

Planning and Environment Committee Report

13th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
September 20, 2021

PRESENT: Councillors P. Squire (Chair), S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins

ABSENT: S. Hillier, Mayor E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: ABSENT: Mayor E. Holder
PRESENT: H. Lysynski and J.W. Taylor

REMOTE ATTENDANCE: Councillors M. Cassidy, P. van Meerbergen, S. Turner and M. van Holst; I. Abushehada, J. Adema, G. Barrett, M. Clark, M. Corby, G. Dales, I. de Ceuster, M. Feldberg, M. Greguol, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, P. Masse, C. Maton, H. McNeely, L. McNiven, B. O'Hagan, B. Page, C. Parker, M. Pease, A. Riley, B. Somers, S. Tatavarti, M. Tomazincic, M. Vivian and B. Westlake-Power

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM, with Councillor P. Squire in the Chair, Councillors S. Lehman and S. Lewis present and all other Members participating by remote attendance.

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that Councillor P. Squire disclosed a pecuniary interest in clause 3.3 of this Report, having to do with the property located at 755-785 Wonderland Road South (Westmount Mall), by indicating that his law office is a tenant in the Mall.

2. Consent

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

That Items 2.1 and 2.2, inclusive, BE APPROVED.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

2.1 7th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

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

That it be noted that the 7th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on September 1, 2021, BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed

2.2 3700 Colonel Talbot Road (H-9387)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by W-3 Lambeth Farms Inc., relating to the property located at 3700 Colonel Talbot Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM Holding Residential Special Provision R1 (h*h-100*R1-3(23)), Holding Residential Special Provision R1 (h*h-84*h-100*R1-3(23)), Holding Residential Special Provision R1 (h*h-100*R1-4(36)), Holding Residential Special Provision R2 (h*h-100*R2-1(17)), Holding Residential Special Provision R4 (h*h-100*R4-6(12)), Holding Residential Special Provision R6 (h*h-100*R6-5(62)), Holding Residential Special Provision R8 (h*h-100*R8-4(49)), Holding Residential Special Provision R8 (h*h-100*R8-4(50)), Holding Residential Special Provision R8 (h*h-100*R8-4(51)), Holding Convenience Commercial Special Provision 6 (h*h-100*CC6(11)), Holding Convenience Commercial Special Provision 6 (h*h-100*CC6(12)), Holding Neighbourhood Facility Special Provision 1 (h*h-100*NF1(17)), and Open Space 1 (OS1) Zones TO Residential Special Provision R1 (R1-3(23)), Holding Residential Special Provision R1 (h-84*R1-3(23)), Residential Special Provision R1 (R1-4(36)), Residential Special Provision R2 (R2-1(17)), Residential Special Provision R4 (R4-6(12)), Residential Special Provision R6 (R6-5(62)), Residential Special Provision R8 (R8-4(49)), Residential Special Provision R8 (R8-4(50)), Residential Special Provision R8 (R8-4(51)), Convenience Commercial Special Provision 6 (CC6(11)), Convenience Commercial Special Provision 6 (CC6(12)), Neighbourhood Facility Special Provision 1 (NF1(17)), and Open Space 1 (OS1) Zones to remove the h and h-100 holding provisions.

Motion Passed

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 Demolition Request on Heritage Listed Property - 900 King Street

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the Anne Eadie Park Stage on the heritage listed property at 900 King Street, the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of the Anne Eadie Park Stage on the property; it being noted that the property located at 900 King Street should remain on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources as it is believed to be of cultural heritage value or interest; it being further noted that clause 4.2 of the 9th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage with respect to this matter, was approved.

it being noted that no individuals spoke at the public participation meeting associated with this matter.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

3.2 1154 Sunningdale Road East (Z-9368)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning & Development, with respect to the application by Mary Dann, relating to the property located at 1154 Sunningdale Road East, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the 1989 Official Plan), BY AMENDING the Urban Reserve Special Provision (UR1(1)) Zone to add an additional permitted use;

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

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

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates intensification of a site within the Built-Area Boundary.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

3.3 755-785 Wonderland Road South (Westmount Mall) (Z-9356)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the application by McCOR Management Inc., relating to the property located at 755-785 Wonderland Road South (Westmount Mall) BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration for further consultation with the applicant with respect to the permitted uses in the zone and how the applicant's request may be accommodated and to report back to a future public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee;

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

- the staff presentation;
- a communication dated September 16, 2021, from P. Lombardi, Partner, Siskinds The Law Firm;
- a communication dated September 16, 2021, from S. Allen, Partner, MHBC Planning;
- a communication dated September 16, 2021, from B. Maly, Executive Director, Downtown London and A. McClenaghan, Chair, London Downtown Business Association;

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

Yeas: (3): S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and A. Hopkins

Absent: (3): P. Squire, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (3): S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and A. Hopkins

Absent: (3): P. Squire, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (3): S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and A. Hopkins

Absent: (3): P. Squire, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

3.4 250-272 Springbank Drive (OZ-9310)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development the following actions be taken with respect to the application of 2355440 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 250-272 Springbank Drive:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend the 1989 Official Plan to AMEND a policy to Section 3.5 – Policies for Specific Residential Area West Coves that would modify the height from 14-storeys to 15-storeys on the subject lands located at 250-272 Springbank Drive;

