

Planning and Environment Committee

Report

17th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
November 22, 2021

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

ALSO PRESENT: PRESENT: H. Lysynski, C. Saunders and J.W. Taylor

REMOTE ATTENDANCE: Councillors M. van Holst, J. Fyfe-Millar, P. Van Meerbergen; I. Abushehada, J. Adema, G. Barrett, M. Butlin, M. Clark, M. Corby, A. Curtis, I. de Ceuster, S. Dunleavy, M. Feldberg, S. Grady, M. Greguol, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, L. Maitland, P. Masse, C. Maton, H. McNeely, L. McNiven, S. Meksula, B. Page, C. Parker, M. Pease and A. Riley

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 PM, with Councillor A. Hopkins in the Chair, Councillors S. Lehman, M. Hamou and S. Lewis present and all other Members participating by remote attendance.

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That Items 2.1 to 2.13 BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins, S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

2.1 8th 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 8th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee from its meeting held on October 27, 2021:

a) the City BE REQUESTED to use the new Municipal Climate Lens tool to explore the implications of varying hydro lines in new developments or developments particularly as it relates to reducing the impact of severe storms on the electrical systems as well as on improving the ability to plant much larger trees along sidewalks in order to make walking a more attractive form of transportation; and,

b) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 2.2 and 4.1 BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed

2.2 9th Meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

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

That the 9th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on November 3, 2021, BE RECEIVED for information.

Motion Passed

2.3 Parking Standards Review

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the Parking Standards Review Information Report appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021, which is the process to review and update the current City of London Parking requirements in Zoning By-law No. Z.-1 BE RECEIVED and BE CIRCULATED for public review and feedback. (2021-T02)

Motion Passed

2.4 915 Upperpoint Avenue (H-9362)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Sifton Properties Ltd., relating to the property located at 915 Upperpoint Avenue, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 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 Holding Residential Special Provision R4 (h*h-54*h-209*R4-6(11)), a Holding Residential Special Provision R5 (h*h-54*h-209*R5-7(9)), a Holding Residential Special Provision R6 (h*h-54*h-209*R6-5(61)), and a Holding Residential Special Provision R8 (h*h-54*h-209*R8-3(5)) Zone TO a Residential Special Provision R4 (R4-6(11)), a Residential Special Provision R5 (R5-7(9)), a Residential Special Provision R6 (R6-5(61)), and a Residential Special Provision R8 (R8-3(5)) Zone.

Motion Passed

2.5 235 Kennington Way (H-9375)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Economic Development, based on the application by Sifton Properties Limited, relating to the northern portion of the property located at 235 Kennington Way, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the 1989 Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Holding Residential R5 Special Provisions and R6 Special Provision (h*h-100*h-198*R5-4(23)/R6-5(51)) Zone TO a Residential R5 Special Provisions and R6 Special Provision (R5-4(23)/R6-5(51)) Zone.

Motion Passed

2.6 1790 Finley Crescent (P-9371)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Kenmore Homes (London) Inc., the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to exempt Block 100, Plan 33M-733 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of Subsection 50(5) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13*, for a period not exceeding three (3) years.

Motion Passed

2.7 Summerside Subdivision Phase 18 - Special Provisions (39T-92020-18)

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 Drewlo Holdings Inc., for the subdivision of land over Concession 1, Part of Lots 15 and 16, situated east of Highbury Avenue North, southwest of Meadowgate Boulevard and north of Bradley Avenue:

- a) the Special Provisions to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Drewlo Holdings Inc., for the Summerside Subdivision, Phase 18 (39T-92020_18) appended to the staff report dated November 22, 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 November 22, 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 November 22, 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. (2021-D12)

Motion Passed

2.8 1478 Westdel Bourne (H-9412)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Townline Orchard Property Limited, relating to lands located at 1478 Westdel Bourne, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Holding Residential R1 (h•R1-4) Zone, a Holding Residential R1 (h•R1-5) Zone, a Holding Residential R6/R8 Special Provision (h•h-54•h-209•R6-5(77)/R8-4(64)) Zone, and a Holding Residential R4/R5/R6/R8 Special Provision (h•h-54•h-209•R4-6(11)/R5-7(9)/R6-5(61)/R8-3(5)) Zone TO a Residential

R1 (R1-4) Zone, a Residential R1 (R1-5) Zone, a Holding Residential R6/R8 Special Provision (h-54•h-209•R6-5(77)/R8-4(64)) Zone, and a Holding Residential R4/R5/R6/R8 Special Provision (h-54•h-209•R4-6(11)/R5-7(9)/R6-5(61)/R8-3(5)) Zone to remove the holding (h) provision. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.9 370 South Street - Heritage Designation - Health Services Building and War Memorial Children's Hospital

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the designation of the property at 370 South Street, that the following actions be taken:

a) Notice BE GIVEN under the provisions of Section 29(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1990, c.O. 18*, of Municipal Council's intention to designate the property to be of cultural heritage value or interest for the reasons outlined in the staff report dated November 20, 2021 as Appendix D and Appendix E; and,

b) should no objection to Municipal Council's notice of intention to designate be received, a by-law to designate the property at 370 South Street to be of cultural heritage value or interest for the reasons outlined in Appendix D and Appendix E of this report BE INTRODUCED at a future meeting of Municipal Council within 90 days of the end of the objection period;

it being noted that should an objection to Municipal Council's notice of intention to designate be received, a subsequent staff report will be prepared; and,

it being further noted that should an appeal to the passage of the by-law be received, the City Clerk will refer the appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal. (2021-R01)

Motion Passed

2.10 466-468 Queen's Avenue Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP21-076-L)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1990, c.O. 18*, seeking retroactive approval for alterations to the heritage designated properties at 466-468 Queens Avenue, in the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, BE APPROVED with the following terms and conditions:

a) the existing wood windows on the 466 Queens Avenue portion of the property be retained; and,

b) the London Doorway on the 466 Queens Avenue portion of the property be retained. (2021-R01)

Motion Passed

2.11 10 Bruce Street - Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP21-073-L)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1990, c.O. 18*, seeking approval for alterations to the porch of the heritage designated property at 10 Bruce Street, located within the Wortley Village-Old South Heritage Conservation District BE PERMITTED as submitted with the following terms and conditions:

- a) the porch be reconstructed using the salvaged brick and concrete block materials;
- b) the porch and railing system be reconstructed as previously constructed according to photographic documentation;
- c) the new columns consist of concrete with fluting and ornamental capitals to be replicated in kind based on the porch's previous construction;
- d) the Heritage Planner be circulated on the Building Permit to ensure the railing and columns are consistent with design of the previous porch;
- e) the proposed alterations to the porch be completed within six (6) months of Municipal Council's decision on this Heritage Alteration Permit; and,
- f) the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed. (2021-R01)

Motion Passed

2.12 1595 Capri Crescent (1600 Twilite Boulevard) (H-9389)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Foxwood Developments, relating to the property located at 1595 Capri Crescent (1600 Twilite Boulevard), the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 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 Holding Residential R5 and R6 (h*h-54*h-71*h-100*R5-6/R6-5) Zone TO a Residential R5 and R6 (R5-6/R6-5) Zone to remove the "h", "h-54", "h-71" and "h-100" holding provisions. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.13 2313 and 2373 Callingham Drive (P-8830)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Town and Country Developments (2005) Inc., the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to exempt Blocks 2 and 3 of Registered Plan 33M-664

from the Part-Lot Control provisions of Subsection 50(5) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, c.P. 13*, for a period not exceeding six (6) months. (2021-D25)

