

# Planning and Environment Committee Report

15th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee  
October 18, 2021

PRESENT: A. Hopkins (Acting Chair), S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, Mayor  
E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: PRESENT: H. Lysynski and K. Van Lammeren

REMOTE ATTENDANCE: Councillors M. Cassidy, J. Morgan,  
P. Van Meerbergen and E. Pelozo; I. Abushehada, J. Adema,  
G. Barrett, M. Clark, M. Corby, G. Dales, B. Debbert, K.  
Edwards, M. Feldberg, S. Grady, J. Hall, P. Kokkoros, G.  
Kotsifas, P. Masse, H. McNeely, L. Mottram, B. O'Hagan, B.  
Page, M. Pease, D. Popadic, A. Riley, M. Schulthess, M.  
Tomazincic, B. Westlake-Power, E. Williamson and S. Wise

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM, with Councillor A.  
Hopkins 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 to no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

## 2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That Items 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.7 BE APPROVED.

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

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (4 to 0)**

### 2.1 6th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the 6th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning  
Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on September 23, 2021, BE  
RECEIVED for information.

**Motion Passed**

### 2.2 7th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 7th Report of the  
Trees and Forests Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on  
September 22, 2021:

a) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to make the Urban Forest Strategy and Tree Planting Strategy documents publicly available on the City of London website instead of being available by request, for transparency and to facilitate better public understanding; it being noted that the document as appended to the agenda, with respect to Plant More: Tree Planting Strategy 2017-2021, was received; and,

b) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2, BE RECEIVED for information.

**Motion Passed**

2.3 8th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the 8th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on October 6, 2021, BE RECEIVED for information.

**Motion Passed**

2.4 600 Sunningdale Road West (H-9394)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Corlon Properties Inc., relating to the property located at 600 Sunningdale Road West, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 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-18\*R1-9) Zone TO Residential Special Provision R1 (R1-9) Zone to remove the h and h-18 holding provisions.

**Motion Passed**

2.7 1478 Westdel Bourne - Wagner Subdivision Phase 1 - Special Provisions (39T-20503)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Townline Orchard Property Limited, for the subdivision of land over Con BF Pt Lot 50, situated on the east side of Westdel Bourne, at the midway point south of Oxford Street West and north of Byron Baseline Road, municipally known as 1478 Westdel Bourne:

a) the Special Provisions, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Townline Orchard Property Limited, for the Wagner Subdivision, Phase 1 (39T-20503) appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE APPROVED;

b) the Applicant BE ADVISED that Development Finance has summarized the claims and revenues appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "B";

c) the financing for this project BE APPROVED as set out in the Source of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix “C”; and,

d) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions.

**Motion Passed**

## 2.5 Environmental Management Guidelines Update

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the Environmental Management Guidelines (2021) appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix ‘D’, BE CIRCULATED for public review and comment in advance of a Public Participation Meeting to be held at a future date; it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a staff presentation with respect to these matters.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

## 2.6 Housekeeping Amendment to Secondary Plans (O-9346)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with respect to the housekeeping amendment to Council-approved Secondary Plans, the draft changes appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix “A” BE RECEIVED for information and BE CIRCULATED to stakeholders and the general public for comments; it being noted that an Official Plan Amendment to amend the Secondary Plans will be considered at a future public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

## 3. Scheduled Items

### 3.1 415 Oxford Street West (O-9335)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with respect to the application by Edmar Land Ltd., relating to the property located at 415 Oxford Street West, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 to amend The London Plan by ADDING a new policy to the Specific Policies of the Neighbourhoods Place Type that would permit building heights up to 8 storeys (12 with bonus) within 150 m of Oxford Street West and buildings up to 4 storeys beyond 150 m from Oxford Street West and by ADDING the subject lands to Map 7 – Specific Policy Areas – of The London Plan;

it being noted that The London Plan amendments will come into full force and effect concurrently with Map 7 of The London Plan;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated October 14, 2021, from A.M. Valastro, by email, 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:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, that encourages higher density residential development within transit supportive areas. 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 Key Directions, the Green Space Place Type, the Rapid Transit Corridor, and the Specific Policy Areas criteria of the Our Tools Section; and,
- the recommended amendment conforms with the 1989 Official Plan, including permitting higher density development along transit corridors, encouraging diverse housing types, and the criteria for special area policies.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

### 3.2 1 Commissioners Road East (O-9339/Z-9340)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning & Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of One Commissioners Road Inc., relating to the property located at 1 Commissioners Road East:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 (Appendix "A") BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 to amend the Official Plan for the City of London (1989) to ADD a policy to Section 10.1.3 – "Policies for Specific Areas" to permit two, 8-storey mixed-use buildings with a total of 157 residential units and 826m<sup>2</sup> of commercial space resulting in a maximum density of 233 uph on site to align the 1989 Official Plan policies with the Urban Corridor Place Type policies of The London Plan;

b) the proposed attached, revised, by-law as Appendix "B BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM an Office Special Provision (OF5(2)) Zone TO a Business District Commercial Special Provision Bonus (BDC( )\*B-( )) Zone;

it being noted that the Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of two high quality mixed-use commercial/ residential buildings with a maximum density of 233 units per hectare and a maximum height of 30.5 metres (8-storeys) which substantially 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;

- i) the inclusion of a height element at the corner of Commissioners Road W and Wharnccliffe Road S, along with providing a well-defined built edge at street level along both Commissioners Road W and Wharnccliffe Road South;
- ii) well-defined principal entrances to all of the commercial and residential units along Commissioners Road West;
- iii) a variety of building materials and articulation break up the massing of the buildings; and,
- iv) purpose-designed amenity space on top of the roof of the structured/covered parking entrance approximately 112.0m<sup>2</sup>(1,200 sq. ft.);

2. Underground parking

3. Provision of Affordable Housing

the provision of 7 affordable housing units which will include 4, one-bedroom units and 3, two bedroom units all within the first 8-storey mixed-use building to be constructed. The affordable housing units shall be established by agreement at 80% of average market rent for a period of 50 years. An agreement shall be entered into with The Corporation of The City of London, to secure those units for this 50 year term and the term of the contribution agreement will begin upon the initial occupancy of the last subject bonused affordable unit on the subject site. The Proponent shall be required to enter into a Tenant Placement Agreement with the City of London;

c) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed by-law as the recommended zoning implements the same range of uses for which public notification has been given albeit at a lower intensity;

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

- the revised recommendation and by-law;
- the staff presentation;
- a communication dated October 14, 2021 from C. Linton, Norquay Highland Ridge Properties Ltd.;
- a communication dated October 14, 2021 from . Homes, CEO, Larlyn Property Management Ltd.; and,
- a communication dated October 15, 2021 from C. Johnson, Managing Partner, AutoPoint Group;

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 PPS, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns 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 is consistent with the in-force policies of The London Plan including, but not limited to, the Urban Corridor Place Type policies. It also conforms with the in-force policies but not limited to the Key Directions, Homelessness Prevention and Housing policies, and City Design policies;
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of an underutilized property and encourages an appropriate form of development;
- the proposal for a mixed-use development with 826m<sup>2</sup> of commercial and 157 residential units is consistent with the planned function of the Urban Corridor Place Type;
- the recommended amendment meets the criteria for specific area policies in the 1989 Official Plan;
- 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; and,
- the recommended bonus zone for the subject site will provide public benefits that include affordable housing units, barrier-free and accessible design, transit supportive development, underground parking and a quality design standard to be implemented through a subsequent site plan application.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.3 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West (39T-21501/OZ-9295)