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend The London Plan to create a special policy area in the Urban Corridor Place Type at 250-272 Springbank Drive to add a site specific policy to align with the Specific Residential Policy in the 1989 Official Plan, and by ADDING the subject lands to Map 7 – Specific Policies Areas – of The London Plan;

c) the proposed attached, revised, by-law (Appendix "C") BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in parts a) and b) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a holding Residential R9 Bonus/Office Residential Special Provision (h.R9-7.H42.B-49/OR4(2)) Zone and an Open Space (OS4) Zone TO a holding Residential R9 Bonus (h.R9-7.H42.*B-) Zone and an Open Space (OS4) Zone;

it being noted that the Bonus Zone shall be enabled through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of a high quality residential development, with a maximum height of 15-storeys (51 metres), 260 dwelling units and a maximum density of 306 units per hectare, which substantively implements the Site Plan and Elevations appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

1. Exceptional Building Design

the building design shown in the various illustrations contained in Schedule "1" of the amending by-law is being bonused for features which serve to support the City's objectives of promoting a high standard of design:

- enhanced building and site design features and a setback podium creating a pedestrian area linked to the public sidewalk;
- buildings oriented to Springbank Drive;
- energy efficient built form;
- garden suites adjacent to Springbank Drive with sidewalk access
- architectural design features on the towers that will enhance the skyline and break up the building mass;
- the inclusion of building step backs with a variety of building materials and building articulation to break up the massing of the building; and,
- purpose-designed amenity space on top of the parking structure.

2. Construction of 2 levels of underground parking;

3. Dedication of the Open Space Lands as a public link and to complement the adjacent Environmentally Sensitive Area along with the removal of the existing asphalt parking lot and substituting it with landscaping;

4. Provision of Affordable Housing consisting of:

- a total of 28 units (14 one-bedroom units and 14 two-bedroom units) allocated towards the purpose of affordable housing;
- a period of affordability for all identified affordable units be set at 50 years;
- that rent for the identified affordable units be set at 85% of Average Market Rents (as determined by CMHC) for the London Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) for the calendar year of 2021 as established for one-bedroom and two-bedroom units;
- the identified units will be mixed throughout and not otherwise identifiable within the building;
- rents for the units shall be inclusive of heat and water and shall only be increased once per 12-month period;
- that the identified affordable housing units be aligned with municipal priorities through a required Tenant Placement Agreement with the City of London; and
- all conditions be secured through an agreement registered on title with associated compliance requirements and remedies.

it being noted that the following Site Plan matters have been raised through the application review process to be addressed through the Site Plan Approval process:

- i) the final building design will consider incorporating bird-friendly design features; including, but not limited to, motion actuated lighting and window treatments up to the fourth floor of the proposed building;
- ii) incorporate an urban treatment between the built form and the City sidewalk. This can be achieved by landscaped tiered planters and staircases where changes in grades exist along the street. This should also include forms of public art along this street frontage, recognising the significant bonus zone that has been provided;
- iii) avoid dark tinted vision glass in favour of clear vision glass to animate the street.
- iv) enhanced provision of boundary fencing along boundaries that not only exceed the standards of the Site Plan Control By-law but also has

screening/privacy qualities;

- v) ensure an access from Springbank Drive along the Thames Valley Corridor to the lands to the south be considered; and,
- vi) address the existing sanitary capacity issues. The Brookdale pumping station needs to be upgraded to accommodate the proposed density of this development;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the staff presentation with respect to this matter;

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

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

- the recommended amendments meet the intent of the OMB Order to permit the development of a two tower residential development;
- the recommended amendments to modify the form of the development are considered appropriate and are consistent with the development framework currently approved;
- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Urban Corridor Place Type and Key Directions;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-family, High Density Residential and Open Space designations;
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of an underutilized site at an important location in the Built Area Boundary and Primary Transit Area; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of affordable housing units that will help in addressing the growing need for affordable housing in London. The recommended amendment is in alignment with the Housing Stability Action Plan 2019-2024 and Strategic Area of Focus 2: Create More Housing Stock.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

3.5 Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan (O-9299)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development and Interim Director, Economic Services and Supports, the following actions BE TAKEN with respect to the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan (CIP):

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend the 1989 Official Plan to designate the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan Project Area pursuant to Section 28 of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13* and as provided for under Section 14.2.2 of the 1989 Official Plan;

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to adopt the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan;

c) the proposed by-law amendment appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend the 1989 Official Plan by adding Section 14.2.2 ii) Dundas Street Corridor and Argyle Mall Area to the list of commercial areas eligible for community improvement under Section 14.2.2 ii), and adding the Dundas Street Corridor and Argyle Mall Area to Figure 14-1 to recognize the commercial areas eligible for community improvement;

d) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "D" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to establish eligibility for financial incentive programs in the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Project Area; and,

e) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated September 20, 2021 as Appendix "E" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 5, 2021 to amend the Official Plan, 2016, The London Plan Map 8 – Community Improvement Project Areas by ADDING the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Project Area;

it being noted that funding for existing CIP incentive programs will expire no later than December 31, 2023, pending a Municipal Council review of the program results to be provided prior to the adoption of the 2024- 2027 Multi-Year Budget, therefore Staff is recommending that funding for any potential incentive programs or other financial requirements in the Argyle CIP be considered through the comprehensive review of funding levels for all CIPs prior to the next (2024-2027) Multi-Year Budget;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee received and reviewed the staff presentation with respect to these matters;

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

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

- based on the policy analysis demonstrated in this report, the Argyle Regeneration Study Recommendations and the community engagement over the past two years, community improvement in the Argyle Core Area is desirable because of age, dilapidation, unsuitability of buildings, deficiencies in infrastructure, as well as other environmental, social and community economic development reasons consistent with the *Planning Act*,
- the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan combines the community's vision for improvement with issues identified by staff into one comprehensive plan. Staff recommends that the Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan be adopted including the financial incentive guidelines, all pursuant to Section 28 of the *Planning Act*, Chapter 14 of the 1989 Official Plan and Our Tools Section of The London Plan.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

