIVED**;

- b) in response to the letter of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, dated February 15, 2013, as submitted by Alan Patton, on behalf of Old Oak Properties, relating to the Draft Plan of Subdivision application by Foxwood Developments (London) Inc., concerning the property located at 1602 Sunningdale Road West, the Ontario Municipal Board **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed its recommendation to the Approval Authority and sees no reason to alter its previous recommendation; and,
  - c) the Managing Director, Corporate Services and City Solicitor **BE DIRECTED** to provide legal representation at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in support of the Municipal Council's decision and the position of the Approval Authority. (2013-D12)
5. Properties located at 1934-1984 Waterloo Drive and 1921-1931 Waterloo Drive (H-8153)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Planning, based on the application of Claybar Developments Inc., relating to the properties located at 1934-1984 Waterloo Drive and 1923-1931 Waterloo Drive, the following actions be taken:

- a) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 14, 2013, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of 1934-1984 Waterloo Drive and 1921-1931 Waterloo Drive **FROM** a Holding Residential R1 (h. h-100. R1-4) Zone and a Holding Residential R1 (h. h-100. R1-13) Zone **TO** a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone; a Holding Residential R1 (h. R1-4) Zone and a Residential R1 (R1-13) Zone, to remove the h. and h-100 holding provisions from certain portions of these lands; and,
  - b) the application to change the zoning of the properties located at 1968-1984 Waterloo Drive **FROM** a Holding Residential R1 (h. R1-4) Zone **TO** a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone, to remove the h. holding provision **BE DEFERRED** until such time as the original Heard Drain, that is located within these parcels, is decommissioned. (2013-D14B)
6. Property located on a portion of 2350 Dundas Street (Block 5, 39T-12502) (H-8171)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Planning, based on the application of Bremor Engineering Ltd., relating to a portion of the property located at 2350 Dundas Street, (also known as Block 5 of Draft Approved Plan 39T-12502), the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 14, 2013, 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 Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision (h\*h-11\*RSC1(22)) Zone **TO** a Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision (RSC1(22)) Zone, to remove the "h" and "h-11" holding provision, subject to the registration of the subdivision plan prior to May 14, 2013. (2013-D14B)

7. Building Division Monthly Report for March 2013

Recommendation: That the Building Division Monthly Report for March 2013 **BE RECEIVED**. (2013-D00)

8. 5th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That the 5th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee from its meeting held on April 18, 2013 **BE RECEIVED**.

### III. SCHEDULED ITEMS

9. Properties located at 2800 Roxburgh Road and a portion of 635 Wilton Grove Road (Z-8164)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Miller Thomson, LLP, relating to the property located at 2800 Roxburgh Road and the easterly portion of the property located 635 Wilton Grove Road:

- a) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 14, 2013, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the property located at 2800 Roxburgh Road **FROM** a Light Industrial (LI1) Zone, which permits such uses as bakeries, business service establishments, manufacturing and assembly industries, pharmaceutical and medical products industries, printing, reproduction and data processing industries, research and development establishments, warehouse and wholesale establishments **TO** a Light Industrial (LI2) Zone, to permit any use permitted in the Light Industrial (LI1) Zone as well as such uses as dry cleaning and laundry plants, food, tobacco and beverage processing industries excluding meat packaging, leather and fur processing excluding tanning, repair and rental establishments, service and repair establishments and textile processing industries; and,
- b) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 14, 2013 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the easterly portion of the property located at 635 Wilton Grove Road **FROM** a Light Industrial (LI1) Zone, which permits such uses as bakeries, business service establishments, manufacturing and assembly industries, pharmaceutical and medical products industries, printing, reproduction and data processing industries, research and development establishments, warehouse and wholesale establishments **TO** a Light Industrial (LI2) Zone, to permit any use permitted in the Light Industrial (LI1) Zone as well as such uses as dry cleaning and laundry plants, food, tobacco and beverage processing industries, excluding meat packaging, leather and fur processing excluding tanning, repair and rental establishments, service and repair establishments and textile processing industries;

it being pointed out that there were no oral submissions made at the public participation meeting associated with this matter. (2013-D14A)