Moved by: E. Holder  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 2515060 & 2539427 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021, to amend the 1989 Official Plan to change the designation on Schedule "A" - Land Use FROM "Low Density Residential" TO "Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential" for Block 37 on the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision;

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Urban Reserve UR1 Zone TO a Holding Residential (h\*h-65\*h-100\*R1-2) Zone, a Holding Residential Special Provision (h\*h-65\*h-100\*R6-5( )/R8-4( )) Zone, Open Space (OS1) and an Open Space (OS5) Zone;

c) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Subdivision of 2515060 & 2539427 Ontario Inc. relating to the property located at 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West:

- i) potential impacts on the quality of residents' well water;
- ii) negative impacts to the water table;
- iii) loss of privacy;
- iv) lack of a buffer such as a fence or a privacy wall;
- v) increase in traffic;
- vi) increase in accidents and only one entrance for residents and emergency services;
- vii) noise impacts;
- viii) lack of public transit;
- ix) no consideration given to a new police and fire station; and,
- x) loss of habitat for wildlife;

d) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports issuing draft approval of the proposed plan of residential subdivision, submitted by 2515060 & 2539427 Ontario Inc., (File No. 39T-21501), prepared by Stantec, Project No. 161413678, dated November 8, 2019, which shows 36 single detached lots (Lots 1-36); one (1) medium density residential block (Block 37); one (1) walkway block (Block 38); one (1) open space block (Block 39); two (2) road widening blocks (Blocks 40 and 41); three (3) reserve blocks (Blocks 42, 43 and 44); and two (2) new local streets (Street A and Street B), SUBJECT TO the conditions contained in the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "C";

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:

- the proposed and recommended amendments are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 which promotes a compact form of development in strategic locations to minimize land consumption and servicing costs, provide for and accommodate an appropriate affordable and market-based range and mix of housing type and densities to meet the projected requirements of current and future residents;
- the proposed and recommended amendments conform to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to Our Strategy, Our City and the Key Directions, as well as conforming to the policies of the Neighbourhoods and Environmental Review Place Type;
- the proposed and recommended amendments conform to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Low-Density Residential designation, the Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation, and the Environmental Review designation;
- the proposed and recommended amendments conform to the policies of the Riverbend Area Plan;
- the proposed and recommended zoning amendments will facilitate an appropriate form of low and medium density residential development that conforms to The London Plan, the 1989 Official Plan, and the Riverbend Area Plan; and,
- the recommended draft plan supports a broad range of low and medium density residential development opportunities within the site including more intensive, mid-rise apartments along the Oxford Street West corridor. The Draft Plan has been designed to support these uses and to achieve a visually pleasing development that is pedestrian friendly, transit supportive and accessible to the surrounding community.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**



3.4 584 Commissioners Road West (Z-9357)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with respect to the application by Foxwood Developments (London) Inc., relating to the property located at 584 Commissioners Road West, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R1 (R1-9) Zone, TO a Residential R5 Special Provision (R5-7(\_)) Zone; it being noted that the following site plan matters were raised during the application review process:

- a) the relocation of the private outdoor amenity space to a centralized and pedestrian friendly location;
- b) the provision of sufficient space between the parking lot and the east property boundary to accommodate enhanced landscaping; and
- c) configuration of the parking area to allow retention of the Black Maple, denoted as Tree 386 of the Arborist Report (Stantec, February 23, 2021);

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 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 Key Directions and the Neighbourhoods Place Type;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Low Density Residential designation; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of a site within the Built-Area Boundary with an appropriate form of infill development.

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

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (4 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

### 3.5 Masonville (Final) Secondary Plan (O-8991)

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the draft Masonville Secondary Plan:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 to amend the Official Plan, 2016, The London Plan TO ADOPT the Masonville Secondary Plan, appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "A", Schedule "1";
- b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 to amend the Official Plan, 2016, The London Plan, TO ADD the Masonville Secondary Plan to Policy 1565, the list of adopted Secondary Plans;
- c) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at a future Municipal Council meeting to amend the Official Plan, 2016, The London Plan at such time as Map 7 is in full force and effect by ADDING the Masonville Secondary Plan to Map 7 – Specific Policy Areas and DELETING specific policy areas 9, and 10;
- d) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "D" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 TO ADOPT the Masonville Secondary Plan, appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "D", Schedule "1" and TO AMEND the Official Plan (1989), as follows:
  - i) AMEND Section 20.2 TO ADD the Masonville Secondary Plan to the list of adopted Secondary Plans;
  - ii) ADD Section 20.10 as the Masonville Secondary Plan;
  - iii) ADD the naming and delineation of the Masonville Secondary Plan, appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "D", Schedule "2" to Schedule "D" – Planning Areas;
- e) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "E" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 TO AMEND The London Plan by DELETING policies 821, 822, 823, 824, and 825;
- f) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated October 18, 2021 as Appendix "F" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 26, 2021 TO AMEND the Official Plan (1989) by DELETING sections 3.5.25 and 3.5.26.
- g) The Masonville Secondary Plan BE REVISED, as per Council direction on September 14, 2021 as follows:

i) any future redevelopment of 109 Fanshawe Park Road East should provide enhanced buffering, screening and landscaping along the eastern boundary of the site at Fawn Court;

it being noted that the direction provided by Municipal Council on September 14, 2021 in g) i) contained an error in the location specified and a revision to the plan will correct the error and provide better clarification that enhanced buffering, screening and landscaping should be provided along the eastern boundary of the site as opposed to the western boundary;

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 October 12, 2021, from R. MacFarlane, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Rock Developments;
- a communication dated October 13, 2021, from R. MacFarlane, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of 1635 Richmond (London) Corp.;
- a communication dated October 14, 2021, from R. MacFarlane, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Copia Developments;
- a communication dated October 14, 2021, from R. MacFarlane, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Choice Properties REIT; and,
- a communication dated October 14, 2021, from L. Kirkness, Principal Planner, Strik Baldinelli Moniz, on behalf of Westdell Development Corporation;

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:

- i) the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which:
- promotes opportunities for transit-supportive development, accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment, taking into account existing building stock or areas;
  - promotes a land use pattern, density and mix of uses that minimize the length and number of vehicle trips and support current and future use of transit and active transportation;
  - promotes healthy, active communities by planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of the public, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity; and,
  - supports long-term economic prosperity by maintaining and where possible enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and mainstreets, encouraging a sense of place by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes; and,
- ii) the recommended amendment is consistent with the policies of the Official Plan (1989) and The London Plan that provide direction to prepare a Secondary Plan where a more detailed and coordinated planning policy framework is required for redevelopment and intensification.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (4 to 0)**

#### **4. Items for Direction**

##### **4.1 250-272 Springbank Drive (Application for Brownfield CIP Incentives)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

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

a) a total expenditure of up to a maximum of \$2,895,020 in municipal brownfield financial incentives BE APPROVED AND ALLOCATED at the Municipal Council meeting on October 26, 2021, under the following two programs in the Community Improvement Plan (CIP) for Brownfield Incentives:

i) provide a rebate equivalent to up to 50% of the Development Charges that are required to be paid by 2355440 Ontario Inc. on the project, as follows:

A) if development charges are paid in one lump sum amount, the Development Charges Rebate will be issued in three equal annual instalments; and,