3.6 1150 Fanshawe Park Road East - Public Site Plan Meeting (SPA21-050)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning & Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Stackhouse Developments (London) Inc., relating to the property located at 1150 Fanshawe Park Road East:

a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public participation meeting with respect to the Site Plan Approval application to facilitate the construction of the proposed residential development relating to the property located at 1150 Fanshawe Park Road East:

- i) lack of privacy with the apartments facing the backyards of the residences on Howlett Circle;
- ii) concern for the wildlife in the forested area of the subject property;
- iii) concern for the possible removal of mature Spruce trees, specifically trees 17 to 21, inclusive;
- iv) concern with the lighting from the proposed apartment building shining on neighbouring properties;
- v) concern with the storage of the garbage;

it being noted that the applicant addressed the concerns relating to the trees, lighting and garbage storage;

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports the Site Plan Application for the subject property;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the staff presentation with respect to these matters;

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

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 9th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

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

That the 9th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from its meeting held on September 8, 2021, BE RECIEVED for information.

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

Absent: (2): S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

None.

6. Confidential

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

That the Planning and Environment Committee convene, In Closed Session, in order to consider the following:

6.1. Personal Matters / Identifiable Individual

A personal matter pertaining to identifiable individuals, including municipal employees, with respect to the 2022 Mayor's New Year's Honour List.

6.2. Personal Matters / Identifiable Individual

A personal matter pertaining to identifiable individuals, including municipal employees, with respect to the 2022 Mayor's New Year's Honour List.

6.3. Litigation/Potential Litigation / Matters Before Administrative Tribunals / Solicitor-Client Privileged Advice

A matter pertaining to advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose from the solicitor and officers and employees of the Corporation; the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation with respect to an appeal at the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal ("LPAT"), and for the purpose of providing instructions and directions to officers and employees of the Corporation.

Motion Passed

The Planning and Environment Committee convenes, In Closed Session, from 6:36 PM to 6:38 PM.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1154 Sunningdale Road East (Z-9368)

- Councillor Squire: There is no staff presentation on this particular matter. Are there any public submissions? Alright. Mr. Gubbels? I did see him some time on the screen I think. Mr. Gubbels are you there?
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: I am Mr. Chairman.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. You have five minutes to make a presentation and you can start any time you are ready.
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: Five minutes is more than enough time. I'll keep it very brief and that is that the applicant supports staff's recommendation for approval and that would be the extent of my presentation.
- Councillor Squire: That is my kind of presentation Mr. Gubbels. Thank you very much.
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: You are most welcome Mr. Chairman.
- Councillor Squire: Do any members of the public wish to speak? Ms. Dann? Ms. Dann are you here?
- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: Mr. Chair I don't have that person in the Zoom room. We do have one unidentified person in the waiting room that I will bring in and we'll see if that's who we're looking for Item 3.2.
- Councillor Squire: Great. Thank you.
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: That would be the applicant.
- Councillor Squire: I am sorry, you were the unidentified person?
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: No. This is Anthony Gubbels. I was the agent; the applicant was attending but I don't believe she had to say anything.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. We'll find out. Is that the person's name that was mentioned?
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: Elise Dann, yes.
- Councillor Squire: Ok. Fair enough. She is not speaking?
- Anthony Gubbels, LDS Consultants: No she is not.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Great. That looks like that is the extent of the public participation. I'll just need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 755-785 Wonderland Road South (Westmount Mall) (Z-9356)

- Councillor Hopkins: With that I would like to go to staff for a presentation. Thank you Mr. Parker. Any technical questions from Committee Members? I hear none so I will go to the applicant if the applicant is there. Please come forward.
- Casey Kulchycki, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Thank you Madam Chair. My name is Casey Kulchycki. I'm a Senior Planner with Zelinka Priamo Ltd. As you alluded to at the top of the item we did file a letter on Friday to Planning Committee Members requesting a deferral for this item tonight. We've reviewed the staff report and we believe that given the content of the staff report there's some material in there that warrants further analysis and further discussion with staff before we make a final determination on the application at hand. I won't go through the contents of my letter, they speak for themselves but just given the presentation tonight and that report, we think that there's some basis for further discussions with staff on how they see this property developing moving forward given its current high vacancy rate and just the sheer size of the property itself providing an opportunity for additional development opportunities. We would like to have those discussions with staff before a final decision is made on the application at hand. I'm available to answer any questions though, if any Committee Members have any. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for that. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to make a comment? I hear none, I see none and I'll ask one more time. Any other comments from the public are welcome.
- Lou Corneli: Hi. This is Lou Corneli, representing the owner. I've heard the comments made by staff and obviously as a person whose life work is positioning and fixing defunct properties I find some of the comparators offered by staff are not exactly accurate for this particular asset but I would look forward to, with, as Casey said, to have further discussions and maybe explain some of the compared properties given the development how they compare to this asset. Our view is only to try and bring this property back to a tax base and also a real community use service for the Southwestern part of London which is becoming more and more a little community. The trends, you know, I watch, my job we have over two hundred properties across Canada, we manage for clients and I can talk about trends, I can talk about office trends and how they are in urban downtowns. Downtowns have to reinvent themselves and I've seen this phenomenon of vacancy and transitioning of offices across the country and I think there is more than just a policy change, some people don't just come to, they want an office to come downtown or any services. I think it's a deeper and more understanding policy that needs to be thought of and I hope that we get the chance to have the discussion further with our Planners, with the City to find a solution because we think that, our game is not to go after downtown, it wasn't our game and we haven't taken that tactic. We feel that this is a different type of use, we're seeing different trends for call centers to move out of urban areas because of parking, transition, transport and staff and this is kind of a option because we know, guys, look at the market, are leaving London because of these situations. Our thought is instead of people not coming to London, if can offer this service, we can keep it in London, keep the jobs in London and support the economy in London.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr Corneli. I'll ask one last time, is there anyone else that would like to make a comment? Please do so. I'd like to go to the Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.