10. Property located at 433 Hyde Park Road

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Services and Planning Liaison, the following actions be taken with respect to the Site Plan approval application by 1873739 Ontario Ltd. relating to the property located at 433 Hyde Park Road:

- a) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that, at the public meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee held with respect to this matter, issues were raised with respect to the following:
- i) landscaping;
  - ii) traffic and pedestrian safety;
  - iii) loss of privacy;
  - iv) loss of wildlife habitat;
  - v) insufficient parking; and,
  - vi) the height of the buildings;
- b) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports the granting of approval of the site plan application, as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, for two (2) townhouse buildings containing nine (9) residential units in total, proposed at 433 Hyde Park Road; and,

- c) the financing for the project **BE APPROVED** in accordance with the “Estimated Claims and Revenues Report” provided as Appendix “A” to the associated staff report, dated May 7, 2013;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Barry McCarthy, #21 – 455 Hyde Park Road – indicating that many of the concerns that were outlined in the staff presentation are concerns that he has; indicating that he has three main issues; advising that he is speaking on behalf of those that are not able to speak, that being the wildlife; noting that there is a wide variety of species living in the area, from the smallest animal to deer; advising that it bothers him that there is no consideration given to preserving the animals habitat; indicating that in 1997, a by-law was adopted relating to maintaining the heights of development within residential areas; expressing concern with the development of a two-storey development in a single storey area; noting that this area of Hyde Park Road is single storey buildings; advising that this is really poor aesthetically; advising that the area consists mostly of seniors; noting that a two-storey development is not compatible with seniors who have problems with stairs; indicating that the most important concern to him is the visual access of the proposed two-storey dwellings into his property; noting that there is not much distance between his property and the proposed properties; also noting that they will have access to his bedroom; further noting that when he is sitting on his deck, he will have the same visual access to their bedroom; advising that young trees are generally planted and that, by the time they are old enough to block visual access, he will not be around; indicating that canopy trees do not have leaves for a long time and that visual access will exist for 6 – 8 months; indicating that there is not enough parking on the west side of Hyde Park Road, as there are ball and soccer games held in the park; indicating that there is not enough parking in the park for parents and they park along Hyde Park Road; expressing concern that a child may dart between parked cars and into traffic; indicating that there is no additional parking proposed with this application; noting that he does not advocate that it be proposed; and advising that, if someone in the new development has more than a couple of guests, those cars will have to be parked on Hyde Park Road as well.
- Barbara Richardson, 1128 Mahogany Road - indicating that the development is literally in her backyard; reiterating the comments previously mentioned; indicating that it is a beautiful site with deer and a variety of animals; noting that it is a thoroughly forested area; advising that it is heartbreaking to see more development; indicating that she participated in the zoning debates that happened 10 years ago; advising that, at that time, the residents were assured that only one-floor residences would be built; advising that two-storey buildings are out of character with entire area on Hyde Park Road; expressing concern with the area in general and her privacy and safety; advising that the road into the site will be driving into her windows; noting that a fence has not been proposed; indicating that this will devalue her property, both financially and in her ability to enjoy her property; expressing concern about the swimming pool and the impact of noise potentially coming from the pool; indicating that she previously made a submission; and advising that she would like to reiterate the points made by the previous speaker as it is very risky to put such buildings in this area.
- Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – providing background on the zoning; noting that the site plan her firm has submitted complies with the current zoning regulations; advising that in 2004, site specific zoning was given to the proposed properties and the properties along Mahogany Road, to ensure that they are sympathetic to the existing residential properties to the west along Mahogany Road; advising that there is an increased rear yard setback and an increased landscaped open space; noting that they have met these requirements; advising that there is a maximum height of 7 metres for these properties and they comply with the maximum height restriction; indicating that there is a balance between the existing condominiums on Hyde Park Road and the existing two storey single family residences along Mahogany Road;

and indicating that, along the easterly property line, the applicant will build a 1.8 m board fence as well as installing new landscaping that staff recommended. (2013-D11)

11. Property located at 425 Wharncliffe Road South

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Services and Planning Liaison, the following actions be taken with respect to the site plan approval application of Ontario Addiction Treatment Centres, relating to the property located at 425 Wharncliffe Road South:

- a) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that, at the public meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee held with respect to this matter, issues were raised by the applicant's representatives with respect to their request to maintain the existing fence and the Civic Administration's request to remove the armour stone;
- b) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the north and south fences are to be constructed of wrought iron, the existing interior chain link fence be retained and the clear throat access be applied;
- c) the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports the granting of approval of the attached, revised, site plan and the site plan application to convert the existing used car dealership into a methadone clinic, dispensing methadone to a maximum of 200 clients per day; and,
- d) the financing for the project **BE APPROVED** in accordance with the "Estimated Claims and Revenues Report" contained in Appendix "A" as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Steven Cornwell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd, on behalf of the applicant – expressing concern with the staff recommendation to remove the existing four foot chain link fence across the south property line and replacing it with a six foot chain link fence; noting that a four foot fence is the standard that the City uses; advising that the applicant does not see the necessity of replacing an existing fence that is working fine; advising that a six foot chain link fence would look worse; indicating that the request for a higher fence does not address a specific issue and the applicant would like the Planning and Environment Committee to consider accepting the existing fence as appropriate for this site; advising that there have been a lot of comments about the large number of parking spaces on the site; pointing out that, contrary to what some believe, it is difficult for methadone service providers to find a suitable location consistent with their needs and that meet the City's policies for locating these facilities; indicating that the owners of the subject property had to make many sacrifices; indicating that there is no need to look at how much parking exists on this site and say that's an indication of the intensity of use that is going to go on here; advising that the Official Plan policies call for high quality and long-lasting materials to be used in fences, but what the policies do not specify, is the circumstances in which fencing is required; noting that it has not been the practice of the City to require fences between commercial properties in a corridor like Wharncliffe Road South; advising that, in fact the City's practice has been to encourage back and forth movements between commercial sites; noting that it is unclear what the purposes of the fences on the north and south sides of this property would actually serve because he does not believe that this City would require different treatment for people suffering from addictions than for any other of its citizens; advising that when you look at the requirement, you can say that the fences on the north and south side of this property meet with the provisions that the holding provision refers to in the Zoning By-law, neither of which are necessary from a planning perspective; and advising that there is no reason to suspect that a 6 foot fence would satisfy anything that a four foot fence would not.

- Alan R. Patton, Patton Cormier & Associates, on behalf of the applicant – see attached communication. (2013-D11)
12. Properties located at 3924 and 4128 Colonel Talbot Road (39T-12503/OZ-8052)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager of Development Services and Planning Liaison, the following actions be taken with respect to the appeals by Colonel Talbot Developments Inc., on the neglect by the Municipal Council to make a decision on the Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment applications and the failure of the Approval Authority to make a decision on an application for subdivision approval concerning lands located at 3924 and 4138 Colonel Talbot Road:

- a) the Ontario Municipal Board **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council has reviewed the appeals and determined that a decision to approve the Official Plan amendment, Zoning By-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision applications, at this time, would be premature, and would not be in the public interest for the following reasons:
- i) the subject lands are located within the area affected by the Southwest Area Plan (OPA 541), which is currently under appeal. Land uses, road alignments and conditions of draft approval cannot be finalized for this plan of subdivision until such time as the land use policies and servicing requirements for the Southwest Area Plan are confirmed;
  - ii) conditions of draft approval cannot be formulated for sanitary servicing since there is no sanitary servicing available to service the proposed plan of subdivision. The Development Charge By-law (By-law C.P.-1473-212) and Growth Management Implementation Strategy, that are currently in effect, do not provide for financing to service the required sanitary works within the 20 year planning period;
  - iii) conditions of draft approval cannot be formulated for stormwater management because a storm/drainage and stormwater management (SWM) servicing Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) is required prior to consideration of this application, to confirm stormwater management requirements for this development and external lands. The Development Charge By-law (By-law C.P.-1473-212) and Growth Management Implementation Strategy, that are currently in effect, do not provide for financing to service the required storm/drainage and SWM works within the 20 year planning period;
  - iv) collector road alignments and conditions of draft approval cannot be finalized for the proposed plan of subdivision until such time as the connecting alignments in the Southwest Area Plan have been confirmed. The collector road alignments in the proposed plan of subdivision are inconsistent with the collector road alignments in the Southwest Area Plan and the Traffic Impact Statement submitted with the revised plan of subdivision application, does not satisfy requirements in the Official Plan Traffic Assessment Guidelines;
  - v) the proposed plan of subdivision is not consistent with the Natural Heritage policies in Section 15 of the Official Plan or the Natural Heritage features delineated in the Southwest Area Plan. The Subject Lands Status Report/Scoped EIS, submitted with the revised application, has not been prepared in accordance with the requirements in Section 15.5 of the Official Plan. Also, the proposed plan of subdivision does not include the pathway corridor alignments as identified in the Bicycle Master Plan; and,