B) if development charges are paid annually over six years, the Development Charges Rebate will be issued in six equal annual instalments, noting that any interest charged by the City of London for deferred development charge payments is not included in the rebate;

ii) provide tax increment equivalent grants on the municipal component of property taxes for up to three years post development;

b) the applicant BE REQUIRED to enter into an agreement with the City of London outlining the relevant terms and conditions for the incentives that have been approved by Municipal Council under the Brownfield CIP;

it being noted that no grants will be provided until the remediation work is finished, a Record of Site Condition is filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and receipts are obtained showing the actual cost of the eligible remediation work; it being further noted that the agreement between the City of London and 2355440 Ontario Inc. will be transferable and binding on any subsequent property owner(s);

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated September 28, 2021, from R. Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc., with respect to these matters;

it being further pointed out that the request for delegation status for Ric Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc., Bo Chiu and Scott Aziz, EXP, with respect to the properties located at 250-272 Springbank Drive was withdrawn;

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

- the development represents a significant investment on Springbank Drive and near the downtown including the construction of 260 new residential units on a fully serviced and remediated site;
- the development includes the creation of 28 of affordable housing units that will help in addressing the growing need for affordable housing in London. The development is in alignment with the Housing Stability Action Plan 2019-2024 and its Strategic Area of Focus 2: Create More Housing Stock;
- the development will eventually generate significant tax revenues over and above the grants that are provided. At full project build out, the municipal portion of the taxes are roughly estimated at \$865,000 per year; and,
- brownfield incentive applications satisfy the Growing our Economy and the Building a Sustainable City Strategic Areas of Focus in the Strategic Plan for the City of London 2019 – 2023. This includes directing growth and intensification to strategic locations and increasing public and private investment in strategic locations.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

## **5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business**

### **5.1 (ADDED) June, 2021 Building Division Monthly Report**

2021-A23

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the Building Division Monthly Report for June, 2021 BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-A23)

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

5.2 (ADDED) July, 2021 Building Division Monthly Report

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the Building Division Monthly Report for July, 2021 BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-A23)

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

**6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:24 PM.

## Appendix B 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 1  
Commissioners Road East

WHEREAS One Commissioners Road Inc. has applied to rezone an area of land located at 1 Commissioners Road East, 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 1 Commissioners Road East, as shown on the attached map comprising part of Key Map No. A.107, from Office Special Provision (OF5(2)) Zone to a Business District Commercial Special Provision Bonus (BDC( )\*B-( )) Zone;

2) Section 25.4 Special Provisions of the Business District Commercial Zone is amended by adding the following Special Provision

25.4) BDC( ) Additional Permitted Use:

Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential Buildings

3) 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-\_\_ 1 Commissioners Road East

The Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of two, 8-storey mixed-use apartments, with a maximum height of 8-storeys (\_\_\_m) and a maximum density of 233 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.

- i. The inclusion of a height element at the corner of Commissioners Road W and Wharncliffe Road S, along with providing a well-defined built edge at street level along both Commissioners Road W and Wharncliffe Road South;
- ii. Well-defined principal entrances to all of the commercial and

residential units along Commissioners Road W;

- iii. A variety of building materials and articulation break up the massing of the buildings; and
  - v. Purpose-designed amenity space on top of the roof of the structured/covered parking entrance approximately 112.0m<sup>2</sup>(1,200 sq. ft.)
2. Underground parking
  3. Provision of Affordable Housing

The provision of 7 affordable housing units which will include 4, one-bedroom units and 3, two bedroom units all within the first 8-storey mixed-use building to be constructed. The affordable housing units shall be established by agreement at 80% of average market rent for a period of 50 years. An agreement shall be entered into with The Corporation of The City of London, to secure those units for this 50 year term and the term of the contribution agreement will begin upon the initial occupancy of the last subject bonused affordable unit on the subject site. The Proponent shall be required to enter into a Tenant Placement Agreement with the City of London.

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

a) Regulations

- i) Commissioners Road East frontage as the front lot line
- ii) Density (Maximum) 233 units per hectare
- iii) Height (Maximum) 8-storeys (35.0 metres)
- iv) East Interior Side Yard Setback (Minimum) 0.8 metres
- v) Rear Yard Setback 1st Storey and Parking Area Stairs (Minimum) 1.0 metres
- vi) Rear Yard Setback Above 1<sup>st</sup> Storey (Minimum) 4.0 metres
- vii) Residential Parking Rate (Minimum) 1 space per residential unit
- viii) Parking Rate of non-residential 1 space per gross floor area 20m<sup>2</sup>

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 26, 2021.

Ed Holder  
Mayor

Catharine Saunders  
City Clerk

First Reading – October 26, 2021  
Second Reading – October 26, 2021  
Third Reading – October 26, 2021

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 415 Oxford Street West (O-9335)

- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: Madam Chair?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes.
- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: It's Barb Westlake-Power. Sorry to interrupt. Just before we get too far into the public participation meeting, I understand I believe it's the applicant I have in the waiting room who hadn't preregistered, but I believe has been sent by the by staff the link so with your consent I'll let him into the meeting before you get started.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Do you want us to wait until he's in?
- Barb Westlake-Power: Yes. It will just take a moment for him to join. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: If you can just let them know, let us know, when he is in? Thank you. We've opened up the public participation meeting I am going to ask staff for a presentation. Jasmine Hall is the Planner on file. Is Jasmine here to do the presentation, which is up to five minutes. Thank you Ms. Hall. I'd like to go to the applicant now. If you could come forward with your name.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Good afternoon, Madam Chair. It's Matt Campbell from Zelinka Priamo with you. Can you hear me okay?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes I can. Please proceed. You have five minutes.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Wonderful. Thank you very much Madam Chair. We certainly won't need that time today. We're certainly supportive of the staff recommendation for approval. We're satisfied with the, the amendment that's being brought forward by staff. There was a little bit of back and forth to address a couple of specific items policy wise with this but we're at a place where we're, we're certainly confident in moving forward with this. The history on, on this matter is, is a little convoluted but suffice to say that I agree with Miss Hall's interpretation of site that it warrants the site-specific policy change and this is going to assist the city in meeting all of the objectives and goals that we found, that we find in The London Plan and four locations along higher order streets, in particular rapid transit corridors, like we have before us today. We think that this is going to be an excellent addition to the Oxford Street West streetscape, and I do just want to take a moment and call attention to, there was a piece of correspondence that was received and is on the on today's agenda. Just for clarity the areas that is referenced in with that piece of correspondence is actually on the other side of Oxford Street West, that's in reference to the Mud Creek works and for clarity the area that is proposed to be redesignated through this amendment is entirely outside of any flood constraint or flood hazard based on the best available data that we have today and as determined through the Mud Creek Environmental Assessment. If there's any questions on that I'd be happy to answer that and if there's any questions on the application happy to answer those as well and thank you for being able to speak at Committee this afternoon. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr Campbell. Are there any technical questions of staff or the applicant from committee members? I see none so I will go to the public if there is anyone here that would like to speak to this application please come forward to the microphone. I'll ask one more time if there's anyone else here that would like to speak on the public on this application please come forward. I see none so I am looking to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1 Commissioners Road East (O-9339/Z-9340)