Appendix C Zoning By-law Amendment

Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)
2021

By-law No. Z.-1-21 _____

A by-law to amend By-law No. Z.-1 to
rezone an area of land located at 250-
272 Springbank Drive

WHEREAS 2355440 Ontario Inc. has applied to rezone an area of land located at 250-272 Springbank Drive, as shown on the map attached to this by-law, as set out below;

AND WHEREAS upon approval of Official Plan Amendment Number (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office) this rezoning will conform to the Official Plan;

THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

- 1) Schedule "A" to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by changing the zoning applicable to lands located at 250-272 Springbank Drive, as shown on the attached map comprising part of Key Map No. A107, from a holding Residential R9 Bonus/Office Residential Special Provision (h.R9-7.H42.B-49/OR4(2)) Zone and an Open Space (OS4) Zone, to a holding Residential R9 Bonus (h.R9-7.H42*B-) Zone and an Open Space (OS4) Zone;
- 2) Section Number 4.3 of the General Provisions in By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by adding the following new Bonus Zone:

4.3) B-__ 250-272 Springbank Drive

The Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of a two tower residential development, with a maximum height of 15-storeys and a maximum density of 306 units per hectare, which substantively implements the Site Plan and Elevations attached as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law, in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

1. Exceptional Building Design

The building design shown in the various illustrations contained in Schedule "1" of the amending by-law is being bonused for features which serve to support the City's objectives of promoting a high standard of design.

- Enhanced building and site design features and a setback podium creating a pedestrian area linked to the public sidewalk;
- Buildings oriented to Springbank Drive;
- Energy efficient built form;
- Garden suites adjacent to Springbank Drive with sidewalk access
- Architectural design features on the towers that will enhance the skyline and break up the building mass;
- The inclusion of building step backs with a variety of building materials and building articulation to break up the massing of the building;
- Purpose-designed amenity space on top of the parking structure.

2. Construction of 2 levels of underground parking;
3. Dedication of the Open Space Lands as a public link and to complement the adjacent Environmentally Sensitive Area along with the removal of the existing asphalt parking lot and substituting it with landscaping;
4. Provision of Affordable Housing consisting of:
 - A total of 28 units (14 one-bedroom units and 14 two-bedroom units) allocated towards the purpose of affordable housing;
 - A period of affordability for all identified affordable units be set at 50 years;
 - That rent for the identified affordable units be set at 85% of Average Market Rents (as determined by CMHC) for the London Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) for the calendar year of 2021 as established for one-bedroom and two-bedroom units;
 - The identified units will be mixed throughout and not otherwise identifiable within the building;
 - Rents for the units shall be inclusive of heat and water and shall only be increased once per 12-month period;
 - That the identified affordable housing units be aligned with municipal priorities through a required Tenant Placement Agreement with the City of London; and
 - All conditions be secured through an agreement registered on title with associated compliance requirements and remedies.

The following special regulations apply within the bonus zone upon the execution and registration of the required development agreement(s):

a) Permitted Uses

- i) Apartment buildings

b) Regulations

i)	Height (Maximum)	51.0 metres
ii)	Density (Maximum)	306 units per hectare
iii)	Front Yard Setback (Minimum)	4.0 metres
iv)	East Side Yard Setback (Minimum)	0.0 metres from the OS4 Zone
v)	West Side Yard Setback (Minimum)	24.0 metres
vi)	Rear Yard Setback (Minimum)	30.0 metres
vii)	Lot Coverage (Minimum)	29%

The inclusion in this By-law of imperial measure along with metric measure is for the purpose of convenience only and the metric measure governs in case of any discrepancy between the two measures.

This By-law shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with

Section 34 of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P13*, either upon the date of the passage of this by-law or as otherwise provided by the said section.

PASSED in Open Council on October 5, 2021.

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading – October 5, 2021
Second Reading – October 5, 2021
Third Reading – October 5, 2021

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 250-272 Springbank Drive (OZ-9310)

- Councillor Squire: Could I have a staff presentation please? Thank you. Is the applicant in attendance? Is someone from the applicant online or in attendance?
- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: Mr. Chair, Mr. Knutson is in attendance at this meeting.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. I wanted him to speak now and then we would have technical questions but I'm not going to wait. Any technical questions for staff? Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a quick one, I understand there's underground parking, two levels, but I'm just trying to get a sense of how many parking spaces?
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead staff.
- Ric Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc.: Through you Mr. Chairman I'm now unmuted.
- Councillor Squire: No. We're asking staff a question sir.
- Ric Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc.: Thank you.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair I actually missed that question. Sorry.
- Councillor Squire: Could you repeat it Councillor?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. I understand there's underground parking and I just wanted to confirm how many parking spaces are in this application.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair if you give me about twenty seconds I can find that information.
- Councillor Squire: Twenty seconds.
- R. Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc.: If I can be of assistance Mr. Chair.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair, sorry, through you Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Yes.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: The site plan indicates there are 211.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Anything further Councillor? Any other technical questions? Alright we'll hear from the applicant now. Go ahead sir.
- Ric Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc.: Thank you Mr. Chairman. We're very pleased with the staff report. I would be remiss if I didn't, through you, thank staff for an exercise that we started last Fall with Alanna, Michael Tomazincic, Jerzy and Brian Turcotte with the London Housing Authority.