- vi) based on the deficiencies identified with the proposed plan of subdivision, and the current status of the Southwest Area Plan, the proposed plan of subdivision is not consistent with the provisions in Section 1.6 and 2.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, and Section 2 of the *Planning Act*;
- b) the City Solicitor and Managing Director of Development & Compliance Services and Chief Building Official **BE DIRECTED** to provide legal and planning representation at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing to support the position of Municipal Council; and,
- c) the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to continue discussions with the applicant relating to the application for draft plan of subdivision approval concerning lands located at 3924 and 4138 Colonel Talbot Road;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Steve Stapleton, Auburn Developments, applicant – see attached presentation.
- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning Urban Design and Landscape Architecture, on behalf of York Developments – see attached presentation. (2013-L01)

### 13. Properties located at 1057, 1059 and 1061 Richmond Street (Z-8106)

Recommendation: That the Planning and Environment Committee was unable to reach a majority decision with respect to the staff recommendation contained in Agenda Item No. 13 relating to the application of Romlex International Inc. regarding the properties located at 1057, 1059 and 1061 Richmond Street and pursuant to Section 18.6 of the Council Procedure By-law, the appended staff recommendation **BE SUBMITTED** to the Municipal Council for its disposition; it being noted that the relevant staff report is attached for reference;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication, dated May 1, 2013, from W. Pol, Pol Associates Inc., with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Richard Zelinka, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – expressing general support for the staff recommendations; indicating that there is no need for the holding provision for the front staircase; advising that the front staircase is clearly on the municipal road allowance and the municipality can remove it any time it needs the right-of-way; reiterating that there is no need for the holding provision on the front staircase; advising that the design of the building is such that the staircase is not necessary for the function of the building as the ground units access the side entrance; advising that the second holding provision deals with the details of site plan; noting that the main portion of the site plan is known, being the church; noting that no other buildings are being proposed to be built on this site; advising that the other site plan details are parking, access and the laneway; asking the Planning and Environment Committee to support the other elements of the staff recommendation as this is an efficient and effective reuse of an important building in the streetscape; advising that the intensification is fully within the parameters of the City's Official Plan, even without the bonusing; advising that the bonusing provides the Municipal Council with extra control to ensure that things are done in a particular way; advising that the intensity that is being sought is an intensity that is permissible under the Low Density Residential designation that applies to this property without bonusing; indicating that this approach is an acceptable one where there is a heritage building; noting that the approach that is being taken ties the use to the building in an appropriate matter; advising that the comment was made to refer the matter back to staff, noting that the Municipal Council

has already referred this matter back to staff for specific matters to be dealt with; advising that the applicant has agreed to a number of improvements to the laneway; indicating that the matter of traffic in and out on Richmond Street was dealt with by the City's Transportation staff and lead to the recommendation before Committee today; advising that people will not be crammed into the basement; noting that there will only be three units in the basement; advising that the demolition of 203 Sherwood Avenue is no longer part of the application; advising that the church is not to be considered as a single family residence; noting that churches are not rezoned in all single family residential areas because they have locational criteria and they are intensive uses; indicating that what is being proposed is a residential use fully in keeping with Low Density Official Plan Policies, as well as in keeping with the Provincial Policy Statement; noting that the Policies promote the preservation of buildings of cultural heritage merit; indicating that this is not a blockbusting precedent; noting that this is a unique situation on Richmond Street indicating that Neighbourhood Character or Neighbourhood Compatibility statements were prepared at the outset of the application; advising that the neighbourhood plan has downsides, as it will be uneconomical and will not retain the church; indicating that preserving the church will provide a neighbourhood benefit; noting that the church is being preserved as it is with minor changes; further noting that it is too expensive to maintain a slate roof; indicating that the stained glass windows are still remaining; indicating that the neighbours and the applicant would like to see a high class upscale development, which cannot be achieved by reducing the number of units; advising that the application is for mostly two bedroom units; indicating that this is not student housing; advising that the costs to renovate the church are such that it is out of the students price range; advising that these units will command a high price as they are in a desirable location; reiterating that this proposal is within the Official Plan policies; indicating that this application fulfills the intent for the North London policies; and requesting that the staff recommendation be passed.