- Councillor Hopkins: With that I would like to go to staff first for a brief presentation. Alanna Riley is the Planner. Alanna? Thank you, Ms. Riley. Any technical questions from the Committee? I see none. Oh. I do.
- Mayor Holder: Thank you Chair. To staff, did I read that, through here that there was some concerns wrote about methane gas on this property and if my understanding that that is correct, how is that intended to be dealt with?
- Councillor Hopkins: Miss Riley?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Sorry. The Solid Waste Division did reply to that and they just made the applicant aware of that there is methane gas and then through the site plan control, site plan approval process or the building, the building approval process, they will have to deal with it at that time.
- Mayor Holder: That doesn't cause a technical, from your perspective, your recommendation, that does not cause staff any concerns?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair not during this process as it was brought to Wastewater Division and they didn't pose forward any major concerns at the time, they just wanted to make the applicant aware.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Mayor?
- Mayor Holder: Yes. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Any concerns from a traffic study and I'm asking this form a technical review of this the site. I think I know the state fairly well in so far as it was, it's currently an insurance building amongst other property tenants on that site but I know some of the questions that, that were raised talk in terms of traffic as a result of this what's the impact on traffic as a result of this, of your recommendation of this proceeding?
- Councillor Hopkins: Miss Riley would you be able to answer that question on traffic?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair, Transportation Division didn't, didn't post any objections on this; however, I will defer to, I believe there is a member of Transportation here because this was a concern brought forward and if not another member of staff, staff is willing to answer it.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. We'll just wait a moment to see if we can get someone to respond.
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Hi Madam Chair. It's Garfield Dales from the Transportation Division. Happy to respond so yes certainly as this the proposal moves forward in terms of access design, that will be something we will look at, we will be looking at as part of the site plan that process as this is a busy area and we will be consistent with our access management guidelines looking at the proper treatment in terms of the entrance locations at design.
- Mayor Holder: Through you Chair to Mr. Dales, then if I can ask because I'm trying to understand this, I guess, based on the current situation which has obviously much less density in its current form when we gross that up significantly with the

recommendation that's here, which, by the way, the building looks great and I think in an underutilized corner of prime space that it's significant but I am exceptionally concerned about the issues around traffic cut throughs to businesses nearby and that's been cited, I think, in their concerns and may come up again and also cut through concerns on Highland Ave and so I'm just trying to get, site plan can fix a lot of sins it would appear but this is a very busy corner as it is and I'm mindful how we plan to accommodate as best we can the commercial and residential tenants in the area, residents in the area, as well as trying to balance out the increased traffic and you'll note that there was one parking space per tenant so they certainly anticipate cars being a key part of this. I'm just wondering how we've allowed for that knowing the corners' as busy as it is.

- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Dales, I think the question is around other forms of transit, transportation to accommodate the intensity of this application. I don't know if you can answer that or if I can go back to.
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Yes. Yes, through you Madam Chair, I can tackle maybe one part of that and then maybe my colleagues can in Planning around transit supportive type development but yes, certainly, as the Mayor has noted this is an important intersection, a busy intersection, so we will be looking at, consistent with our, our access management guidelines, the manner in which we do have entrance locations are provided and that will include looking at the, the traffic generated by the site, the existing entrance location at Highland Avenue which currently is a full access at this time. I also believe as part of the proposal there is discussions or requirements related to the adjacent property and an access arrangement as well so that those will be details that we will be looking at as part of the of the site plan. In terms of overall, in terms of traffic generated by the site or trips generated by the site we would be looking at a certain percentage of that activity to be accommodated through transit and through other means, active transportation, to help to reduce some of the traffic volume in that area.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Dales. Mr. Mayor?
- Mayor Holder: Yeah. I think those are my questions for now. I appreciate the responses from staff just help me deal with the issue. I didn't hear how our transit planning was, was going to accommodate in part but I don't think this is a transit play quite frankly; notwithstanding the major intersection that it is. I think this is clearly an automobile play but primarily based on the parking spaces per resident but having said it I'll reserve to ask more questions but I appreciate staffs response so far.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you and just as a reminder to everyone this is just technical questions from staff. Councillor Hillier I see your hands up.
- Councillor Hillier: Thank you very much. Yes, to continue upon the Mayor's questions, it's, he actually asked most of mine. Mine is directly related to the southeast corner of the site. I'm quite familiar with the back, the easement and behind these buildings were accessing car dealerships and they are, they use Highland quite a lot and I'm very concerned about the southeast corner and the in and out of going into this new development and how much traffic is actually coming, if you do an overlay and showing where the easement is, you're accessing three different businesses and apartment building and I'm very concerned about the southeast corner. Is anything being done to address that corner because I myself know that's a blind corner coming around.
- Councillor Hopkins: This is the southeast corner of Commissioners and Wharncliffe?

- Councillor Hillier: No. The southeast corner of the development.
- Councillor Hopkins: Of the development.
- Councillor Hillier: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Councillor Hillier. If I could go to Ms. Riley.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair I believe that, it is not a, I believe this is a question for Transportation, if Transportation could respond to that. I just want to make note that during this planning process Transportation did not have any major concerns with moving forward with the Zoning By-law Amendment and they pushed that during the site plan approval process the further issues would be dealt with but I can relay to Mr. Garfield if he has any more information for you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I would like to. Go ahead.
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Sorry Madam Chair and through you, just to respond to the question, so certainly we will look at the sight lines and the operation associated with the, that entrance location that that would be part of the site plan process that we would be looking further at sort of that the design details related to that, that location.
- Councillor Hillier: Well thank you. The reason being is because I look at slide three of the staff presentation, it's showing in red coming off Commissioners Road, yes you can turn a right off Commissioners but if you're leaving the property you cannot turn left because of the median so you have to use the Highland entrance which means, I predict a majority of the residents of this complex will be using that entrance. That's my only concern.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Councillor. We're right now on technical questions. Any further technical questions from anyone else of staff? Before we move on, maybe I can stay with staff and as you can see Committee Members we have a number of revised recommendations for by-law. If I can go to Ms. Riley she can outline the amendments that are before us as well while we are on technical questions. Ms. Riley?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Sorry. Through you Madam Chair I'm just bringing up those amendments. Sorry, I'm just bringing up those amendments. I apologize. The one amendment was to add the tenants agreements with regards to the affordable housing and that is in the recommendation in the by-law and then I'm just bring up the other revised one so I can relay the message appropriately and the other was, sorry it's just coming up on the screen, with regards to the rear yard setback. Through the discussions with our site plan approval staff the rear portion of the building on building one is not completely below grade therefore it's treated as a first storey so we had to amend the by-law to give that a one meter setback; however, anything above this four storey which is the full storeys of the buildings will be providing a four meter setback and those are the amendments, they are in the recommendation and the by-law.
- Councillor Hopkins: That's the two and only amendments that we're changing.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Yes.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you very much for that. Moving on, I'd like to go to the applicant. If you can come forward with your name please.