Motion Passed

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 3103 Petty Road and 3047 White Oak Road (Z-9383)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Hamou

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by 2831570 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 3047 White Oak Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 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 (R1-10) Zone TO a Holding Residential R1/Residential R6 Special Provision Residential R8 Bonus (h*h-100*h-161*h-227*R1-10/R6-5(59)/R8-4(46)*B60) Zone;

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 and will serve to implement the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 which encourage infill and intensification and the provision of a range of housing types, and efficient use of existing infrastructure;
- the proposed residential uses and scale of development are consistent with the policies of the London Plan, the 1989 Official Plan, the Southwest Area Secondary Plan and the North Longwoods Area Plan policies; and,
- the subject lands are of a suitable size and shape to accommodate the development proposed. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): 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, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

Moved by: M. Hamou
Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

3.2 City Wide - Encouraging the Growing of Food in Urban Areas (OZ-9332)

Moved by: S. Lewis
Seconded by: M. Hamou

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law relating to policies and regulations for the growing of food in urban areas:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend The London Plan by ADDING a new subsection in the Food Systems Chapter to allow for the growing of food in urban areas on lands, in greenhouses and shipping containers; and ADDING a new policy in the Our Tools part of the Plan to allow for a scoped site plan approval process for greenhouses; and

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with The London Plan), by REVISING Section 4.26 (Uses Permitted in All Zones) to include Urban Agriculture and ADDING a new Section 4.38 (Urban Agriculture) to provide regulations for greenhouses and shipping containers used for growing of food;

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

- the staff presentation;
- a communication dated November 18, 2021, from J. Cordes, Chair, Middlesex London Food Policy Council; and,
- a communication dated November 17, 2021, from Members of the Urban Agricultural Steering Committee - 2021;

it being noted that no individuals spoke at the public participation meeting associated with these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves these applications for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendments to the London Plan and Zoning By-law Z.-1 are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2020);
- the recommended amendments are consistent with three of Councils goals in the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan; and,
- the recommended amendments to the London Plan and Zoning By-law provides more opportunities to allow for the growing of food within the City's Urban Growth boundary (UGB). (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 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, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

3.3 99 Southdale Road West (Z-9162)

Moved by: S. Lewis
Seconded by: M. Hamou

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Southdale West Holdings Inc., relating to the property located at 99 Southdale Road West:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM an Urban Reserve (UR4) and Environmental Review (ER) Zone TO a Residential R9 Special Provision Zone (R9-5() Zone and Open Space (OS4) Zone;

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

- i) ensure that the development provides adequately sized and located enhanced outdoor amenity and recreation area(s) to support healthy and livable environment for the number of residents. This can be achieved by providing a central amenity space and smaller compatible amenity areas serving individual buildings;
- ii) provide for a safe network of internal streets with convenient and direct pedestrian connections throughout the site (North- South and East-West) connecting building entrances, amenity areas, parking spaces, open spaces and the city sidewalk along Southdale Road East;
- iii) ensure an active building façade along Southdale Road by including principal building entrance(s), lobbies, common amenity areas and street-oriented residential units with front porches/courtyards and individual unit entrances connected to the public sidewalk along that frontage. Provide direct walkway connections from ground floor units to the sidewalk to create a pedestrian scale rhythm and activation;

- iv) explore opportunities to minimize the visual impact of surface parking by reducing the expanse of surface parking and drive aisles to the required minimum and accommodate majority of the parking underground to provide adequate amenity and recreational areas and in turn reduce the heat island effect;
- v) ensure the design of the proposed building(s) offer variation in appearance and massing to add character throughout the development and promote wayfinding;
- vi) ensure an EMP (Environmental Management Plan) is completed through the site approval process; and,
- vii) consider the comments made at the public participation meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting by the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Community of London and Vicinity;

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

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

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

- the recommended amendment to Zoning By-law Z.-1 is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 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, which contemplates a range of residential uses including stacked townhouses, fourplexes, and low-rise apartments within the Neighbourhoods Place Type where the property has frontage on a Civic Boulevard;
- conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan including, but not limited to the Policies for the Multi-Family Medium Density Residential and Open Space designations. The recommended amendment would permit development at an intensity that is at the upper range of the maximum density for residential intensification within the Multi-family, Medium Density Residential designation but still ensures the nature of development is suitable for the site and the immediate neighbourhood. The recommended amendment would help to reach the objective of supplying housing choices and options for all residents;
- the recommended Zoning By-law amendment is consistent with the Southwest Area Secondary Plan. The subject lands represent an appropriate location for residential intensification, along a higher-order street at the fringe of a developing neighbourhood, and the recommended amendment would permit development at a magnitude that is suitable for the site and the adjacent neighbourhood; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of a site within the Built-Area Boundary and the Primary Transit Area with an appropriate form of infill development. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: E. Holder

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.4 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street (OZ-9418)

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 the application by Vision SoHo Alliance, relating to the properties located at 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend the 1989 Official Plan, to add policies to Section 19.15.4 Vacant Land Condominiums;
- b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend The London Plan, 2016 to add policies to Policy 1709 Vacant Land Condominiums;
- c) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan to change the designation of a portion of the subject the subject lands FROM a Low-Rise Residential designation TO a Mid-Rise Residential designation and amend policies pertaining to the Mid-Rise Residential designation and The Four Corners designation;
- d) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "D" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 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 a portion of the subject lands FROM R8 Special Provision (h*h-5* R8-4(56) Zone; Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h*h-5* R8-4(57); and, a Holding Residential R8 Special Provision (h*h-5*R8-4(58)) Zone TO a Holding Residential R4 Special Provision/Residential R8 Special Provision (h*h-5*R4-6(13)/R8-4(59)) Zone, with amendments to the associated special provisions of the Residential R8-4 zones applicable to the subject lands;

e) the requested amendment to the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan to remove policy from 20.6.4.1(iii) regarding commercial at the ground floor BE REFUSED given the goals and objectives for the designation within the secondary plan;

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

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

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

- the proposed amendments are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020 by providing a mix of residential uses including affordable housing in an appropriate location and at a time of defined need;
- the proposed amendments conform to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi Family High Density Residential designation which applies to the subject lands;
- the proposed amendments conform to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Neighbourhoods Place type which applies to the subject lands;
- the proposed amendments conform to the policies of the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan; and,
- the amendment to the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan recommended for refusal is recommended as such because it is not consistent with the vision for the area set out within the objectives of the plan. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.5 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street (SPA21-081)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Vision SoHo Alliance, relating to the property located at 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street:

- a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Site Plan Approval to permit the construction of five new apartment buildings and the redevelopment of two existing buildings on the subject lands; and,
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council has no issues with respect to the Site Plan Application, and the Municipal Council supports the Site Plan Application;

