

Planning and Environment Committee

Report

1st Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
December 13, 2021

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

ALSO PRESENT: PRESENT: Councillor J. Fyfe-Millar; H. Lysynski and J.W. Taylor

REMOTE ATTENDANCE: Councillors M. Hamou and J. Morgan; J. Adema, A. Anderson, G. Barrett, E. Biddanda Pavan, J. Bunn, M. Clark, M. Corby, A. Curtis, S. Dunleavy, K. Edwards, M. Feldberg, M. Greguol, K. Gonyou, J. Hall, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, A. Macpherson, P. Masse, C. Maton, H. McNeely, L. Mottram, B. O'Hagan, A. Pascual, S. Meksula, B. Page, M. Pease, A. Riley, M. Schulthess, S. Tatavarti, M. Tomazincic, M. Vivian, B. Westlake-Power and E. Williamson

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 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. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

1.2 Election of Vice-Chair for the Term ending November 14, 2022

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That Councillor S. Lehman BE ELECTED as Vice-Chair for the term ending November 14, 2022.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2. Consent

Moved by: S. Hillier

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That Items 2.1 to 2.5, inclusive, and 2.7 to 2.11, inclusive, BE APPROVED.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

2.1 355 Middleton Avenue (H-9363)

Moved by: S. Hillier
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 355 Middleton Avenue, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 R5 (h*h-100*h-198*R5-4(23)) and a Holding Residential Special Provision R6 (h*h-100*h-198*R6-5(51)) Zone TO a Residential Special Provision R5 (R5-4(23)) and a Residential Special Provision R6 (R6-5(51)) to remove the h, h-100 and h-198 holding provisions. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.2 890 Upperpoint Avenue (H-9392)

Moved by: S. Hillier
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 890 Upperpoint Avenue, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 R1 (h*R1-4) Zone TO a Residential R1 (R1-4) Zone. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.3 890 Upperpoint Avenue (P-9358)

Moved by: S. Hillier
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 Sifton Properties Ltd., to exempt Block 141, Plan 33M-754 and Block 42, Plan 33M-810 from Part-Lot Control:

- a) pursuant to subsection 50(7) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 BE INTRODUCED at a future Council meeting, to exempt Block 141, Plan 33M-754 and Block 42, Plan 33M-810 from the Part-Lot Control provisions of subsection 50(5) of the said *Act*; it being noted that these lands are subject to registered subdivision agreements and are zoned Holding Residential R1 (h*R1-4) in Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which permits single detached dwellings;
- b) the following conditions of approval BE REQUIRED to be completed prior to the passage of a Part-Lot Control By-law for Block 141, Plan 33M-754 and Block 42, Plan 33M-810 as noted in clause a) above:
 - i) the applicant be advised that the costs of registration of the said by-laws are to be borne by the applicant in accordance with City Policy;
 - ii) the applicant submit a draft reference plan to the Planning and Development for review and approval to ensure the proposed part lots and

- development plans comply with the regulations of the Zoning By-law, prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
- iii) the applicant submits to the City a digital copy together with a hard copy of each reference plan to be deposited. The digital file shall be assembled in accordance with the City of London's Digital Submission / Drafting Standards and be referenced to the City's NAD83 UTM Control Reference;
 - iv) the applicant submit each draft reference plan to London Hydro showing driveway locations and obtain approval for hydro servicing locations and above ground hydro equipment locations prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
 - v) the applicant submit to the Deputy City Manager, Environment and Infrastructure or designate for review and approval prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office; any revised lot grading and servicing plans in accordance with the final lot layout to divide the blocks should there be further division of property contemplated as a result of the approval of the reference plan;
 - vi) the applicant shall enter into any amending subdivision agreement with the City, if necessary;
 - vii) the applicant shall agree to construct all services, including private drain connections and water services, in accordance with the approved final design of the lots;
 - viii) the applicant shall obtain confirmation from the City that the assignment of municipal numbering has been completed in accordance with the reference plan(s) to be deposited, should there be further division of property contemplated as a result of the approval of the reference plan prior to the reference plan being deposited in the land registry office;
 - ix) the applicant shall obtain approval from the City of each reference plan to be registered prior to the reference plan being registered in the land registry office;
 - x) the applicant shall submit to the City, confirmation that an approved reference plan for final lot development has been deposited in the Land Registry Office;
 - xi) the applicant shall obtain clearance from the Deputy City Manager, Environment and Infrastructure that requirements iv), v) and vi) inclusive, outlined above, are satisfactorily completed, prior to any issuance of building permits by the Building Controls Division for lots being developed in any future reference plan;
 - xii) that on notice from the applicant that a reference plan has been registered on a Block, and that Part Lot Control be re-established by the repeal of the bylaw affecting the Lots/Block in question. (2021-D25)