- Ben McCauley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Good afternoon Madam Chair. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. I can.
- Ben McCauley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Excellent. My name is Ben McCauley, Planner from Zelinka Priamo Ltd. and representing the applicants. I'd first like to thank the abutting property owners Norquay Properties, Larlyn Property Management and AutoPoint Group for their written submissions and to acknowledge that we have reviewed and understand their comments around access arrangements particularly as it relates to the private laneway on the east side of the site and we are committed to working with these landowners to ensure that any updated joint use and maintenance agreements or any other necessary agreements are put in place through the subsequent site plan approval process. Otherwise I have reviewed the staff report and recommendations and we are agreeable. Thank you for your time and I'm here to answer any other questions if necessary.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. McCauley. If there are any technical questions from Committee Members? Yes Mr. Mayor.
- Mayor Holder: Yes. Thanks very much. I was glad to hear the comments about the interaction with the area commercial property holders in that area as well and it's important that that undertaking will take place. It's like site plan but I think this goes a little deeper and I think in my experience maybe just being old but being a better neighbor for all the reasons that it makes sense by doing things right the first time goes a long way so I thought that I'd applaud the applicant for doing this and that gives comfort to the area commercial folks and I would say frankly to the residential tenants in the area that it extends to them.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'll now move on to the public. If there's anyone from the public that would like to speak to this application, please come forward. I'm going to ask one more time if there is anyone here from the public that would like to speak to this application please come forward. Just one moment.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Sean MacDougall, please.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. MacDougall?
- Sean MacDougall: I have no questions at this time.
- Councillor Hopkins: Okay. There's no one from the public then? Thank you and I'll ask one more time, if there's anyone else from the public that would like to speak? I see none. I will go to the Committee Members for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West (39T-21501/OZ-9295)

- Councillor A. Hopkins: Moving on to our next public participation meeting which is on 14 Gideon Drive and 2012 Oxford Street West. This is for an application for thirty-six single detached residential lots the medium sized building at medium density open space block and two new streets as well as a woodland compensation and I would like to go to the committee to open up the public participation meeting. Councillor Lehman. Seconded by, how about the Mayor. And with that we will open up the public participation meeting.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: And I would like to go to staff and is it Mr. Page who will be doing a presentation.
- Matt Feldberg: Hello Madam Chair. It's Matt Feldberg speaking, Mr. Meksula couldn't attend today but we have a staff member who started with us in June who has agreed to do the presentation on his behalf so Allison Curtis will be doing the presentation for you folks and the public and then either myself or Mr. Page can help answer any questions after.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Feldberg and welcome Alison Curtis. If you can start the presentation, you have up to five minutes.
- Allison Curtis: Staff Presentation
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Thank you Ms. Curtis. Any technical questions to staff? I see none. I do have one technical question if the committee will allow me to ask a question from my chair. Ms. Curtis, I noticed there's a number of holding provisions I know you went through them, but could you be just a little bit more I guess specific to the holding provision H-65 what it stands for.
- Allison Curtis: Yes, Madam Chair. Through you just give me a second, I'll open up that section of the zoning by-law or if Bruce Page would be able to answer that question as well.
- Matt Feldberg: Madam Chair if you could just give us a moment, we'll come back to that one if that's okay.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Yes, that would be fine. I will go to the applicant if the applicant is here or the applicant's consultant. If you can come forward to the microphone, please state your name and address and you have 5 minutes. Welcome.
- Amelia Sloan, Stantec Consulting: Thank you for having me. My name is Amelia Sloan with Stantec Consulting here on behalf of the client or the applicant tonight. I just wanted to take a minute to thank staff for working through this application process with us. We're supportive of the recommendations from staff in particular the holding zones and the draft conditions of the subdivision. I think these things will work to alleviate some of the concerns of the public and I'm here to answer any questions that the Committee or the public might have.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Thank you. Are there any technical questions of the applicant? I see none, thank you. I'd like to go now to the public if there's anyone here from the public that would like to make comments on the recommendation, please come forward stating your name and address you have up to five minutes.

- Andy Scheibner: Thank you for your time and consideration. My name is Andy and I live at 44 Gideon Drive. My property line is approximately 65 feet away from the planned development. I just want to take the time to let you know some of my concerns. I've lived here with my family for approximately twenty-four years. My neighbours we've all enjoyed a long, quiet country lifestyle. We are all on private wells we share a common water table. I have several concerns about the development. I'm not against the development but I believe my concerns need to be addressed. We're concerned about our well water. The quality of the water, potential for run off, for pesticides from lawn treatments and the runoff. We're concerned about the water table itself going down. Another concern of ours just the intrusion of privacy with the proposal medium density Allison two apartment buildings looking down on us no national buffer at the length of the property, no proposal for any kind of a privacy fence or privacy wall that might help you know soften the blow to us. We enjoy this quiet country lifestyle. We're also concerned about the traffic, the amount of cars potentially you know over a hundred cars cruising in and out in front of our driveways. These are all concerns of ours and I just wanted to voice these concerns with you. Thank you.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Thank you Andy. We'll address, I'll have staff address your questions after the public participation meeting has ended so if you could just stay tuned. Yes, please come forward with your name and address and you have up to five minutes. Welcome.
- Jennifer Knechtel: Awesome thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair, and chairpersons, councillors, members of the public, the mayor. So, I'm speaking on behalf of people that live on Gideon Drive. My name is Jennifer and I'm concerned about the fact that it's been proposed as a medium density. There's a lot of building going on Westdel Bourne off of Westdel Bourne you have high density building there you have lots of building in West Five you have apartment buildings, you have houses, you have townhouses, not a lot of trees left, and all of the wildlife are scattering, and I thought this was the forest city so I am really concerned. In the plan, the London Plan that you speak of there's things such as part six as encourage infill residential development in residential areas where existing land uses are not adversely affected. If you put two apartment buildings, townhouses and thirty-six residential houses in that small amount of property and the entrance and exit is on Gideon Drive there is going to be a lot of issues. Traffic is going to be huge. Right now, if anybody was aware and lives in that area, one person hit a pole on Oxford Street just past Gideon about a week and a half ago and it shut down the whole area. If you have all those people now living just off of Gideon where are they going to go. If there's an emergency how many car accidents are going to happen there and constantly there's cars being flipped over and it's not even built up to the standard which is being proposed right now. Even if you eventually widen the roads expropriate people's property on Gideon and make it roundabout, you're still going to have a lot of issues. You're going to have issues of traffic and noise, and people needing emergency help and there's one entrance and one exit currently off of Gideon to that residential area, the medium density residential area that's being proposed. In the London Plan it talks about how you have to look at the whole area and try to be measured in and allowing development and allowing this development to go beside individual residences that have been living off of wells I think would be a big mistake of the City's. I really do. I think there's a lot of building that's occurring there and there's not much thought as to where the animals, about the water table, the high traffic attributed that you're going to be having there. You know what are you going to do with emergency situations, where the new police station, where's the new fire station you know all those things need to be considered. There's no public transit that goes to that area so you're going to be dealing with tons and tons of cars so for two apartment buildings that are now four levels high, townhouses and 36 residential houses you're going to have how many cars over two hundred and something cars



potentially more with service vehicles and friends that are attending those places it's going to be coming out to Gideon. When I talked to the planner he said well we'll have to put in something else for emergency situations, is this an after thought? Do we value green space here, do we value older trees, do we value animals because when the builder took over the place the people that lived in that single family residence that we now want to change into a medium density area, two apartment buildings, townhouses and thirty-six single residential lots they started cutting the trees down, did they apply.