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

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

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

- the proposed Site Plan is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which directs development to designated growth areas and that development be adjacent to existing development;
- the proposed Site Plan conforms to the applicable policies of The London Plan with the exception of the Vacant Land Condominium policies subject of the application OZ-9418;
- the proposed Site Plan is in conformity with the applicable policies of the Official Plan (1989) with the exception of the Vacant Land Condominium policies subject of the application OZ-9418;
- the proposed Site Plan is in conformity with the policies of the Old Victoria Hospital Lands Secondary Plan (2014) with the exception of the designation and design policies subject of the application OZ-9418;
- the proposed Site Plan will conform to the regulations of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law subject to the approval of the requested Zoning By-law amendment under consideration as OZ-9418; and,
- with the exception of minor drawing amendments required, the proposed Site Plan conforms to the regulations of the Site Plan Control By-law. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.6 3095 & 3105 Bostwick Road (39T-21502 & Z-9322)

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: M. Hamou

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, based on the application by Southside Construction Management Ltd., relating to the property located at 3095 and 3105 Bostwick Road:

- a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix 'A' BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 7, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM an Urban Reserve UR3 Zone TO a Holding Residential R2 Special Provision (h*R2-3(_)) Zone; a Holding Residential R2 Special Provision (h*h-__*R2-3(_)) Zone; a Holding Residential R4 Special Provision (h*h-198*h-__*R4-4(2)) Zone; an Open Space OS1 Zone, and an Urban Reserve UR3 Zone;
- b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Subdivision submitted by Southside Construction Management Ltd., relating to the property located at 3095 and 3105 Bostwick Road; and,
- c) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports issuing draft approval of the proposed plan of subdivision as submitted by Southside Construction Management Ltd., prepared by Zelinka Priamo (Project No. SPE/LON/12-02), certified by Jason Wilband O.L.S., dated November 11, 2021, as red-line revised, which shows a total of 168 single detached residential lots, three (3) street townhouse residential blocks, three (3) park blocks, two (2) urban reserve blocks, three (3) future road block served by the extensions of Frontier Avenue, Regiment Road, Raleigh Boulevard and four (4) new local streets, SUBJECT TO the conditions appended in the staff report dated November 22, 2021 as Appendix "B";

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

- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 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 draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Neighbourhoods Place Type, Our Strategy, City Building and Design, Our Tools, and all other applicable London Plan policies;
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the Low Density Residential; Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential; and Open Space designations; and,
- the proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the Southwest Area Secondary Plan, including but not limited to the Low Density Residential; Medium Density Residential; and the Open Space and Environmental Review designations. The proposed draft plan of subdivision and zoning conforms to the vision for the North Talbot Neighbourhood that new development will reflect the existing character of the neighbourhood, provide a walkable environment with a pedestrian scale, and incorporate street-oriented development on public right-of-ways. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Hillier
Seconded by: M. Hamou

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.7 1453-1459 Oxford Street East and 648-656 Ayreswood Avenue

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Red Maple Properties, relating to the property located at 1453-1459 Oxford Street East and 648-656 Ayreswood Avenue:

a) the request to amend The London Plan by ADDING a new policy the Specific Policies for the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type and by ADDING the subject lands to Map 7 – Specific Policies Areas – of The London Plan, BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

i) the proposed development is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which promotes intensification and

redevelopment in appropriate locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available.

ii) the proposed development does not conform to The London Plan (2016), including, but not limited to, the Key Directions, City Design, Intensity and Form policies of the Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type, Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSA) policies, and Near Campus Neighbourhoods policies.

iii) the existing sanitary sewer servicing the site does not have sufficient capacity to support the proposed density.

b) the request to amend the Official Plan for the City of London (1989) to change the designation of the subject lands FROM a Low Density Residential designation TO a Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation, BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

i) the proposed development is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which promotes intensification and redevelopment in appropriate locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available;

ii) the proposed development does not conform to the Official Plan (1989), including, but not limited to, the Permitted Uses, Density and Scale, Bonusing, Residential Intensification, Urban Design, and Policies for Near Campus Neighbourhoods;

iii) the proposed development represents an over-intensification of the site and does not satisfy the criteria of the Planning Impact Analysis;

iv) the existing sanitary sewer servicing the site does not have sufficient capacity to support the proposed density.

c) the request to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1 to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R1 (R1-6) Zone and Residential R1/Office Conversion (R1-6/OC4) Zone TO a Residential R9 Bonus/Neighbourhood Shopping Area (R9-7*B-_*H77/NSA3) Zone, BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

i) the proposed development is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which promotes intensification and redevelopment in appropriate locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available;

ii) the proposed development does not conform to The London Plan (2016) as the requested Specific Policy is not recommended for approval;

iii) the proposed development does not conform to the Official Plan (1989) as the requested Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation is not recommended for approval;

iv) the proposed development and requested zoning represent an over-intensification of the site and do not satisfy the criteria of the Planning Impact Analysis;

v) the existing sanitary sewer servicing the site does not have sufficient capacity to support the proposed density.

vi) the facilities, services, and matters identified through the proposed bonus zone are not commensurate for the requested height and density; it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications with respect to these matters:

- the staff presentation;
- a communication dated November 16, 2021, from P. Lombardi, Partner, Siskinds; and,
- a communication from C. Kulchycki and H. Froussios, Senior Planners, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., and P. Champagne, Owner, Red Maple Properties;

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. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Motion to refer the application back to the Civic Administration.

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Hamou

That the application by Red Maple Properties, relating to the properties located at 1453 to 1459 Oxford Street East and 648 to 656 Ayerswood Avenue BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration to undertake the following actions and to report back to a future meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee to:

- a) work with the applicant to ensure the appropriate framework is in place for the provision of affordable housing units at 70% of the average market rate for fifty years;
- b) work with the applicant to determine options to resolve the sanitary sewer capacity issues; and,
- c) work with the applicant to revise the application to consolidate the subject properties as being within the Rapid Transit Corridor; it being noted that this is notwithstanding the 100 meter policy guideline adjacent to a Rapid Transit Station, for the purpose of developing scale, density and form suitable to such locations;

Yeas: (2): S. Lewis, and M. Hamou

Nays: (4): A. Hopkins , S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Failed (2 to 4)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from its meeting held on November 10, 2021:

a) the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) 2022 membership with the Community Heritage Ontario BE APPROVED; it being noted that the LACH has sufficient funds in its 2021 Budget to cover the \$75.00 renewal fee;

b) on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act, seeking approval for alterations to the porch of the heritage designated property located at 10 Bruce Street, located within the Wortley Village-Old South Heritage Conservation District BE PERMITTED, as submitted, with the following terms and conditions:

- the porch be reconstructed using the salvaged brick and concrete block materials;
- the porch and railing system be reconstructed as previously constructed according to photographic documentation;
- the new columns consist of concrete with fluting and ornamental capitals to be replicated in kind based on the porch's previous construction;
- the Heritage Planner be circulated on the Building Permit to ensure the railing and columns are consistent with design of the previous porch;
- the proposed alterations to the porch be completed within six (6) months of Municipal Council's decision on this Heritage Alteration Permit; and,
- the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed;

c) the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act, seeking retroactive approval for alterations to the heritage designated properties located at 466-468 Queens Avenue, in the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, BE APPROVED with the following terms and conditions:

- the existing wood windows on the 466 Queens Avenue portion of the property be retained; and,
- the London Doorway on the 466 Queens Avenue portion of the property be retained;

d) on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated November 10, 2021, related to the Designation of the Health Services Building and War Memorial Children's Hospital, located at 370 South Street, under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act:

- i) notice BE GIVEN under the provisions of Section 29(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1990, c.O. 18, of Municipal Council's intention to designate the above-noted property to be of cultural heritage value or interest for the reasons outlined in Appendix D and Appendix E of the above-noted report; and,
- ii) should no objection to Municipal Council's notice of intention to

designate be received, a by-law to designate the property located at 370 South Street to be of cultural heritage value or interest for the reasons outlined in Appendix D and Appendix E of the above-noted report BE INTRODUCED at a future meeting of Municipal Council within 90 days of the end of the objection period;

it being noted that should an objection to Municipal Council's notice of intention to designate be received, a subsequent staff report will be prepared;

it being further noted that should an appeal to the passage of the by-law be received, the City Clerk will refer the appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal; and,

it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage encourages that effort be put into locating and using the original memorial plaque, as appended to the above-noted staff report in Appendix C, in the development of the property; and,

e) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1 and 4.4, BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

5.1 (ADDED) 8th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: M. Hamou

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 8th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on November 18, 2021:

a) S. Levin, Chair, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) BE DIRECTED to speak on behalf of the EEPAC at the Planning and Environment Committee public participation meeting relating to Environmental Management Guidelines; and,

b) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 to 3.4, inclusive, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4 BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Vote:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Hamou

Motion to change the order of business to hear the delegation by S. Levin, Chair, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee.

Yeas: (6): A. Hopkins , S. Lewis, M. Hamou, S. Lehman, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 3103 Petty Road and 3047 White Oak Road (Z-9383)

- Councillor Hopkins: This is a Zoning application. Committee Members, I'm looking for a motion, sorry, is there anyone here that would like to speak to this application? I'm just getting too far ahead of myself. I do apologize. If the applicant is here, if there is anyone that would like to speak to this application please come forward.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Madam Chair, I have just allowed Scott Allen into the meeting and he's speaking on behalf of the applicant.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Allen. You have up to five minutes. Welcome.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Allen, can you hear us?
- Scott Allen, MHBC: My apologies, I was having some difficulties and I didn't realize I was called.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes. You can, the Chair has indicated that you can go ahead.
- Councillor Hopkins: You have up to.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: You have up to five minutes Mr. Allen. We can hear you quite clearly.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: Thank you Madam Chair and Members of the Committee. Quickly my name is Scott Allen, I'm with MHBC Planning. We are acting on behalf of the applicant. With me today is Mohamed Abuhajar who is also available to respond to questions. At this time, we would like to express our support for the findings and recommendations of the planning staff report as prepared by Mr. Meksula. In particular, we agree that the conclusion said in the report that the multi-unit residential zoning proposed for these lands is consistent with the Provincial Planning policies, compatible with local development context, will encourage greater housing choice in the community particularly through the lands to be consolidated with the adjacent property 3103 White Oak Road to create a consolidated cluster townhouse project. The findings of the staff report are reflective of the planning justification report and at this point we would also like to thank the Planning staff for their attention to this application. Finally, Madam Chair, with approval of this proposed rezoning, the applicant intends to advance a site plan approval submission shortly and is hoping to initiate project construction this Spring. Thank you for your consideration. We will gladly answer any questions Committee Members may have.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Allen for being here and I'd like to go to the public and ask them if there's anyone here that would like to speak to this application please come forward. I see no one else. I will look to the Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 99 Southdale Road West (Z-9162)

- Councillor Hopkins: With that I understand we have a staff presentation. Thank you, Ms. Riley. I will go to the Committee for technical questions only. Councillor Hillier.
- Councillor Hillier: Thank you. I visited the site recently and my biggest concern is actually building four. If you're on slide six of the staff proposal is building four. Now if you're familiar with the Holy Trinity Church, they have a, a magnificent window - it's gotta be two and a half storeys tall and my, my thoughts are, I'm looking at building four and visualizing this very large building looking down to this window during services and I'm wondering if there's some way we can redistribute the floors and have buildings two and three be the tallest buildings with a smaller building sloping off. Has that been looked at by staff?
- Councillor Hopkins: Ms. Riley?
- Mike Corby, Manager, Planning Implementation: Through you Madam Chair, it's Mike Corby here. Through discussions with the Hellenic Center, we have had discussions about redistributing the height. The zoning recommended by staff does not lock in the height of these buildings so it could be re-distributed in the future putting more storeys along Southdale or to the east along the woodlot. There is opportunity with the recommended zoning to do that. If you would like to get more specific, we could reduce the height permissions in proximity to the Hellenic Center.
- Councillor Hillier: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: I'd like to go to the Mayor.
- Mayor Holder: Thanks very much. I know we're going to hear some comments from the public, I'm sure, with regard to that but I was I was heartened to hear staff just indicate that there was an opportunity to, to consider the distribution to potentially be east or the north side of the of the lot. In other words that the density is one issue that that can, that may well be able to be accommodated through, through additional I'll say work with the developer and, and our community but I'm just got a question as it relates to the traffic patterns as a result of this. Not sure if you can and I am just wondering what impacts staff feel that this, that the additional residences in this area will have on, on traffic volumes. Sometimes I find having gotten into the Church parking lot can be a bit of a challenge. Just wondering how that might be accommodated.
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair a Traffic Impact Assessment was done through this process. Transportation has reviewed this and has no concerns moving forward and they also said that any outstanding issues would be dealt with through the site plan approval process. Just to let you know they did look at the increase and they have no concerns whatsoever.
- Mayor Holder: Chair, through you, what would, what would the process need to be then to be able to do a rebalancing then of the, of the building such that we would, we would consider the community's concerns and also respect the developer's plan to be able to shift the emphasis away from the church and over to, I'll say the woodlot area that is there. What's that process have to look like? If I can ask that, through you Chair, to staff.

- Mike Corby, Manager, Planning Implementation: Through you, Madam Chair, Mike Corby here. In terms of directing staff to consider that the easiest option would likely be to direct the Site Plan Approval Authority to consider redistributing the heights around the site to reduce potential impacts on the Hellenic Center.
- Mayor Holder: It may well be then, Chair, that that is an outcome although I'd like to get feedback from developer and the community with respect to this project right now. Partly I'd like to hear as well, should the developer's representative who will be speaking what their willingness would be attitudinally to consider such a site plan reconsideration and also to get some feedback from the community how they would feel about that. If the emphasis was put on the, I'll say the woodlot side versus the church side, the greater emphasis. That's, I think that's where Councillor Hillier was going and then I would be interested in supporting but I'd like to again get that feedback from, from all parties. Thanks.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We are just on technical questions at the moment with staff. Maybe as we go through the process we'll eventually get there. I'd like to go to the applicant now if the applicant is here.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Casey Kulchycki.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Kulchycki. Can you hear us? Welcome. Yes, I think we can hear you.
- Casey Kulchycki, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Welcome to Planning Committee. You have up to five minutes.
- Casey Kulchycki, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of Planning Committee. My name is Casey Kulchycki. I'm a Senior Planner with Zelinka Priamo Limited and I am representing the developer on the project at 99 Southdale Road West. We have reviewed the staff report and we are in agreement with its recommendation to approve the Zoning By-law as presented tonight. Just to kind of give a brief overview we've been working with staff on this project for quite some time. It was initiated in 2013. At the first consultation meeting with staff and we've been working with staff over those years to address and resolve matters related to tree retention, sight layout, parkland dedication, traffic studies and various other planning matters ahead of formally submitting the application. After considerable back and forth with staff and studies we submitted our application in the Fall of 2019 and the formal Notice of Application went out February 27, 2020 with the public notice sign being posted shortly thereafter. This application has been on the public record and, for approximately two years and we're well beyond the statutory timelines put forth by the *Planning Act* for this so we're very excited to be here tonight with the recommendation for approval to take this project to the next stage being the site plan approval process. We are aware that the adjacent landowner, the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox community has filed some correspondence requesting a deferral of this application to March, 2022 in order for them to have a new Council installed and bring them up to speed on the proposal. Given the amount of time this application has been in the public record and on public notice, the extensive efforts of the applicant and city to address other comments received during the review process we do not support the request for further delays to this application. In their letter the Holy Trinity community suggests that views to their church building are to be protected. That's not correct, there is no policy in the Southwest Area Secondary Plan that states that and the East Bostwick Area Plan only suggests that visual amenity of the church could be maintained through site design but it's not explicitly protected or preserved. Furthermore, the Holy Trinity community decided to construct their beautiful church at the rear of their lands behind their existing