Together, I believe, we brought a better plan before you than what had been approved by the Board and just a couple of quick notes. There's a best efforts towards the LEEDS; we were advised the LEEDS certification would delay the project in construction by at least two years and maybe three because of that process. There's never been an apartment building done to LEEDS certified standard in London prior. Also, the green roof was a component of the commercial podium which has been eliminated. There is an amenity space where that podium would have been which is between the two towers and behind the two storey residential apartments facing Springbank. I don't have a lot to tell you, there's been a long history on this and staff, as I say, have done yeoman work to bring this before you. On that I would be happy to answer any questions that the Committee has and also that any of the public might have. Thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any technical questions for the applicant from Committee? There being none we will then go to the public.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, Stefanie Pereira.
- Councillor Squire: Ms Pereira?
- Stefanie Pereira: Hello.
- Councillor Squire: You have five minutes whenever you want to start. If you would like to give us your address you can.
- Stefanie Pereira: Okay. I'm at 80 Springbank Drive, down the road. As a resident against this proposal and the zoning amendments and the waiving of the LEEDS certification I worry about the enjoyment of the Coves since I feel like these buildings are going to be seen no matter where you are walking in the Coves. I also worry about the unique wildlife and vegetation in the Coves and how it is going to change the overall community. I have read transcripts the Council had proposed a smaller mid to low-rise building which I feel is much more appropriate for this area. With that said, I do have two kind of specific points. I know that the building is going to obviously increase the density of the people in the area, there's going to be more garbage, more foot traffic, much of which will be in the Coves, in those trails. Has there been anything done to specifically assess the impact on the Coves? I know that the Thames Valley Conservation Authority was, I don't know, at a meeting or they didn't have objections but I don't really know what that means like has anyone actually been consulted that knows about the wildlife in this Environmentally Significant Area and what the impact will be on and then my other question is that yes, it's in a multi-family high density residential zone but there is still certain criteria in that zone. The Ontario Board previously found no impact to the character in the surrounding area and just as a resident, I disagree with that. I don't think it does fit the single-family homes and the small businesses so my second question is how, like what is the rationale of how this possibly matches the scale and character in the adjacent area? I'm done.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Stefanie Pereira: Thanks. Sorry about my dog.
- Councillor Squire: That's okay. We've heard a lot of them since we've been in Covid. They like to show up at meetings. Thank you. Next.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, Skylar Franke.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. You have five minutes.

- Skylar Franke: Lovely. Thank you. Hi everybody. My name is Skylar Franke. I live at 99 Springbank Drive and I'm a resident in the Coves neighbourhood and I just want to say thanks for the opportunity to share our feedback about this proposed development. I wanted to start off by saying I truly appreciate and applaud the inclusion of the twenty-eight affordable housing units in the development as London desperately needs more affordable housing units across the city in all neighbourhoods and I am so pleased to see this included. As well, this development is on a bus route and close to downtown so I think it's a really great location for high density because folks who live there ideally won't need to be as reliant on cars to get around since they have some other options. I also appreciate that the developer will endeavour to build to LEED standards and I do have a question here as I would love to know what level of LEED. I do understand that LEED certification is expensive and has lots of delays but I do know that there's various items that can be included so I just am wondering to what level such as will local sourcing be included or sustainable materials or how energy efficient is the building going to be and how will the waste generated on site be recycled so if there's any way for the developer to be able to outline what LEED standard they are seeking, despite not actually getting certification, I would really love that information. I also wanted to echo the thoughts of Councillor Turner in earlier discussions, that would be really great to see bird friendly features included in the site plan since the development is adjacent to an ESA and it's on a bird flight path, in fact, they actually call it a bird highway. I know that living beside the Coves I see bald eagles and great blue herons fly daily from the Coves to the River and back to do their fishing and I'd really hate to think of those majestic birds colliding with this building since it's so close to the ESA and I do know there's lots of ways that buildings can be improved – motion sensor lights directed at the ground and window treatments with dots or lines up until the fourth storey would all help prevent birds from colliding into these windows. Also, just because it is beside an ESA, I would really love to see native plants prioritized. I'd hate to think of invasive species brought in and creeping in to the Coves and where ever possible in the landscaping I would love to know if the developer is planning to use native species – maples, oaks, tulip trees are all beautiful and provide great habitat for the area. Just to round out my comments, I do want to say while I love high density and infill developments and I do really, really want this density in my backyard, I do think that this is a too large development for the location although I totally understand that it has already been pre-approved for fifty-one meters but I just wanted to put it out there, mid-rise probably would have been slightly better for the location because I am worried the fifteen storey building is going to overshadow the ESA and it's going to be visible from anywhere where you are walking, which I regularly walk through the ESA but I understand that's moving forward and I've made my peace with it but just to round out thanks for including the affordable housing as well as the LEED development options and please consider the bird friendly practices and thank you for your time.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, Brendon Samuels.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Samuels.
- Brendon Samuels: Hello. Thank you for this opportunity to share my feedback on the proposed development. I'm the Coordinator for London's Bird Team, I'm also a frequent visitor to the Coves Environmentally Significant Area. In general I support this project but I echo Skylar Franke's concerns. I would like to see more information included in the site plan about what specifically the developer will be including to achieve LEED standard but my main reason for being here is I would like to take a moment to speak about the bird friendly features that have been discussed for inclusion in the site plan. In 2019 and then again in 2020, this