- William Pol, Pol Associates Inc., on behalf of the area residents – see attached presentation
- Paul Adams, 191 Sherwood Avenue – showing a video presentation prepared by M.A. Colihan, 191 Sherwood Avenue.
- Michael Backx, 192 Sherwood Avenue – advising that the residents did not oppose the residential use for this site, they oppose the application because it is too intense; indicating that the issue on this application is intensity and how many units should be permitted; advising that the issues relating to this application, such as parking and traffic, just to name two, are related to intensity; advising that, simply put, there are too many units proposed; indicating that, in the church the applicant proposes 14 units with 34 bedrooms; indicating that a number of the residents are proposing 6 units, with 3 bedrooms each, for a total of 18 bedrooms; advising that the issue is 14 units versus 6 units, in other words 34 bedrooms versus 18 bedrooms; advising that the residents proposal conforms to the Official Plan and represents good land use planning; requesting the Planning and Environment Committee to consider the residents proposal; advising that the application is contrary to everything that the City Council has done in North London; advising that the issue of intensity in this area has been on every Council's agenda for decades; indicating that Council and the City have undertaken numerous reports, attended countless Ontario Municipal Board hearings and spent thousands of dollars in staff time studying issues directly related to the intensity of this area; advising that there is the Richmond Street Corridor Plan, which studied Richmond Street from Grosvenor Street to Park Hill Avenue and the purpose of which was to preserve the Low Density Residential character despite pressures of multi-unit residential and office conversion uses; advising that there was also a North London Residential Study which dealt with addressing pressure relating to residential intensity and resulted in zoning amendments to address intensity, including the imposition of more area ratios and parking regulations; advising that, more recently, there was the Greater Near Campus Neighbourhood Strategy, which was done to address issues related to residential intensification in this area; advising that zoning amendments arising from this study include the three bedroom