community center in a location where it would already be screened by existing vegetation and buildings. When they had the opportunity to construct it closer to Southdale Road West where it would be a more prominent landmark along the streetscape. The Holy Trinity community then constructed a large front addition to their community center giving it prominence and further impeding views from the church from the Southdale Road/Notre Dame entry to their site. It is unfair and unreasonable asking to have the onus for the preservation of views placed on the adjacent landowners when they themselves have detrimentally impacted the views of their own church. At this point we're in agreement with staff's recommendation for the approval of the Zoning by-law as presented. While we are open to having additional discussions regarding height distribution to the site plan approval process we would just like to have this application be moved forward to that stage. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'd like to now go to the public. If there's anyone here that would like to speak to this recommendation, I'll ask them to come forward or speak on the phone.
- Steve Vergiris: Madam Chair, members of Planning Committee,
- Councillor Hopkins: Just one moment please. Yes, Steve if you could go ahead, sorry. You have up to five minutes. If you could just state your name and address if you wish.
- Steve Vergiris: Sure. My name is Steve Vergiris. I'm a board member of the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Community Council of London and Vicinity and beside me is Mr. William Pol who we've hired as a, as a, our consultant. We appreciate that this opportunity to present our views and, and the concerns regarding this development, developments impact on the Holy Trinity community. Please refer to our presentation that we've sent to the members of the Planning Committee and to the developer. First, we want to apologize for bringing our concerns forward at this late stage of the process. The Notice of Planning application of February 7, 2020 was not brought to the attention of our Board of Directors. We became aware of the significance of the development upon receipt of the revised Notice of Application requesting comments by October 28, 2021. Since that time our Board has been heavily engaged in understanding the proposal and communicating with the city's and the developers Planners and with our Ward Councillor. To make this decision that has such a significant impact to our Holy Trinity community we require our memberships consent. We have nominations and elections this month and the new Council takes office in January, 2022. We need January to evaluate the development proposal and work with the developer to articulate our concerns and to find a resolution that we can take to our membership. Our community was founded and in London in 1936, 85 years ago. The community purchased the land at 131 and 133 Southdale Road West in 1975. The site consists of the community church which was completed in 2003, the Hellenic Community Center and a soccer pitch and field house to the rear. The community serves almost ten thousand Canadians of Greek descent in London and the surrounding area offering programs in religious, cultural, educational and recreational activities. Prior to Covid-19, the community center hosted one hundred seventy-seven events with fifty-one thousand eight hundred forty people participating in one year. More than ninety percent of the participants were from the London community at large. There are over three hundred soccer matches played annually, hosting over thirty-three thousand attendees and players. The Holy Trinity community serves an important role in the religious, cultural and sporting life of London. The church is a community landmark with a distinctive Byzantine architecture and a twenty-meter-high dome. It was intentionally located at the rear of the site to offer quite a quiet space and permit interior light access from all four directions creating a beautiful and unique focal point for the East Bostwick area. Our goal is to retain and enhance the significant landmark building as development occurs around the site. Our community has had a long successful relationship with the City of London and surrounding residential

developers to protect and enhance the views into our site and the views light into the church. Through the East Bostwick Area Plan and the Southwest Secondary Plan these urban design views are protected. Our request is to continue the discussion and that has occurred over the past few weeks to improve the urban design, reduce the building heights and reposition development as it affects our lands. In reviewing the planning staff report dated November 22, 2021, we note that there is insufficient consideration to protect the significant architectural and design features of the Holy Trinity Church in sight. Similarly, reviewing the planning and design report and the revised site plan the proposal does not address the significant church architecture and community significance of the Hellenic Center. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment reducing setbacks and increasing building height permits buildings that will have an, an invasive and negative impact on our communities lands and buildings and reduce the visual significance of the church. Finally there are a number of site plan matters that require consideration by the, the Holy Trinity community. The applicant and the city, and the city, prior to adopting the zoning regulations. It is premature at this time for the community to support the application as presented. Deferral at this time is appropriate recognizing the importance of the Holy Trinity community to London the forthcoming executive elections in the General Assembly means in the architectural significance of our church. Thank you for allowing me to address our concerns. Our community members are entrepreneurs. We have a full understanding of the economic benefits and economic growth given to our city by developers. We are here to work together and achieve a mutually agreed term for the benefits of all part parties involved. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Vergiris. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to make a comment?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Madam Chair, we have Pamela Cochrane-McInnes in Committee Room #1 who wishes to speak to this.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. Please come forward stating your name and address if you wish and you have up to five minutes.
- Pamela Cochrane-McInnes: See attached presentation and displays shown at the meeting.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'd like to go to the public and ask one more time if there's anyone who would like to speak to this recommendation? I see none and with that I would like to go to the Committee to close the public participation meeting.

Hello,

I am one of the owner/residents of 166 Southdale Road W., where the town-home condo complex of 161 units are directly across the street from the proposed rezoning application site. I have lived in my home for over 25 years.

It is a joy to hear and see wildlife in our neighbourhood and is one of the reasons I have remained living in this area for so long.

For this reason and others, I oppose this application due to many facts / concerns:

1. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. This area is **Protected Wetlands and is a landmark**. Trees, deer, geese, ducks, reptiles, bull frogs, turtles and other living creatures, including our provincial flower – trilliums – are in this area. Any kind of construction, particularly with this magnitude of structural development (with underground parking), will destroy the wildlife and natural habitat, and have a negative impact on the environment, eco-system and the community / residents. There will also be an increase with noise and pollution.

How can the City allow a development to proceed on Protected regulated land? It would be irresponsible and contravene with the City's Environmental Policies and the Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks authority and regulations.

There would be no benefit to the residents of this area. Does the City not care about protecting its wildlife, environment and its eco-systems, and maintaining a healthier living environment for its residents and all living things?

2. GRIDLOCK and TRAFFIC ISSUE –High Density will further increase the traffic issue that will result in more accidents and gridlocks. The traffic is so dense that we have difficulty entering / exiting our complex.

We have no other means of entering and exiting our property.

Having both entry and exit points of the proposed development facing north on Southdale Road W., directly across from our complex's entry and exit points facing south, will create even more havoc / gridlock with entering and exiting our complex. The centre lane is used not only for entering our complex from the west, but for exiting to the east, as the centre lane is used

in order to cross over to the eastbound lanes. The centre lane is also used for turning left (south) into the Hellenic Centre where they host several events. So....you have traffic coming from all directions using the centre lane.