Committee expressed support for updates to the Site Plan By-law to require the use of bird friendly glass materials in all new site plans; however, for reasons that are unclear to me, the City of London still does not require bird friendly glass materials to be used in building construction for new site plans. As a result new development continues to use large amounts of reflective, untreated window glass that poses an imminent risk of harm to natural heritage. The City's Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee continues to recommend the use of bird friendly materials in new site plans. We are discussing the construction of a large residential building featuring many large windows immediately adjacent to an Environmentally Significant Area, more specifically, the building will be erected between the Coves ESA and the Thames River to the North and will thus contribute to further fragmentation of habitat for birds and other wildlife. As birds move between the ESA and the River they will be put at risk of colliding with untreated window glass that they mistake for open space or extensions of their habitat. The solution for this is straight forward – all window glass on the building should have their exterior surfaces treated with visual markers spaced two inches apart up to the fourth storey. The City should refer to the City of Toronto 2007 Bird Friendly By-law or look to the Canadian Standards Association Bird Friendly Building Design Standards for 2019. In addition, I would recommend the use of occupancy sensors for outdoor lighting fixtures to minimize the light trespassing to the ESA. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Next.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, Tom McClenaghan is in the Committee Room.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Mr. McClenaghan. Sir, whenever you are ready, you have five minutes.
- Tom McClenaghan: Okay. A number of the points that I have already been made and I'm not going to repeat them. One of the things that I think is extremely important that this particular structure, this project is bordered on two sides by the Coves Environmentally Significant Area and I guess the question that I would be asking if I were on this Committee, would be in what way does this project enhance the Coves Environmentally Significant Area. The City and citizens have already invested a considerable amount of money into land acquisition and trail building to date. I have a suspicion that there will be much more invested as well so the City is, I think, has acknowledged that (1) the Coves is a very significant asset for the city and most people who live in that area would agree. I want to make one other point and that those of you who know your history know that every history of London begins on March 2, 1793 with the arrival of the Governor at the Coves where a large peninsula has just been cut off from the River. The missing piece of information that often occurs is the fact that he was joined by Joseph Frank and that night at the campfire, it would have been interesting to know what they talked about and some of you are probably aware that the decision was made that the new capital of Upper Canada would be at the Forks of the Thames. That didn't occur but I think that this is an extremely important place of peace and in the history of this city and at this particular point in time, the Coves is very much intact from what it would have been like in 1793 so to some degree, we're sort of erasing or rubbing away at what our history and not very many cities, I don't think, can identify their beginning in the dramatic way that London could. These things need to be preserved particularly the tree line for the meander or the, I think the word is geomorphological feature. That's all I have to say for the moment. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Next speaker?

- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Tyson Whitehead also in the Committee Room.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Whitehead. Whenever you are ready sir, go ahead.
- Tyson Whitehead: See attached presentation.
- Councillor Squire: You have one minute remaining. You just hit five minutes. I will give you ten more seconds sir if you could try to wrap up. Thank you. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. Next speaker.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, that is everyone that has pre-registered; however I don't know if there is anyone else in the Committee Room.
- Councillor Squire: We'll just check and see if there's anyone in the Committee Room. Nope there isn't. Alright so it appears that wished to speak has spoken. I just need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

Comments on Proposal OZ-9310

Brenda Palmer

Tyson Whitehead

The decisions City Council makes will conform with The London Plan ... Being open and transparent in its decision making will allow all Londoners to see that the values, vision, and priorities of the Plan are being adhered to in every decision City Council makes. [London Plan 52]

The Situation

We are the couple who own and live at 185 Forest Hill Avenue. This process has been a significant learning experience for us. Our initial feedback on this proposal, as can be found in the city's planning report, was essentially that the buildings looked nice. Since learning more about this history, the process, and how this may impact us, our concerns have grown.

Our understanding of what is happening is that Rand Developments no longer wishes to build according to the zoning that was granted to them in Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearings PL140423 and PL160951. Instead, they are seeking new zoning and official plan provisions under which to build. Specifically, they wish to remove the bonusing requirements for a commercial podium, associated green roof, and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. They would also like an increase in lot coverage from 28% to 29% and to add another story (without an increase in height). The city planners recommend accepting this in exchange for an affordable housing provision.

An Alternate Compromise

In the frenzy of compromises, there is one glaring oversight: these concessions do not benefit the local community at all. The most significant local issue with this proposal has always been its size relative to the intensification level of the surrounding area. It fits neither the designation or zoning of the original 1989 Official Plan (as Rand Developments must have been entirely aware when they bought the land) nor the newer London Plan (the Urban Corridor type place has a maximum fully bonused height of 8 stories). [London Plan table 8]



Figure 1: Scale of proposed towers relative to surrounding intensity.

Further, the city has twice let the local community down with regard to the size of this development. First, when Rand Developments brought their initial 42m proposal forward, the city failed to adhere to the timelines

of the Planning Act. This resulted in the original OMB hearing that approved a fully bonused 42m zoning in principle (subject to site details being addressed, such as the orientation and facing of the buildings, the partial exposure of the parking lot, etc.). Second, the current 51m (an increase in height of 29ft) is not an artifact of the OMB. It is the outcome of the city coming to an agreement in private with Rand Developments that included a new height of 51m, which the OMB then rubber stamped. It is inexplicable why this was granted as the OMB had ordered the original site issues to be addressed at 42m, or how it was granted considering the OMB had already bonused two stories to get the 42m figure.

We thus feel strongly that this proposal should be rejected and instead a more equitable trade-off should be sought that seeks to address the local sizing issues in addition to affordable housing. For example, instead of all just affordable housing, Rand Developments could agree to a combination of affordable housing and a return to 42m in exchange for the city removing the requirement for LEED certification, a commercial podium (which is not gone, but just repurposed to residential), and associated green roof. While the building is of exceptional design, much of this, if not all of it, stems from items the OMB had required addressing at 42m and that are also now part of the new Urban Corridor form policy. [London Plan 841]

Official Plan Issues

Our other issue with this stems from the manner in which the London Plan amendment is being proposed. As already mentioned, the designation of the site in the London Plan is Urban Corridor. This is consistent with the vision the city has always expressed for this area, but it does not fit with the current zoning. The mechanism the London Plan adopted to deal with High Density Residential (HDR) exception areas being carried forward from the 1989 official plan was the creation of the HDR Overlay place type. [London Plan 954-959]