limit which the City will be defending to the Ontario Municipal Board in June; indicating that, despite all of these studies and years of problems and countless Ontario Municipal Board hearings in an area whose primary concern has always been intensity, the Planners are recommending a proposal that will exceed the maximum density permitted in the Official Plan; indicating that the neighbourhood is simply at a loss, hence why they looked for outside advice; indicating that they have 14 units and 13 bedrooms, with a maximum density of 75 units per hectare; reiterating that it is too much and is not of the scale which is compatible with the neighbourhood; advising that this is a blockbuster precedent; advising that there is nothing like this on Richmond Street; indicating that on Richmond Street, between Grosvenor Street and Huron Street, there is no other residential properties that, meet, exceed or come even close to the maximum density in the Official Plan of 75 units per hectare or that have 14 residential units; pointing out that there are none with more than four residential units; advising that the application has also included tearing down a heritage home on Richmond Street which will leave a large, gaping hole in the landscape; advising that in the Official Plan, it says that conversions done in this area are to be done through conservation and rehabilitation of existing housing stock; noting that he does not see how that fits with tearing down homes, especially heritage homes; indicating that there was a suggestion to install a brick wall in place of the demolished home; advising that this is not good urban design; indicating that there are no brick walls on Richmond Street between Grosvenor Street and Huron Street; enquiring if this is to be the new standard, brick walls in front of parking lots all along Richmond Street; enquiring if this is the face of Avenue Road in Toronto to which the applicant alluded to in February; indicating that there is nothing in the Planning report to justify how the Planners arrived at the maximum density; indicating that the Planning report justifying 76.6 units per hectare to keep the church, is not a reasonable bonus or density; advising that they are at a loss as to how Planning staff can justify this amount; indicating that if the proposal is to be compatible, the starting point for the density would be the surrounding neighbourhood residential units, which he understands to be 35 units per hectare, not the maximum of 75 units per hectare; indicating that they met with city staff on this matter and the staff did not provide the residents with an answer; advising that they are not aware of any obligation in land use planning to suggest that the City must go to the maximum density; advising that there was no neighbourhood character statement and no compatibility report done by the applicant, as required under the Official Plan, for intensification; indicating that these reports are critical to good planning and that is why they are included in the Official Plan; indicating that these reports would have highlighted the incompatibility of this development on the neighbourhood; advising that the Official Plan is clear, for intensification, a proposal must be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood; advising that there are 12 residential units, in total, on Sherwood Avenue; noting that this proposal is for 14 residential units, which more than doubles the existing intensity; indicating that concerns have been expressed by the neighbours and even the City, about traffic, access and parking; noting that all of these issues stem from intensity or the number of units; if the traffic is too much for ingress and egress on Richmond, then simply put, it is too intense; noting that if it is too much for Richmond Street, then it is too much for Sherwood Avenue, which is a one block, dead-end substandard street; advising that the impacts need to be contained on the site and if they cannot be, then the proposal is simply too intense; reiterating that the application is too intense, that it is contrary to everything that the City has done to protect this area; indicating that neighbourhoods are the fabric of our communities; requesting that neighbourhoods be protected, not destroyed; and asking that the Planning and Environment Committee refuse this application.

- Sid Noel, 196 Sherwood Avenue – indicating that the aspect of the planning proposal that most affects life on Sherwood Avenue is whether or not access to the laneway from the development is permitted, if it does, it will create serious deterioration in the quality of life on the street; noting that it is a narrow street, without a turning circle at the end; indicating that it is totally inappropriate to have traffic directed into Sherwood Avenue in connection with this proposal; requesting the

Planning and Environment Committee turn to page 9 of the staff report, at the top, where it states “the parking access will be directed towards Richmond Street instead of Sherwood Avenue”; commending the planning staff for realizing the importance of this point and expressing support for this part of the staff report; indicating that the staff report opposes placing bollards at the rear of the property, by saying that the blockage would result in added vehicular impact on Sherwood Avenue from vehicles travelling north on Richmond Street and turning left onto Sherwood Avenue and using the street to u-turn, so that they could enter the parking lot with right-in, right-out access onto Richmond Street; advising that this entire passage is premised on the notion that only right-in, right-out access will be permitted with even a raised median to be placed on Richmond Street to prevent left turns; enquiring as to why should this relatively small parking lot for the Robinson Memorial Church proposal be treated differently than other lots on Richmond Street; indicating that the Planning and Environment Committee should be aware that there are numerous parking lots along Richmond Street that have unrestricted access and there is no special problem with any of them, to site a few examples, there is the CIBC parking lot just north of the Oxford Street/Richmond Street intersection; noting that this is a busy parking lot during business hours; the Chabbad House parking lot at 1114 Richmond Street, which is now a student centre, formerly a Greek Orthodox church, has a parking lot far larger than the one proposed for this redevelopment and it has unrestricted in and out access onto Richmond Street; noting that the high rise apartment blocks north of the University Gates, each with unrestricted entry and exit; notwithstanding the reservations of the Transportation staff, urging the Planning and Environment Committee to consider treating this access to the parking lot like all of the other access points along the street; advising that imposing a restriction on Robinson Memorial United Church redevelopment only is an unnecessary complication and completely at odds with the treatment of other parking lots that have exit/entry onto Richmond Street; reiterating that not directing traffic onto Sherwood Avenue is the key part of the planning staff’s report; and noting that, if this can be accomplished, it would be a major step towards preserving the quality of life on Sherwood Avenue.