Proposed development could house 2,000 residents (751 units) and if each household has two cars, that is a total of 4,000 cars going in and out of the proposed development, impeding traffic flow and obstructing us from entering and exiting our complex. Our complex has 161 units with a maximum of 322 vehicles. That is an increase of 1,142% in a very restricted area.

NOTE that all along Southdale Road – from Pondmills to Westdel Bourne, there are NO adjacent properties where entrances/exits points face directly across from one another. (In fact, all throughout London, this doesn't exist).

WE CANNOT BE BLOCKED IN.

To build 751 units would be a hindrance to traffic flow, resulting in safety issues for us all that would affect delivery and service vehicles and first responders. How can the City allow this?

3. **SAFETY ISSUE** – higher volume of traffic will result in more vehicle and pedestrian accidents. One resident was hit by a car at Notre Dame and Southdale while walking / crossing at the light and still walks with a cane. Earlier this month, I was almost hit by a driver in the same area – driver was too impatient to wait while I walked across the street. It is also very dangerous walking down Southdale Road West between Wharncliffe and Wonderland. Many of us fear that we will be hit by a car. The frustration we have endured with the current traffic density, racing of motorists, noise, construction and higher crime rate is affecting our neighbourhood and causing havoc, anxiety and safety concerns for many of us.
4. **OUR FRONTAGE VIEW WILL BE OBSTRUCTED.** Any development will directly impede the frontage view of residents' homes within our complex. According to the City's Original Plan, there cannot be any obstruction in the frontage of our property (facing south).

5. HIGHER CRIME RATE WILL ENSUE with higher population density. Since the development of houses near Singleton Avenue, there has been more crime in the area. When you build high density apartment buildings, the crime rate will increase.

The City of London needs to protect its – OUR - precious land and citizens at every cost. It is not always about making money / profit and appeasing developers. It is about planning wisely and consciously. Residents of London need to be heard, not ignored. Many of us have lived in this neighbourhood for over twenty (20) years, some over forty years. The landscape has changed dramatically and not favourably. The construction and development has been ongoing, non-stop, for years on Southdale Road W. and enough is enough. The City has a responsibility to protect **Designated Protected Lands** and to protect / safeguard EXISTING residents of this area, and it can do so by vetoing this planning application.

I do not stand alone on this matter.

To date, there has been over 75 residents who have signed a petition to stop the rezoning and development at 99 Southdale Road W.

Thank you.

.....

BACK-UP

Section 28, Preserving and Protecting our Environment for Future Generations – A Made-In-Ontario Environmental Plan, Ontario Trillium, Bill 184)

Currently, it is zoned as “conservation” land.

The city has an environmental policy plan (May 2021) – excerpt:

1293 - Protection, management and enhancement of the environment is central to all of the planning that we do. Our Environmental Policies provide direction for: 1. The identification, protection, conservation, enhancement, and management of our Natural Heritage System. 2. The minimization of risks associated with Natural and Human-made Hazards. 3. The identification, protection, and conservation of our Natural Resources

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACHIEVE? 1295_ Our Environmental Policies will provide clear direction for the long-term protection and conservation of our Natural Heritage System and our Natural Resources and ensure that development is directed away from Natural and Human-made Hazards

Assessment Parcel (MPAC/MNRS)

MPAC Street Address 79 SOUTHCOTE RD W
Unit
MPAC Taxation Municipality LONDON CITY
Assessment ROLL Number
3934282750146/000000
Assessment ROLL Number (Primary)
W4220000000000000

[View Additional Details](#) [Remove from Results](#)





NBU. 11.201

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street (OZ-9418)

- Councillor Hopkins: I understand we have a presentation here from staff. I would like to go to staff to, to the presentation. You have up to 5 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Maitland. Any technical questions from the Committee? Councillor Lewis.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Madam Chair. Just one technical question and it's on the piece that staff are recommending refusal of ground floor commercial on. I recognize that we're working from existing policy documents and, and plans; however, as we know during the last almost two years of a pandemic situation there's been a considerable change in the, the vacancy and the demand for commercial space and I'm wondering if that, if any sort of analysis, planning impact analysis, took that into consideration given that I think probably no one wants to see this Vision SoHo development result in a bunch of vacant spaces created in a building on the ground floor with potentially no demand for commercial use. Through you to our staff was consideration given to the changing commercial real estate market and demand for commercial spaces or are we working from a policy basis that predates the pandemic change in real estate demand?
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Maitland.
- Michael Pease, Manager of Site Plan: Hi. It's Mike Pease, Manager of Site Plan. I can answer that question through you Madam Chair to Councillor Lewis. In, in some respects they are proposing some commercial spaces; however, the zoning that was in place prior to the zoning that's before you today already provided some flexibility to have either residential or commercial so refusing it in a sense is already advocating or provided for what's already permitted so it's just a policy change to reflect what is already in place. The policies prevent permissive, it's not prescriptive so that, that's the zoning already in place to allow for that flexible approach whether it be commercial or residential.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Mr. Pease. That's extremely helpful as always from you in the many years I have been working with you on different applications so thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Any other technical questions? I do have a quick one to staff regarding the parkland dedication. If you can expand on that parkland dedication? I understand it's five percent but if you can just add a little bit more context to it.
- Leif Maitland, Site Development Planner: Through the Chair, the standard requirement is five percent cash in lieu. There's, there's no additions or there's no change from any other standard proposal for parkland. I guess, I'm, I'm not sure if there was another element to the question that I may have missed.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yeah, just so it's not cash in lieu it is the five percent we are going to be getting?
- Michael Pease, Manager of Site Plan: Through you Madam Chair, it's Mike Pease again. Just to reiterate what Mr. Maitland said, so I think the question was about parkland dedication and in this case, it would be cash in lieu based on the number of units. There's a rate per unit that would be applied. There would be no other parkland applied to this area. Just as a reminder as well, there is the civic space that is at the four corners intersection that is a separate city project that is occurring at