- Councillor A. Hopkins: Sorry to interrupt I just want to let you know you have about forty-five seconds left.
- Jennifer Knechtel: Sure, that's quick. And I guess you have to ask yourself this question, this is the kind of developer you're going to be dealing with somebody who doesn't apply to the city to take down trees, they just do it because they can. It really should be something that is considered a buffer for noise in between existing single family home residences that have been there for years and years and years on wells. There should be a huge wall that's being put in place to buffer that sound and the noise. There should be more measures made for safety and emergency vehicles. That is too many people in that area that's being proposed, and I don't believe that it's a great entrance and exit off of Gideon Drive even if you make it a circle it's still not a good place. If you live in the area on those properties, you'll see what I'm talking about.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to make comments? I'll ask one more time if there's anyone else, please come forward if you'd like to make a comment to this application. And just before I close the public participation meeting, I would like to go back to Mr. Feldberg or Ms. Curtis for an answer to the technical question regarding the holding provision H-65.
- Matt Feldberg: Certainly, Madam Chair. So, the H-65 is to ensure that there are no land use conflicts between the adjacent arterial roads and the proposed residential uses as it pertains to noise, vibration and things of that matter which we would deal with through the engineering review and subsequent site plans. We would require noise studies to address that.
- Councillor A. Hopkins: Thank you and with that I'd like to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 584 Commissioners Road West (Z-9357)

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I would like to go to staff. Ms. Debbert who will be doing a brief presentation. Thank you. Any technical questions from the Committee? I see Councillor Van Meerbergen is here joining us. Welcome. I'll go to the Mayor first and then I'll go to you Councillor.
- Mayor Holder: Thanks very much and thank you to our staff for the explanation, that was very succinct and clear. I noted that one of the deviations you noted was building the property closer to the road and, as we know, Commissioners being a major thoroughfare, I'm concerned about the potential impact if widening becomes an issue there and I'm wondering what the potential impacts would be particularly if we bring the building closer to the street limiting, I think, the potential to widen there as necessary in the future. I wonder if I could get some comment on that please.
- Barb Debbert, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair it's Barb again. I can address that question. The road widening has been taken into consideration in the draft site plan concept that we have so the reduction in the yard setbacks is to the ultimate road widening not to the current front property line.
- Mayor Holder: Through you Chair, when you say ultimate road widening, this is to staff, I'm not sure exactly what that means, that's probably a planning term but I'm just trying to wonder, it may have been taken into consideration but in the long-term if we were to widen Commissioners in that particular area that extends east and west what the potential implications would be by moving that building closer to the road.
- Councillor Hopkins: We're talking about future road widening then?
- Mayor Holder: Yes.
- Barb Debbert, Senior Planner: Yes. Again, through you Madam Chair, the development has been designed such as it would not interfere with any future road widening. The road widening is shown on the draft plan. This is very typical for most redevelopments in existing sites where road widenings are required is when we receive site plans they already show the road widening that will be required by the City at the site plan stage. There really are no impacts that reduced setback from the road allowance is from the future road allowance not the current road allowance.
- Mayor Holder: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Hopkins: Councillor Van Meerbergen, welcome.
- Councillor Van Meerbergen: Thank you Madam Chair. Actually, the Mayor touched on some of what I wanted to ask on this. This is in Ward 10. Obviously at some point in the future this is going to widen. My understanding is currently it's on the books for 2037. There could be, in reality, a very good chance that it needs to be widened far ahead of that. I'm wondering if we could get some comment as to when the thinking is for widening of Commissioners in that area.
- Councillor Hopkins: The widening is slated for 2037? Is Mr. Dales still with us? Maybe he could help.

- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Yes Madam Chair. It's Garfield Dales from the Transportation Division.
- Councillor Hopkins: I'm glad you're still here.
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Thank you. A growth project has been identified for this section of Commissioners essentially from Wonderland to Westmount Drive/Cranbrook. That project is identified for 2033 currently and then further to the west as was pointed out the alignment through the Snake Hill area is actually shown through 2037 I believe at this time.
- Councillor Hopkins: From what I understand, sorry Councillor Van Meerbergen, the road widening that is slated for 2033 that's from Cranbrook to Wonderland?
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Yes Madam Chair that's correct.
- Councillor Hopkins: Okay. Then 2037 is Snake Hill.
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Right. Further to the west.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you.
- Councillor Van Meerbergen: My follow-up to that is there allowance right now or is it part of the project currently to have a dedicated left hand turning lane on Commissioners going into the project when you are heading west onto Commissioners?
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Through you Madam Chair, Garfield Dales again. As part of our assessment of the traffic volumes associated with this development, recognizing that it is a relatively small number of trips that would be generated, there are no plans for a turning lane directly into this development.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you.
- Councillor Van Meerbergen: Just to be clear, the thinking is there would just be a normal lane of traffic, they would have to stop, wait to make the left-hand turn and thereby plugging up the traffic behind them. It's already a fairly busy stretch there. Is there any thinking that maybe a left-hand turning lane may be a good idea?
- Garfield Dales, Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design: Through the Chair, as I had mentioned, just with the volumes that are associated with this development, they wouldn't warrant the need for a dedicated turn lane at this point.
- Councillor Van Meerbergen: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I see no further technical questions of staff. I'll move on to the applicant if the applicant is here. If you could state your name and address.
- Brian Blackwell, Stantec Consulting: Good afternoon Madam Chair. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Mhm.

- Brian Blackwell, Stantec Consulting: Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Committee, my name is Brian Blackwell and I work for Stantec Consulting. I am the Agent for Foxwood Developments on this file. Madam Chair, I would like to start by thanking staff for working with us on this application and we support staff's recommendation for our ZBA application. Madam Chair, the revised site plan is on page 547 on the Planning Report. This plan reflects the revisions from Urban Design, Transportation, Site Plan Department, City Arborists and Engineering Departments. We have provided a 7.37 metre road widening fronting Commissioners Road as requested by Transportation. That is reflected on the plan. We have located the three and a half storey stacks fronting onto Commissioners for urban design comments. We've also allowed for sidewalk connections to Commissioners Road as per urban design comments. The three and a half stacks are twelve meters in height. This is the same height allowed in underlying Zoned R1-9. This Block A has twelve units. The two storey stacks are located on the southwest location of the site. These units are nine meters in height. This Block B has fourteen units. We have one access point fronting Commissioners which is supported by Transportation. I must mention that Commissioners Road is classified as a Civic Boulevard/Arterial Road, this is one of the higher classifications of municipal roads in the city. Zoning requires 1.5 spaces per unit for parking. We are not requesting a reduction in the parking for the subject site. We have a total of forty-three surface parking spaces for this site. The amenity spaces located between the two buildings which is interconnected by sidewalks to the space. Madam Chair, we have completed a tree report and have had discussions with the City's Arborist. All trees on common property limits will be retained. All trees on City properties will be retained. A black maple was, is retained after discussions with City staff on the east property limit. Landscaping and screening. Foxwood has provided three layers of screening along the property limits. The first being shrubs screening along the property, the second is new tree planting along the property limits and the third is a 1.8 meter board-on-board wooden fence along the boundary. We will also have planting at the front of the townhouse units. I should note that we have a 43% landscaping coverage of the subject site. Zoning requires 30%. We have also provided a greater landscaping setback along the east property limit at staff's request. Madam Chair, in conclusion, we did have a virtual public meeting on October 6. 158 letters were delivered on September 23 from the City of London mailing list. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you very much. I would like to go to Committee Members for any technical questions of the applicant. I see none. I'd like to now go to the public if there's anyone here that would like to speak to this recommendation, please come forward with your name and address and you have up to five minutes. I'll ask one more time if there's anyone here from the public that would like to make a comment please come forward. I see none so with that I'd like to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Masonville (Final) Secondary Plan (O-8991)