Motion Passed

2.4 1478 Westdel Bourne (H-9411)

Moved by: S. Hillier

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Stantec Consulting c/o Amelia Sloan, relating to lands located at 1478 Westdel Bourne, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 R6/R8 Special Provision (h-54•h-209•R6-5(77)/R8-4(64)) Zone TO a Residential R6/R8 Special Provision (R6-5(77)/R8-4(64)) Zone to remove the holding (h-54 and h-209) provisions. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.5 1235 Fanshawe Park Road West (H-9287)

Moved by: S. Hillier

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Calloway REIT (Fox Hollow) Inc., relating to lands located at 1235 Fanshawe Park Road West, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 R8 Special Provision (h-147•R8-4(39)) Zone and a Holding Residential R8 Special Provision/Associated Shopping Area Commercial Special Provision (h-147•R8-4(40)/ASA3(10)/ASA6(4)/ASA8(5)) Zone TO a Residential R8 Special Provision (R8-4(39)) Zone and a Residential R8 Special Provision/ Associated Shopping Area Commercial Special Provision (R8-4(40)/ASA3(10)/ASA6(4)/ASA8(5)) Zone to remove the holding (h-147) provision. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.7 1225 Hyde Park Road (H-9419)

Moved by: S. Hillier

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Economic Development, based on the application by Motivity Land Incorporated, relating to the property located at 1225 Hyde Park Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 Restricted Service Commercial RSC1, RSC3, and RSC5 (h-17•RSC1/RSC3/RSC5) Zone TO a Restricted Service Commercial RSC1, RSC3, and RSC5 (RSC1/RSC3/RSC5) Zone. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.8 1150 Byron Baseline Road (H-9424)

Moved by: S. Hillier

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Economic Development, based on the application by 2186121 Ontario Incorporated, relating to the property located at 1150 Byron Baseline Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 R5-7 Special Provision (h-5•h-183•R5-7(12)) Zone TO a Residential R5-7 Special Provision (R5-7(12)) Zone. (2021-D09)

Motion Passed

2.9 613 Superior Drive (33M-680)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Economic Development, 2047790 Ontario Inc., the owner of the potential school site located on the south side of Superior Drive, north of Sunningdale Road East, municipally know as 613 Superior Drive and legally described as Block 103 on Registered Plan 33M-641, BE ADVISED that the City has no interest in acquiring the said property for municipal purposes. (2021-D09/S13)

Motion Passed

2.10 59 Albion Street (HAP21-79-L)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* seeking retroactive approval for the use of the NUVO Iron railing system on the front porch of the heritage designated property at 59 Albion Street within the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District, BE APPROVED with the following terms and conditions:

a) any future repair, alterations, or replacement to the railing system require the implementation of the squared wooden spindles approved through HAP21-018-D. (2021-R01)

Motion Passed

2.11 October, 2021 Building Division Monthly Report

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

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

Motion Passed

2.6 Transit-Oriented Secondary Plan Prioritization

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the Transit-Oriented Secondary Plan Priority Areas, appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE ENDORSED. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 876 Wellington Road (Z-9380)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 1985798 Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 876 Wellington Road:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan, (The London Plan, 2016) and the Official Plan for the City of London (1989)), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Highway Service Commercial Special Provision (HS(1)) Zone TO a Highway Service Commercial Special Provision (HS(_)) Zone; and,

b) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed by-law as the change in parking is minor in nature, the existing conditions plan circulated in the Notice of Application and Notice of Revised Application and Notice of Public Meeting accurately reflect the existing condition of the site, and no development or site alteration is proposed;

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

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

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions and Rapid Transit Corridor Place Type;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Auto-Oriented Commercial Corridor designation; and,
- the recommended amendment would facilitate reuse of the existing building with a use that is appropriate for the context of the site. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.2 4270 Lismer Lane (Z-9494)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Goldfield Limited, relating to the property located at 4270 Lismer Lane, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 Holding Residential R8 (h*h-100*h-104*h-198*R8-4) Zone, TO an Holding Residential R5 Special Provision and R8 (h*h-100*h-104*h-198*R5-7()/R8-4 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 zoning by-law amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
- the recommended zoning conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including, but not limited to, the Neighbourhood Place Type, City Building and Design, Our Tools, and all other applicable London Plan policies;
- the recommended zoning conforms to the policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including, but not limited to, the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation; and,
- the zoning will permit development that is considered appropriate and compatible with the existing and future land uses surrounding the subject lands. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.3 1955 Jim Hebb Way (Z-9382)