some point in the near future I would hope but the park would be separate, and it would be public land that would be owned by the city.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for that clarification. I'd like to now go to the applicant.
- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of Planning Committee, it's to Harry Froussios from Zelinka Priamo Limited, a Senior Associate. I'm pleased to bring forward this application on behalf of the Vision SoHo Alliance Group this evening and with me in attendance this evening is also Ron Rowbottom who is the, the Vice Chair of Vision SoHo Alliance and we also have Jim Sheffield and Tim Wickens of Nicholson Sheffield Architects as well here to address the Committee and able to answer any questions that, that may arise. Firstly, we just want to thank staff for their efforts; there's been a very strong collaboration between staff and the Vision SoHo team. There's been several meetings held in order to bring this application forward for consideration in a very timely fashion. We're very appreciative of their efforts. I'll be, I'll be brief, Mr Maitland has already provided a very excellent overview of the application. It's an application to facilitate the redevelopment of a portion of the Old Victoria hospital lands for residential uses including affordable housing within five new buildings and two existing heritage buildings. An application which is unique, appropriate and necessary. It's unique, to our knowledge it's the first of its kind. The proposed redevelopment is being undertaken by Vision SoHo Alliance which is comprised of six non-profit community-based organizations all with previous development experience in the in the City of London. There are Chelsea Green Home Society, Homes Unlimited, Indwell, which is based out of Hamilton but they're rapidly becoming a prominent affordable housing provider in the community, the Italian Seniors Project, London Affordable Housing Foundation and Zerin Development Corporation. These organizations have joined together with the common goal of providing housing opportunities which are sustainable, accessible and affordable while also integrating the development into the SoHo community in a responsible, comprehensive and coordinated manner. Through the retention and reuse of the existing health services and War Memorial Children's Hospital buildings, the historical and heritage significance of the property and the area is also being preserved as part of the, as part of this development. There has been extensive public engagement through the efforts of the Vision SoHo team including hosting two separate virtual open houses to interested, interested members of the public. Both open houses were well attended, and we were very pleased the overall level of support that was provided for the project. This application is appropriate, the amendments will realize the goals and objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement, both London Official Plans, the Old Victoria Hospital and Secondary Plan which encourages mixed use and residential intensification, a mix of housing types in a compact built form and the integration of heritage buildings to create a diverse and inclusive residential and mixed-use neighborhood. The proposed amendments will respect the current height permissions established for the various areas within the Secondary Plan area and will make efficient use of the lands to provide much needed housing opportunities in the community and lastly it's a necessary application, the amendments are necessary to facilitate the proposed development which will provide approximately six hundred seventy-four housing units of which a minimum of four hundred those units will be affordable housing units and one hundred of those are at least one hundred of those will be deep affordability rates. It is the intent of the Alliance to begin construction as early as 2022 with the goal of completing the project in 2024. Approval of the proposed amendments will assist the City of London in realizing its immediate goal of providing necessary affordable housing units to a wide range of families, individuals and special needs groups in order, in our community in a very timely fashion. We support the staff recommendation to approve the necessary amendments the Official Plan, The London Plan, the Secondary Plan and the Zoning By-law. We have no issue with the staff recommendation to refuse the amendment relating to commercial uses on the ground floor based on the interpretation we heard

this evening that they want to maintain the Policy in its current form and it would not preclude the proposed development. With that Madam Chair and members of the Committee we thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Vision SoHo Alliance. As I've noted before we are available to answer any questions you may have and I thank you again for, for allowing us to speak on their behalf.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for being here. I would like to go to the public if there's anyone here that would like to make a comment please come forward.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Madam Chair, we have Kelley McKeating joining us by Zoom and we do have Wayne Ray in the Committee Room.
- Councillor Hopkins: Just wondering who we should go to first.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: You may wish to go to Ms. McKeating first.
- Councillor Hopkins: Ms. McKeating.
- Kelley McKeating: Thank you. It is Kelley McKeating and I'm speaking both on behalf of myself personally and the Architectural Conservancy of London and I just want to express strong support and enthusiasm for this development proposal and I'm speaking to 3.4 and 3.5 here. The proposal is good for the SoHo neighbourhood, it's good for the greater London community and as a bonus it's good for the conservation of heritage architecture. The proposed new buildings have designs that are sympathetic to the two existing buildings with the scale that's respectful of the two existing heritage buildings. I just wanted to, a lot of the times when ACO London speaking we're opposing things, we're being negative, and this is an opportunity for us to be positive and I wanted to seize that opportunity. Thanks very much.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you very much. I'd like to now go to the committee room 1 and 2. Sir, if you come forward, please. You can state your name and address if you wish and you have up to five minutes.
- Wayne Ray: My name is Wayne Ray and I live at 430 South Street. Through various discussions and two heated ones today we have a few that we think are important points. One I believe was answered, although I'm not clear about the commercial. I'll start with that one. The nearest grocery stores are a mile to a mile and a half way in either direction Oxford and Richmond and I believe Commissioners and Wellington with that amount of traffic coming and going there, is there, is there not a plan for like a large convenience store or small grocery store or even Shoppers Drug Mart that sells food as well? This would cut down on traffic in the area and a lot of the seniors wouldn't have, you know, who can't get out, we'd not have far to go. The main concern is the, at 430 South Street, I believe 40 of the 70 units are of Polish descent, immigrants, after the Second World War. There was no notices in the native language, most of them don't know what's going on, they're having difficulty, you know, reading and speaking English and I tried to talk to several of them and they, they just know there's a building going up, that's the limit of the conversation going. Through several discussions we were wondering why the largest building, eleven stories high, is going to be like within a hundred feet of our building blocking the entire westerly sun where a lot of seniors need sunlight and what's the possibility architecturally of switching the five and the eleven so that the eleven storey overlooks a vacant, hardly used parking lot for the church and five storeys, is would be right beside our and not be that much of an inconvenience for the westerly sun particularly in the winter; it's going to be pretty dark I would think with eleven storey building overshadowing the seniors building. The third point, the final point is, was brought up, is South Street between Colborne and Wellington because of all the, the new traffic and also the new building that's on the south side of South Street will it be converted to two-way traffic between Wellington and Colborne to alleviate cars going past say the seniors building and the next one

over 440, it's the next population with a lot of families. That might be something no one's considered but I think that or we think that we can alleviate a lot of the traffic but our primary concern is this huge building blocking ours. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'll ask one more time if there's anyone here that would like to speak to this recommendation? I see none. We'll go to the Committee to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 370 South Street and 124 Colborne Street (OZ-9418)

- Councillor Hopkins: I'd like to go to staff for a brief presentation. I know we just heard one but this is the site plan process. I would appreciate that. Thank you. Any technical questions of staff? I see none. I would like to go to the applicant.
- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Good evening again Madam Chair. It's Harry Froussios from Zelinka Priamo Limited again, on behalf of the Vision SoHo Alliance and, and again we have in attendance this evening Mr. Ron Rowbottom as well as Jim Sheffield and Mr. Tim Wickens of Nicholson Sheffield to answer any questions of any technical nature. This application, the site plan, is, is really intended to implement the site-specific zoning that was just previously considered a few moments ago by Planning Committee. Again, just want to thank staff for, for working very diligently with us to process the site plan application to bring it forward tonight. We've already received a first round of comments which were working through right now to prepare an exhibition depending on the nature of comments we receive tonight we hope to get that that resubmission very shortly and keep the process moving. At this point in time we have nothing to add. That was a very in-depth presentation provided Mr. Maitland so we're just able to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. Is there anyone here from the public that would like to make a comment?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. McKeating is still on the line.
- Councillor Hopkins: Ms. McKeating? Are you still there? I know she mentioned that her comments.
- Kelley McKeating: Yeah. Thank you. I had my back turned but I don't have, I really did, to me it made sense. I thought I'd be redundant if I spoke twice.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for being here.
- Kelley McKeating: You're probably as hungry as I am so I won't say anything more.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you for being here. Is there anyone else that would like to make a comment to the site plan process on this application? I see none. I will go to Committee to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 3095 and 3105 Bostwick Road (39T-21502 an Z-9322)

- Councillor Hopkins: A brief presentation, it's a brief verbal presentation from our Planner Michael Clark. This is the first time he will be here doing the presentation. Welcome Mr Clark. Thank you, Mr. Clark. Any technical questions of staff? I see none. I'd like to go to the applicant.
- Casey Kulchycki, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Good evening Madam Chair and members of Planning Committee, it's Casey Kulchycki from Zelinka Priamo Limited speaking again. We have reviewed the staff report and we are in agreement with the recommendation to pass the draft plan as shown with conditions. We'd like to thank staff, particularly Michael Clark and Bruce Page for all their hard work on bringing this application forward tonight. We look forward to moving forward with the detailed design of this next phase of the Talbot Village community. I'm available to answer any questions or comments that Planning Committee may have. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'd like to move on to the public now. Is there anyone here? I do not see anyone and I understand there is no one. With that I would like to ask one more time if there is anyone here from the public? I hear and see none. I would like to go to the Committee to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1453 – 1459 Oxford Street East and 648 – 656 Ayerswood Avenue