- Councillor Hopkins: We'll just give another moment to make sure we have everyone in the room that would like to hear the presentation. I'd like to remind the Committee Members that we did receive a number of Added's as well. With that we'll start the public participation meeting, and I would ask Sonia Wise, Planner on the file to do a brief presentation. I see one of the Ward Councillors, Councillor Cassidy. Welcome. Thank you, Ms. Wise and before I go to any questions, I wanted to welcome Deputy Mayor Morgan as well to our Planning. With that I would like to ask the Committee if there's any technical questions of staff? Seeing none and I would like to go to the public now to make comments on the adoption of the Masonville Secondary Plan. Yes.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: On Zoom we have Mike Koncan.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Koncan?
- Mike Koncan: Yes.
- Councillor Hopkins: Welcome. Can you see us? Do you have your mute button off? One of the few things I've learned in this past few, year and a half.
- Mike Koncan: Okay.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes I just heard you there.
- Mike Koncan: Okay. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. I just wanted to ask you to state your name and if you can give us your address if you wish and you have up to five minutes.
- Mike Koncan: Sure. My name is Mike Koncan. I live at 2 Fawn Court. Hello and thank you for the opportunity of addressing you. I've been a resident of Fawn Court for the last twenty-nine years. Firstly, I would like to thank Councillor Maureen Cassidy and the Planning staff for listening to the concerns addressed by the residents of Fawn Court over the last number of months and the inclusion of the policy statements relating to our street in the current version of the Plan. Again, a big thank you to all involved. During the March 29 meeting of this same Committee, I addressed this Committee regarding the Draft Plan. Just to recap, the Plan considers the addition of 6,023 residential units adding over 10,000 people to a 0.9 square kilometer area of space. Many of the points brought up during that presentation are still valid today; namely, point one: current traffic bottlenecks and gridlock at Fanshawe Park Road and Richmond Street. Studies recently presented to the City have shown that this intersection is currently over capacity. Fanshawe Park Road currently transports 33,000 vehicles in an east-west direction daily, while 27,000 vehicles travel north-south on Richmond Street per day. However, based on the statistics presented by the consulting firm Stantec, I believe these numbers are grossly understated based on the timing and completion dates of the studies. I also believe that this is a very urgent issue where traffic flow improvements are already years too late. Our road systems seem to be the last consideration given in the planning stage. Many people I have spoken to are already using Medway Road as their northerly east-west route as the two-lane Sunningdale Road is becoming overly congested and Fanshawe is difficult to navigate. Point two: The addition of more vehicles to the area. The 6,023 new residential units will add an additional 7,000 resident-owned vehicles

within this 0.9 square kilometer plan area. This will again only add to the current gridlock conditions within this area unless the road systems are redesigned now to contend with all the projected volume increases based on the Plan and not reconstructed piece meal prior to building approvals being granted as is stated in the Plan. This redesign must include the Y intersection of Richmond Street, Western Road and Sunnyside. I believe including this Y intersection in the current road redevelopment process will greatly improve the traffic flow in the area. We, the residents, cannot live in a state of road construction for the next twenty-five years as new development is added, and congestion continues to grow. Point three: Construction traffic. During the summer months I have witnessed bumper-to-bumper congestion on Fanshawe Park Road during this years Bike Lane Reconstruction project. Given the City's current environmental concerns how does the City plan on managing traffic during this reconstruction phase and minimizing idling time such that traffic flows smoothly. Point four: an additional policy which I believe should be added to the Plan and used city-wide is the requirement that building construction companies cannot impede traffic on a major thoroughfare by reducing lanes in front of a construction site for the storage of equipment, trucks, cranes and delivery of goods. We have lived through this during the construction of 1235 Richmond Street at the Windermere Bridge along with the two towers at 545 Fanshawe Park Road at Wonderland where one lane of traffic in a busy corridor was blocked for months on end to support construction. Better construction planning by the developers, use of on property locations and coordination with the city is a must to ensure that the flow of traffic is not impeded. Point five: Bike Paths. I applaud the city on their efforts on creating a bicycle plan. Currently however, there are no bike paths south of the library on North Centre Road. I would ask that this be dealt with in the short-term and not within the term of the Plan. Point six: Parking Plan. Given that the Plan calls for an increase in commercial office in civic spaces by fifty-two percent plus the new residential units parking requirements will only increase. As we cannot assume that the BRT will be in place with that that within the time frame of the Plan, sufficient parking must be allotted to ensure that the area can continue to support it stores and vendors. Thank you for your time. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or city staff may have regarding my listed points.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Koncan you came in right on time and thank you very much for your comments. Next?
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Carla Trembley.
- Councillor Hopkins: Ms. Trembley?
- Carla Trembley: Yes, hello.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. We can hear you. Please state your name and address for the Committee and you have up to five minutes. Please proceed.
- Carla Trembley: My name is Carla Trembley and I am a resident of 94 Sunnyside Drive. I just want to start by echoing everything that Mr. Koncan said because my comment tonight is, is directed to the traffic in our area. As a resident of Sunnyside Drive for the last twenty-four years I have watched the traffic increase annually. Drivers use it as a through way to Masonville Mall and they have little regard for appropriate speed. There is an elementary school on our street and cars are constantly speeding and do not stop for pedestrians that are crossing the road. I've seen three dogs hit by speeding vehicles, two of them died in front of my home and my own dog was hit by a vehicle and left in the middle of the road with a mangled leg on Sunnyside Drive. I'm a long-time resident and I am very concerned about the safety on Sunnyside Drive. As this area continues to develop it will generate even more traffic issues on and around Sunnyside Drive. I've

spoken with many residents in this area and they have similar concerns, they wonder why nothing has been done to stop this flow of traffic and to discourage speeding on our street. I'm truly hoping that the city has plans to put speed bumps on Sunnyside Drive in order to hopefully slow down the flow of traffic, slow down the speeding cheap residents say and to ensure that we aren't going to have an increase in issues as this development starts to grow. Traffic is a huge problem in and around this area. I truly hope that the city plans on working with us to find a solution to this issue because as a long-time resident I honestly don't think that it will be bearable to live on the streets once these plans go through. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Ms. Trembley for your comments. Next?
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Laverne Kirkness.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Kirkness.
- Laverne Kirkness: Hello Madam Chair and Committee Members. I'm here on behalf of Westdell Development Corporation which you probably know owns and is currently constructing new buildings at the northwest corner in the Richmond Highland commercial center the northwest corner of Fanshawe and Richmond Street and that we have had a meeting with staff, a couple of meetings and looked at the Secondary Plan and we appreciate that it's really an implementation of policies out of The London Plan where you need something more specific as a policy plan to evaluate projects and we will be bringing projects forward, in fact, some are kind of on the front burner now to intensify our quadrant but what we fear is that the Masonville Secondary Plan can't predict all that we need to be able to predict to use the language that it has. It has too many "shalls" and not enough "should's". I suppose it does introduce quantities like six parking spaces on private streets and then we need a landscape offer or we need a two hundred and fifty square metre landscape area and those kinds of things, we don't think, should find their way into policy unless they're couched in terms that you're going to encourage that or you're going to work towards those numbers as a target because there are simply too absolute and if we come with a proposal that everybody loves but we can only do five spaces like we could all agree but we can't get an approval because we defied the Plan and so we're basically asking that the Plan being looked at in terms of making it more general and less certain and speak of targets and speak of should's rather than absolutes. I think one of the first points I made in the added communication was the uncertainty of the future and the difficulty it is to predict what's going to happen. In addition to that, in terms of how we live and how we shop, particularly in these high density kind of group village type things, I think that Westdell has some commercial tenants that have long term leases and renewals and for them to kind of say oh you have to get out of the site or can't lease anymore it's just not doable and therefore the implementation the Plan is going to take a long time and this wording of the Plan in terms of it being less absolute would help us work with phasing redevelopment intensifying and in in the end and certainly work towards the objectives but we're afraid that we're going to trip over ourselves or the city is going to make us trip over ourselves in terms of the approvals and proper implementation of a master plan. I guess, for an example, the public park situation and we do know we need public park spaces up there but the Plan calls for an urban park which is a definable term or a defined term, it has a half a hectare it wants, which is about the size of Staples and Best Buy if people know the Westdell Center, they're big stores and it's a big area and you know notwithstanding that the city has taken cash in lieu for years and years up there, we're now faced with having to kind of provide for a half hectare park and Westdell is willing to work towards that target but would like to do so not within the context of an urban park necessarily but a variety of ways of offering open space, particularly rooftop locations for spaces that are provided by condo apartment buildings for example or amenity spaces that are within the build.