This overlay and all the corresponding points in the London Plan are currently under appeal in Phase 1B of the London Plan LPAT case PL170100 (including whether an HDR overlay is the correct way to do this). Other large development corporations in London are present ensuring their interests are being looked after. Handling this Rand Developments HDR area as a site specific West Coves policy in the Urban Corridor place type is not consistent with this approach and likely in violates the London Plan dictum to not create Specific Policy Areas that set general precedents. [London Plan 1730-1731]

Personal Note

In addition to the traffic issues this building will likely create for the neighbourhood (its proposed entrance falls between the two exits of the U-shaped loop we live on), one of our primary concerns with this building is the shadowing. We are the second house in along Forest Hill Avenue and the online shadow calculator indicates that this building will place our house (and even more so our neighbours to the south) under shadow for multiple hours around noon in the months of November, December, and January. It will also rob the residents along the east side of The Coves of most of their evening sunshine during the summer. The situation, at least for us, is significantly improved under the original 42m height.

We are also concerned about the risk to blue herons, egrets, ospreys, and many other bird species that we see living in and around The Coves environmentally significant area. We strongly suspect that the shadow calculations, bird strike risks, etc. were not reconsidered when the city inexplicably upgraded the zoning from 42m to 51m (an increase of 21%) during the OMB process.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Argyle Core Area Community Improvement Plan (O-9299)

- Councillor Squire: Presentation Please. Thank you very much. Well under five minutes. Appreciate it. Any technical questions from the Committee? There being none we will move on to public comments.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, Jae Truesdell.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead sir.
- Jae Truesdell, SmartCentres: Thank you Committee. Thank you. Thank you, Committee Members, for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jae Truesdell and I'm the Director of Corporate Affairs for SmartCentres. We own and operate the Argyle Mall within the proposed Community Improvement Plan area, and we appreciate the opportunities to engage with staff on the CIP and want to acknowledge the forward-thinking that has gone into it. SmartCentres was founded on providing value-oriented retail for communities across Canada, and for the past five years we've begun intensifying our centres by adding residential, both condo and purpose-built rental, seniors housing, and self-storage to begin to build truly mixed-use communities. Presently, SmartCentres has applications or approvals for over seven thousand residential units across Ontario, ranging from townhomes in Cambridge to high rise luxury rentals in mid-town Toronto. We're very pleased to see that the strategies presented in this report will contribute to the community and help us all move forward towards a brighter future. I want to thank staff, again, and thank the Committee Members and, eventually, Council for looking at this in all seriousness and for including us in the conversation. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Next speaker.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you, Mr. Chair, I believe there are people in the Committee Room.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Members of the community in the Committee Room who wish to speak to the Argyle Core Area Plan? Yes? No? No. Alright. Are there any other speakers? No.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, no.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. We'll have to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1150 Fanshawe Park Road East – Public Site Plan Meeting (SPA21-050)

- Councillor Squire: Staff presentation please. Thank you. Any technical questions for staff? There being none is the applicant here?
- Barb Westlake-Power: Mr. Chair we've had some people drop off the Zoom so if you would like see if we have anybody in the Committee Rooms and I will let you know if someone else joins.
- Councillor Squire: Sure. That would be great. In the Committee Room anybody wish to comment on this development? Fanshawe Park Road East. Go ahead. You have five minutes.
- I am a resident at 1243 Howlett Circle and also the house owner so I would just speak for myself. I am strongly against the construction plan of 1150 Fanshawe Park Road East and mainly for two reasons. First, this is an apartment building and has a very high elevation and in the upper level of the apartment building it will have a very nice view of our backyards so essentially we have a great loss of privacy and our houses are under the supervision, under the seeing of all the residents of the apartment building and especially consider that our community of the Howlett Circle we have a lot of small kids and a lot of children are playing by the street and in the backyard every day so this building of the high apartment building is really concerning for us about our own privacy and also the security for our kids. This is my first main point why I am so very against the building of the apartment construction. Like alternative thing like building townhouse or single houses I think many of the residents will find it acceptable but building high apartment in a neighbourhood that has a lot of single houses with very young families, I don't think it is a very good decision and it won't be a good mixture of the community. Secondly, it is now a small forested area and it has a lot of bushes and trees and it is a natural habitat of a lot of small animals so I can spot groundhogs, deer, rabbits in my backyard so I am concerned that if we are erasing this bush area it will be a big disaster for the local animals and it will destroy the local balance for the small animals. I think from an environmental perspective, I am also strongly against the plan of building the apartment building.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much.
- Resident: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Is there anyone else in the Committee Room who wishes to speak? No. Now is there someone on the Zoom call who wishes to speak?
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, we do not have anyone at this time; however, I have been advised that the applicant is trying to get on.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Why don't we wait a few moments for that. Anything yet? Okay. It's just a question of how long are we going to have to wait or do we have any idea? I guess not. Sure.
- Barb Westlake-Power: Mr. Chair, we do have somebody joining by phone. I'm going to apologize in advance for the pronunciation. Yudhbir Parmar.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Are you on the line? Hello? Hello? Yes. Hello?