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. Any technical questions from committee? Councillor Lewis.
- Councillor Lewis: Thank you Madam Chair and through you to our staff I do want to ask in particular about the third reason for refusal in subsection a) which is the sanitary sewer capacity concerns and so through you to our staff I'm wondering if you can provide it an overview of where things are with the sanitary sewers not just for this site specific application but recognizing that this is a rapid transit corridor and very near to a protected, I'm going to get the acronym wrong, so the primary transit corridor area or the primary transit station area. Apologies on getting the acronym wrong. If staff could indicate because I'm concerned if we don't have capacity for one building today in, along a rapid transit corridor how are we going to address a future intensification along this corridor which is one of the primary goals of, of The London Plan and, and of our Secondary Plans in terms of encouraging intensification along designated rapid transit and primary transit corridors so I'm a little concerned to hear that there's not capacity for this today. If I could just ask through you to staff Madame Chair.
- Councillor Hopkins: If I can go to Ms. Maton or Mr. Corby to address the capacity?
- Ismail Abushehada, Manager, Development Engineering, Site Plan: The outlet for this development is two hundred fifty meters at the second road and that one is now, currently, is running at ninety-eight percent capacity. With whatever the development proposed that will bring us to above one hundred percent which is not supported by us or the engineering groups. Again, to answer your question Councillor, about the area, this is mainly for this building and the surrounding but not everything along the, so there are other outlets. My understanding is that our engineering staff they are doing and conducting a very dense study about the area and if there is any upgrade required. I hope I answered your question Councillor.
- Councillor Lewis: Okay. I think and I am just going to summarize really quickly and and make sure that I'm understanding correctly then. Along that corridor between Highbury and, and Fanshawe College along Oxford, my understanding then is that there are multiple different outlets and that the capacity issue is with the outlet in particular that this building would be connecting to is that correct?
- Ismail Abushehada, Manager, Development Engineering: Absolutely. Yes.
- Councillor Lewis: Okay. Thank you for that. That's helpful. That's it for my technical questions.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Councillor Lewis. I see no other technical questions.
- Mayor Holder: Yep. One question if I could Chair, please.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mayor Holder.
- Mayor Holder: Yes. Thank you very much. Ms. Maton indicated that it wasn't within one hundred meters, how far is it, if I could ask, just to get a sense of that distance please.

- Councillor Hopkins: Are you referring to the connection for the sewers?
- Mayor Holder: Chair, Ms. Maton indicated that the property itself was not within one hundred. The property itself, not a sewer station so I'm going down the road a bit here.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'm still on sewers. Ms. Maton.
- Catherine Maton, Senior Planner: Thank you Madam Chair. Through you I'm just going to take an approximate measurement. I don't have an exact figure for that distance; however, the closest station is located at Oxford and London Lane which at the closest point of the site is approximately three hundred meters away.
- Mayor Holder: Thank you for that. That was my question. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'll move on to the applicant.
- Paul Champagne, Red Maple Properties: Hello, can you hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes I can.
- Paul Champagne, Red Maple Properties: Fantastic. Good evening Madam Chair.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes, good evening Mr. Champagne. Just to let you know you have up to five minutes and please proceed.
- Paul Champagne, Red Maple Properties: Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity to bring this application to Planning Committee. I'm here this evening with Mr. Kulchyski and Mr. Froussios from Zelinka Priamo as they will be able to answer any technical questions that Committee may have. I would also like to thank staff for their time and effort on this file. I'll begin by addressing the residential growth neighbourhood where this development is being proposed. It is well recognized that the demand for housing in this neighborhood has been nothing short of explosive. Between 2017 and 2020 Fanshawe College achieved almost twenty eight percent growth in their enrollment; however, over the same period the level of housing stock has grossly failed to keep pace. In fact, virtually no new housing inventory has been added. Looking forward and as documented in the Strategic Mandate Agreement between Fanshawe College and the Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, both the Province and the Collage have entered into an agreement to increase international enrollments by almost two thousand seven hundred students over the five-year period of 2020 to 2025. This translates into a fifty-three percent growth in Fanshawe's current level of international enrollments. To put this in perspective, the rental under the Rental Licensing policy allowed within this neighbourhood the equivalent of eight hundred and eighty-three new houses would need to be constructed in order to meet this demand. Our development will provide relief in the way of six hundred and sixty new beds for the neighbourhood housing inventory. Sadly; however, this development will only meet twenty-three percent of the growth to be realized the next five years. The equivalent of four new developments with the same residential intensity as our proposal is required to accommodate the coming growth and this is without any consideration to the existing shortage within the neighborhood housing stock. More than ever the student sprawl is having a marked impact on the city as more students are being pushed further outwards into non-student neighbourhoods in efforts to find accommodation unlike other generations, Generation Z students bring a unique set of needs and lifestyle preferences, and their housing preferences are just as unique. This demographic is not interested in single family homes, townhouses, condominiums, private apartments or traditional dorms.

Instead, students seek out places to live that offer increased safety and privacy along with smart connected and technology enabled living spaces to enable their studies. In house bike and car sharing services, as well as, in house recycling programs are now the norm along with other amenities which are specifically designed to support their educational studies. Today students seek four- or eight-month tenancy agreements, not one-year leases or leases which are not aligned to their academic calendar. Access to public transportation, proximity to campus and affordability are paramount in the choice of where that used to live and as these three pillars upon which our proposal has been built. When addressing London's housing requirements, we need to distinguish that London doesn't just need greater housing supply but we also need the right type of supply. Our vision for this development utilizes a proven model of purpose-built student accommodation, a model that has been adopted around the world and widely perceived as a preferred housing option for post-secondary education. This form of housing is purposely designed as an affordable alternative housing option with rents typically being two thirds to three quarters the cost of a one-bedroom apartment in the same market. In addition to offering London an alternate form of housing this application also proposes twenty units to be dedicated to the Housing Development Corporation to address the shortage of affordable units in the city. This neighborhood is now in a very precarious situation, a situation of tremendous imbalance between the number of residents and London's ability to create sufficient housing stock. We firmly believe that a recommendation to lower the height and unit count will only be interpreted as a failure in which London did not appropriately respond to the housing needs of the community not only by failing to capitalize on the amount of affordable alternative units the project has to offer but also failing to protect the sustainability of the neighborhood. In closing, Madam Chairperson, we encourage Planning Committee to recognize and think differently about how the Near Campus has grown and what truly is required to protect its health and sustainability. This application offers the opportunity to create new housing for London and relieve some of the pressure in this neighborhood. It is our hope that Committee members here tonight recognize that student accommodation is a very significant component to London's housing crisis sufficiently to stick, to warrant unique consideration. London's housing shortage affects all parts London, but it is even more disproportionate in the Fanshawe campus neighborhood. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Champagne. I'd like to go to the public now. I see there aren't, there's no one on the line and no one in the committee room so I'll ask one more time if there's anyone here from the public that would like to make a comment? I hear and see none. I will go to the Committee to close the public participation meeting.