Now I know there also has to be community space and Westdell realizes that, too and we're quite prepared to work with that but it doesn't seem like anything that can be done on the private sector will count we have to provide this urban park. We would like it to be expressed as a target and we would like to have it couched in terms that we can provide it in a variety of ways. Lastly is the twenty-five percent affordable housing and we're not sure what that means because the definition is, the Plan could actually maybe apply that twenty-five percent based on projected incomes based on the project population and willingness that are forecasted so we know what that means so there are those kinds of unknowns.

- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Kirkness you're coming to an end of your five minutes.
- Laverne Kirkness: I'm coming to an end, I'm on my last sentence.
- Councillor Hopkins: Sorry.
- Laverne Kirkness: Basically, have the Plan looked at, relooked at and make the wording less certain. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for your comments.
- Paul Orrick: Could I speak?
- Councillor Hopkins: Could I have that name again, please?
- Paul Orrick.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Please proceed. If you could give us your name and address and you have up to five minutes.
- My name is Paul Orrick and I live at 122 St. Bees Court, just off Richmond Street, just included in the periphery of this development area. I am responding as a concerned citizen, a person in the neighborhood that's going to be affected and also a representative of OMA which is Old Masonville Association. My comments are this Masonville Secondary Plan, is really confusing. Is it the final plan? Where did the initial plan come from that we have been talked to over the years, but it never seemed to be a real plan it's very confusing and now adding in apartments and other type things it just seems very piecemeal type document. Residents in the neighborhood have complained about traffic for more than ten years. Mike Koncan had some specifics, but I want to state that the traffic study that he referred to was dated October 22, 2015. As residents we went to that meeting and that's what this traffic density is based on for the development. Since this time city hall has dropped in four major apartment buildings around Masonville Mall, there are two condominiums on Sunningdale Road, there are all the extra townhouses on Sunningdale Road by the golf course; it's almost fully developed all the way to Adelaide on Sunningdale Road. All this traffic needs to come down Richmond Street in the morning and this is after the 2015 study so I think it's laughable that, that city hall can go on these numbers from 2015 when as Mike said there's going to be ten thousand apartments going into Masonville Mall that were not accounted for in this traffic study. I think this whole corner development is very flawed and studies and planning requirements are based on outdated information and I don't think a shovel should be put in the ground until a current traffic study is done and not right now with Covid because that was another thing I heard a rumor that there was a subsequent traffic study in late 2020, well there was no traffic because everybody's at home with Covid so this traffic study and the way this development is being planned, as a resident and I am very concerned that city hall is just charging ahead with massive urban development and as Mike said no concern for traffic. I have one final comment to make and on the boundaries of this



development it all seemed reasonable to go around the commercial areas Fanshawe, Richmond, but as a resident I have a specific concern that the Western Presidents property is like a little thumb stuck out on top and I don't know if that's a commercial money passing back and forth between Western and the City or what but that is a very historic site almost like Elie Perrin and I have real concerns as to why the Western property has that little thumb sticking north on Richmond Street was included in this whole development plan. Thank you for your time.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Orrick for your comments. Moving on.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Josie in Committee Rooms 1 and 2.
- Councillor Hopkins: I can go to Committee Room 1 and 2. If you can state your name and address and you have up to five minutes. Welcome.
- Good evening city hall my name is Josie Dovincenzu. I'm at North Centre Road and you'll have to excuse me for missing the previous meeting. I've just sort of been listening to all of the comments on the previous ones also having to do with Masonville Secondary Plan. I am really concerned like some of the other persons have been discussing about the high rises, the traffic and I can't seem to understand if a company like Cadillac Fairview, or whoever owns it now wants to build a twenty-storey high rise and parking. Traffic it's unbelievable right now and it's not just in Masonville and also, I'd like to, I'm wondering whatever happened to talk of that ring road? This was this was happening about twenty-thirty years ago. Talk about a ring road. It almost feels like London's turning into a small Toronto and don't get me wrong, that's not a bad thing, it's a good thing but it would be really nice to observe some of our natural boundaries that we already have and like many other cities and other places of the world a ring road does work so I mean Wonderland is a nightmare to drive; Fanshawe is terrible. I've been to, I kind of, and someone said once I was at a party chit chatting, well, we don't really need a ring road, just take all the other routes, well, I tried that. It's not the best solution so I'm just hoping, I'm sorry if I haven't had a chance to look at all of the current information, the charts and all that which you're talking about but, you know, public transportation, I used to take the bus all the time. Right now, I don't very often to be completely honest with you but we've got the Go Trains now, all the other trains but a more viable type of transportation would be great if, I guess we need to know how are people getting around. There's way too many cars. This just sort of exploded in a year or two and there's all these little pockets, little silo, areas here in London but like, you know, now I mean I can't talk very long because I'm going to get a ticket. I parked on the street here. Just to consider some other kind of viable, if a ring road would work and the other concern was really high rises, the areas, can you do that? My understanding is I don't know because you're own a big mall you just put a twenty-thirty storey apartment building in there like what do you do with all the people, traffic, all the services that you are going to need and also we do want to retain the Forest City's beautiful public spaces.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for your concerns. Thank you very much Josie for coming out and your comments. Is there anyone else? I'll ask one more time if there's anyone else from the public that would like to make their comments please come forward.
- Penny Masse, Committee Support Clerk: One moment.
- Councillor Hopkins: Welcome Sir. If you can state your name and address if you wish and you have up to five minutes.
- My name is Ron Steesma, I live at 145 North Centre Road. There's a lot of talk about traffic and I noticed in the past when there's construction on the major

arteries, let's say it's a north-south artery then there's a parallel artery going north-south they could both be under construction at the same time. Of course if one is under construction you can use the alternative, the one parallel so my concern is that there's an underpass planned on Adelaide. When that's under construction, will there also, so people will come to Richmond from Adelaide to go north-south. Will there also be construction on Richmond at the same time? I think that's something to consider so that the parallel north-south routes aren't both under construction. The other thing that I wonder about, I heard that there were eight different slides that you have the ability to look at regarding the Secondary Plan, Masonville Plan, but I didn't get a chance to see it. Is there any chance of getting that onto the public domain? That's all I have. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for coming out and for your comments. With that I will ask one more time.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: May I please confirm that Dave Traher and Lyman Meddoui do not want to speak?
- That's correct. Laverne Kirkness spoke for us already.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for being here.
- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: Madam Chair, sorry, it's Barb Westlake-Power again. We do have a couple of people in the waiting room so I need to know if staff have forwarded the link because I haven't moved them into the meeting part because I don't have their identity ahead of time so if there's somebody else that was expected from staff it would be helpful to know if they should be brought into the meeting.
- Councillor Hopkins: If I can go to staff? If there's anyone else that should be added?
- Britt O'Hagan, : Hi this is Ms. O'Hagan, I don't believe our staff forwarded it to anyone so we're not expecting anyone to have signed on.
- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you and with that I'll ask one more time if there's anyone here that would like to make a comment please do so. If not I will close the public participation meeting.