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, based on the application by Foxwood Developments (London) Inc., relating to the lands located at 1955 Jim Hebb Way, the proposed by-law appended to the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda as Appendix 'A' BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 R5/R6 (h*h-54*h-71*h-100*R5-6/R6-5) Zone, and a Holding Residential R6/R9 (h-54•R6-5/R9-3•H20) Zone TO a Holding Residential Special Provision R5/R6 (h*h-54*h-71*h-100*R5-6(__))/R6-5 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 zoning amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, as it promotes efficient development and land use patterns; accommodates an appropriate range and mix of land uses, housing types, and densities to meet projected needs of current and future residents; and minimizes land consumption and servicing costs;
- the recommended zoning amendment 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 recommended zoning amendment permits a use, form and intensity of residential development that conforms to the in-force policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designations;
- the recommended zoning amendment will allow for a reduced front yard depth of main building on Henrica Avenue, a reduced exterior side yard setback of to the main building on Dyer Drive & Jim Hebb Way and reduced yard encroachments to patio projection from the street line;
- the subject development block is of a size and shape suitable to accommodate the proposal. The recommended zoning amendment provides appropriate regulations to control the use and intensity of the building and ensure a well-designed development with appropriate mitigation measures; and,
- the proposed uses, form, and intensity are considered appropriate and compatible with existing residential development in the surrounding neighbourhood. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner
Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman
Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.4 506 Oxford Street East (OZ-9397)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Sidhu McDowall Medicine Professional Corporation, relating to the property located at 506 Oxford Street East:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021, as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 2021, to amend the 1989 Official Plan to ADD a new policy to Section 10.1.3 – "Policies for Specific Areas" to a pharmacy on the subject lands; and,

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021, as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 2021, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan as amended in part a) above), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R3/Office Conversion (R3-1/OC5) Zone TO a Residential R3/Office Conversion Special Provision (R3-1/OC5(*)) 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 amendments are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, for mixed use development within transit supportive areas;

- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including the Key Directions and the Urban Corridor Place Type; and,
- the recommended amendment conforms with the 1989 Official Plan, including permitting convenience commercial in mixed use areas and the criteria for specific area policies. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.5 1408 Ernest Avenue (Z-9385)

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning & Development, based on the application by Paner House Inc., relating to the property located at 1408 Ernest Avenue, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021, as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 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 Restricted Office (RO2) Zone TO a Residential R8 Special Provision (R8-4()) 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 the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;

- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the *Neighbourhood Place Type policies;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation;
- the recommended amendment would facilitate reuse of the existing building with a use that is appropriate for the context of the site; and,
- the subject lands represent an appropriate location for intensification in the form of an apartment building, at an intensity that is appropriate for the site and surrounding area. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

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

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.6 978 Gainsborough Road (Z-9247)

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

That the application by Highland Communities Limited, relating to the property located at 978 Gainsborough Road BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration for further consideration;

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

- the staff presentation;
- a communication dated December 8, 2021 from H. Froussios, Senior Associate, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.; and,
- a communication dated December 6, 2021 from M. Niglas;

it being further 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, S. Lehman, S. Turner, 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, S. Lehman, S. Turner, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.7 414-418 Old Wonderland Road (SPA20-103)

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Four Fourteen Inc., relating to the property located at 414-418 Old Wonderland Road:

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 facilitate the construction of the proposed residential development; and,

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council has no issues with respect to the Site Plan Application, and that 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 this matter;

it being further 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 Site Plan, as proposed, is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, as it provides for development within an existing settlement area and provides for an appropriate range of residential uses within the neighbourhood;

- the proposed Site Plan conforms to the policies of the Neighbourhoods Place Type and all other applicable policies of The London Plan;
- the proposed Site Plan conforms to the Multi-family, Medium Density Residential designation of the 1989 Official Plan;
- the proposed Site Plan conforms to the regulations of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law; and,
- the proposed Site Plan meets the requirements of the Site Plan Control By-law. (2021-D09)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Turner
 Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

3.8 Environmental Management Guidelines

Moved by: S. Lehman
 Seconded by: S. Turner

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the Environmental Management Guidelines Update:

a) the Environmental Management Guidelines appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix 1 to Appendix "A", BE ADOPTED as a Municipal Guideline Document; and,

b) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on December 21, 2021 to adopt the Environmental Management Guidelines, appended to the staff report dated December 13, 2021, in accordance with London Plan policy 1713;

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

- a communication dated December 2, 2021, from S. Franke, Executive Director, London Environmental Network;
- a communication dated December 2, 2021, from J. Hanbuch, The

Urban League of London;