- Yudhbir Parmar: Yes, I can hear you sir.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. I can hear you too so you have got five minutes so if you'd like to go ahead and start any time you like.
- Yudhbir Parmar: Has anybody else spoken?
- Councillor Squire: Yes. Other people have spoken.
- Yudhbir Parmar: So I have missed the bus.
- Councillor Squire: You missed, you missed just one person I think. Go ahead.
- Yudhbir Parmar: I am a resident of 1253 Howlett Circle and the building which is coming up, it's entrance is going to be just opposite to my backyard and what I see is that all along from south to north there are the Northern Spruce trees. It's only in my area which is about forty feet that there is one berry tree. I'm just wondering because as per the old plan, these trees are to be cut. My worry is, my question is, are they retaining these Northern Spruces. Apparently, they have been numbered as, all the trees have been numbered. I'm more worried about the trees 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, five of them because I went to, what information you have given us, maybe I am a layman but it doesn't provide me what's going to happen there. I was also thinking because it's only my area, about forty feet, which doesn't have any trees there and apparently the entrance of the building is going to be from the side so the lights will directly fall on my house. Sir, is it possible for you, even before all the construction starts, can they work on the plantation part of the, have some Spruce trees planted there?
- Councillor Squire: I will ask that question. Hello?
- Yudhbir Parmar: Yes.
- Councillor Squire: You are worried about trees 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and the lights on your house and you are looking at Spruce trees to be planted.
- Yudhbir Parmar: Yes. Even before they do anything at least because mine is the barren area and the lights will fall very steep on my house.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Is there anything else you wish to say?
- Yudhbir Parmar: One more thing is I am not sure what type their garbage collection site is going to be and unfortunately that's also going to be just opposite of my house just not even ten meters from my backyard. Is there any plan for them to cover it up or, I don't know, is there any solution for that?
- Councillor Squire: I will ask.
- Yudhbir Parmar: Thank you sir.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Anything else?
- Yudhbir Parmar: I think I am good, sir. Thank you for giving me an opportunity.
- Councillor Squire: You are more than welcome. Thanks for coming. Have a good evening.
- Yudhbir Parmar: Good evening sir.

- Councillor Squire: I saw some other people coming on the screen.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, I believe Yanyou Chen.
- Yanyou Chan: Yes. Do I get a chance to talk, to speak?
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Go ahead.
- Yanyou Chan: Should I turn my video on? I'm happy to do that.
- Councillor Squire: If you would like, it's up to you. You can speak, just speak or you can put your video on.
- Yanyou Chen: The host has stopped me from.
- Councillor Squire: There you are.
- Yanyou Chen: I am a resident at 1243 Howlett Circle which is, based on complaints, not by the construction but I do have very strong concern of the privacy. I would be much more comfortable if the new construction is for stand-alone houses or for like townhouses but this is an apartment for six storeys and if you check the neighbourhood, most of the neighbourhood houses are stand-alone houses. It means you are basically building a tower in the neighbourhood and like the six storey apartment is very close to the neighbourhood. I am just wondering because we are facing the backyard of most of the houses so how are you going to protect the privacy from, so people just staring out of their houses so they can see everything in the neighbourhood so my foremost concern would be the privacy given the distance. I would imagine there would be some instructions on how high the building can be if that makes sense. That's.
- Councillor Squire: I understand.
- Yanyou Chen: That's my first concern. I do also have some concerns about the environmental damage this might cause to the place because I would occasionally see all kinds of wild animals in the area that is designated to be an apartment. We are also not sure about is there going to be any environmental damage to the neighbourhood? I would say those would be the, two of my most important concerns and I already explained. I think the construction is just like building new stand-alone houses or townhouses like what the neighbourhood is already so I would be much more comfortable having that but given the neighbourhood there is no six storey apartment in the neighbourhood and I do not see any facility that can facilitate living or the large population of the apartment. I am pretty surprised by the plans for, to build a six storey apartment.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Anything further?
- Yanyou Chen: I think that will be it and thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Through you Mr. Chair, we do have Michelle Doornbosch, the applicant, on the line.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Go ahead.

- Michelle Dornbosch, Brock Development Group: Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of Council. I apologize for my technical issues. Thank you for giving me the time to jump onto this call this afternoon. I have had a chance to review the staff report, we've continued to work with staff on the site plan application. We have no issues with anything, any of the information provided by staff with regards to our application. With regards to fencing we are proposing fencing around the entire perimeter of the property along the north and west property lines. We want to ensure we have consistency with the fencing around the entire perimeter. The westerly trees are to remain, we have proposed those from the outset of this application, even prior to the rezoning application. Our long-term intent has always been to maintain the large established Spruce trees and we have incorporated them into the design and we've looked at them extensively and very closely with the Landscape Architect to ensure that any change to the design will ensure that those trees remain. That's the number one priority for us with regards to this application. Garbage collection, that is internal to the building, we do have a little bit of overflow in the parking lot but the primary garbage collection is inside the building and will be brought out on garbage collection day, that's typical of any multi-unit residential building. If there's any other questions I'd be happy to answer them. I think I might have missed some comments in between trying to log on here but if any of the public has additional comments or the Committee Members have any comments I'd be happy to answer them for you.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. There was one member of the public was asking about particular trees. Numbers 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 and whether they were coming down.
- Michelle Doornbosch, Brock Development Group: Those are the large, through you Mr. Chair, those are the large Spruce trees.
- Councillor Squire: Yep.
- Michelle Doornbosch, Brock Development Group: They are intended to be retained. Yes.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. He was also concerned, I don't know if you heard him, about lights on his house. Would the Spruce trees help with that or is that a different issue?
- Michelle Doornbosch, Brock Development Group: That is part of the Spruce trees but the updated fencing will ensure that the trees together with the fencing will reduce any light issues into the backyards of those existing houses.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. He asked about the garbage collection. I think you addressed that. The outside area that has garbage, what is that, is it covered?
- Michelle Doornbosch, Brock Development Group: Those are earth bins so they are the deep well bins so it eliminates any smell issues and that's typically just for overflow. What we have found is holidays, things like that, Christmas, the garbage room, when there's extra garbage, tends to overflow so we have the outdoor collection for those particular occasions where we just don't have enough room in the building.
- Councillor Squire: Great. Thank you. Are there any other submissions? No. We'll have to close the public participation meeting.