- Steve Harris, 201 Sherwood Avenue – suggesting that the safety of children be the baseline issue and the top priority; advising that he is requesting, on behalf of the families with children on the street, that common sense rule as someone could be injured or killed on this lane due to the increased traffic that would be part of the new development; advising that the solution is simple, please keep automobile access for this development along Richmond Street; and requesting to please close the west end of the parking lot so that traffic cannot enter or exit at the lane.
- Brian Luckman, 1069 Richmond Street – advising he is the former owner of 203 Sherwood Avenue and sold it to Jane Bigelow many years ago; indicating that he and his wife have raised two children on this street at a time when all the young children lived at the Richmond Street end and not the other end of the street; expressing support for the restriction of the ingress into Sherwood Avenue to allow any attempt at parking as it will make living in their place completely unsustainable; noting that they already have major problems with people turning around in their driveway at all hours of the day and night; and noting that this will only make it much worse.
- Pollyanna McClinton, 194 Sherwood Avenue – expressing concern for the safety of the children on Sherwood Avenue; noting that they play hockey and baseball on the street; advising that the lane is used daily by all the children going to school or to the park; and requesting that the Planning and Environment Committee consider the residents quality of life.
- Jim Waters - advising that he previously resided at 1059 Richmond Street, which has been demolished; reiterating that access to the lane and the street be denied; and advising that he spoke at the previous public participation meeting with respect to this matter. (2013-D14A)

#### IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION

##### 14. Blackfriars/Petersville Neighbourhood Planning Options

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the Blackfriars/Petersville neighbourhood:

- a) the report, dated May 7, 2013, from the Managing Director, Corporate Services and City Solicitor, relating to the planning options for the Blackfriars/Petersville neighbourhood **BE RECEIVED**;
- b) the London Advisory Committee on Heritage **BE REQUESTED** to consider the Blackfriars/Petersville neighbourhood as the next potential Heritage Conservation District on the list of potential Heritage Conservation Districts as maintained by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage;
- c) the London Advisory Committee on Heritage **BE REQUESTED** to recommend the hiring of a Consultant to prepare a study for the Blackfriars/Petersville Neighbourhood, generally bounded by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the north, the Thames River to the east and south and the floodplain boundary to the west, and as shown on Schedule "A" as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, to determine whether areas within the Blackfriars/Petersville area meet the Official Plan criteria and the Ontario Heritage Act criteria with respect to the creation of a heritage conservation district under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- d) the Civic Administration **BE DIRECTED** to undertake a concurrent study to consider a City initiated Zoning By-law Amendment to rezone the subject area from a Residential R2 zone to a Residential R1 Zone;  
  
it being noted that staff will report back regarding possible changes to the staff workplan that may be required to undertake the zoning study identified above;
- e) that **NO ACTION** be taken with respect to an Interim Control By-law for the Blackfriars/Petersville area;
- f) the proposed draft by-law, as appended to the staff report dated May 7, 2013, **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on May 14, 2013, for the purpose of revoking the delegated authority for site plan approval for the property located at 108 Wilson Avenue; and,
- g) a special meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee **BE HELD** on Tuesday, May 7, 2013 at 2:30 PM to receive advice from the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, the Managing Director of Planning and City Planner and the Managing Director of Corporate Services and City Solicitor, with respect to the potential designation of the Blackfriars/Petersville area as a heritage conservation study area by by-law, pursuant to Section 40.1(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee heard verbal presentations from the Manager, Land Use Planning Policy, the Managing Director, Corporate Services and City Solicitor, the Manager, Development Services & Planning Liaison and the attached presentation from K. Bice, 2 Leslie Street, on behalf of the Blackfriars community, with respect to this matter. (2013-R01)

#### V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

##### 15. Hazelden Park

Recommendation: That the Civic Administration **BE REQUESTED** to review the amount of parking in Hazelden Park and look for potential opportunities to expand the existing parking lot; it being noted that cars are parking along Hyde Park Road during ball games and soccer games.

16. Properties located at 1057, 1059 and 1061 Richmond Street

Recommendation: That the Approval Authority **BE ADVISED** that the Municipal Council supports the rights-in, rights-out access onto Richmond Street and the denial of access to the laneway, as it relates to the properties located at 1057, 1059 and 1061 Richmond Street.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.