- a communication dated December 6, 2021, from B. Samuels, Member, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee; Coordinator, London Bird Team and PhD Candidate, Department of Biology, The University of Western Ontario;
- a communication dated December 4, 2021, from D. Wake, Nature London; and,
- a communication dated December 9, 2021, from M. Wallace, Executive Director, London Development Institute;

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-D03)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

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

Motion to add a new part c) which reads as follows:

c) the bi-annual review as outlined in the Environmental Management Guidelines BE ADDED to the Planning and Environment Committee Deferred Matters List;

Yeas: (3): A. Hopkins , S. Turner, and S. Hillier

Nays: (3): S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Holder

Motion Failed (3 to 3)

3.9 50 King Street - Demolition Request

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

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the demolition request for the heritage designated property at 50 King Street, located in the Downtown Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED pursuant to Section 42(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* subject to the following terms and conditions:

- a) prior to any demolition, photographic documentations and measured drawings of the existing building at 50 King Street be completed by the property owner and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director, Planning and Development.
- b) prior to any demolition, a demolition plan shall be prepared by the property owner and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director, Planning and Development demonstrating how the heritage attributes of adjacent cultural heritage resources are conserved, mitigating any potential direct or indirect adverse impacts, and implementing the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted as part of the demolition request, it being noted that should an area(s) identified as requiring further archaeological assessment be included within the work area for the demolition of the existing building at 50 King Street, further archaeological assessment shall be required;
- c) prior to any demolition, a landscape plan shall be prepared by the property owner and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director, Planning and Development identifying work required to create a grass lawn on the property as an interim condition until any future redevelopment. No additional commercial and/or accessory parking will be permitted on the property as an interim use prior to the redevelopment of the property. The landscape plan should identify the cost of the work for the purpose of calculating a landscape security;
- d) a security for landscape be taken to ensure condition c) is implemented within an appropriate timeframe;
- e) prior to demolition, the plaques commemorating the opening of the Middlesex Municipal Building in 1959 and 50 King Street in 1986 be salvaged by the property owner; and,
- f) efforts to commemorate the Middlesex Municipal Building and the Court House Block be addressed through any future Heritage Impact Assessment required for the site and integrated into any landscape plans for the broader site;

it being noted that a separate Heritage Impact Assessment will be required as part of a future planning application for the property and Heritage Alteration Permit approval will be required before the issuance of a Building Permit;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated December 8, 2021, from K. McKeating, President, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, London Region, with respect to this matter;

it being further 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-R01/P10D)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Turner

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

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

Absent: (1): E. Holder

Motion Passed (5 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 1st Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 10th report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on December 1, 2021:

a) the following comments, from the Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE), BE FORWARDED to the Municipal Council through the Planning and Environment Committee for consideration, with respect to the Wharnccliffe Road South Expansion and 100 Stanley Street Relocation:

- the ACE recommends that the Wharnccliffe Road South Improvements project explore every possible avenue to avoid road widening to provide more traffic lanes for motor vehicles; it being noted that there are a number of alternative methods that provide better traffic flow and improved options outside of driving one's own personal vehicle (public transit, cycling, walking, etc.) and making this stretch the first of many projects to turn a stroad into proper transportation infrastructure;
- the ACE recommends that the Civic Administration be directed by Municipal Council to revisit the issue of moving the property located at 100 Stanley Street and to find a way to move the house across the street; and,
- the ACE encourages that, as we are in a climate crisis and have declared a climate emergency ourselves, means we must do everything possible to mitigate negative environmental impacts, for example demolishing homes and making room for more motor vehicles, is the exact antitheses to this declaration; and,

b) clauses 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2, inclusive, 3.1, 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4, inclusive, BE RECEIVED for information.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4.2 9th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

That the 9th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on November 24, 2021 BE RECEIVED for information.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

4.3 Request for Council Resolution, under Section 45(1.4) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13 - 1919-1929 Oxford Street West

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the property located at 1919-1929 Oxford Street West:

a) on the recommendation of the City Clerk, the report dated December 13, 2021 and entitled "Request for Council Resolution, under section 45(1.4) of the *Planning Act, 1990, c. P.13* - 1919-1929 Oxford Street West" BE RECEIVED for information; and,

b) the request to accept a Minor Variance application relating to the property located at 1919-1929 Oxford Street West BE APPROVED. (2021-D13)

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

5.1 Deferred Matters List

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development BE DIRECTED to provide current information related to the items on the Deferred Matters List to the Committee Clerk in order to update the List.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

5.2 (ADDED) 1st Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Moved by: E. Holder

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 1st Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from its meeting held on December 8, 2021:

a) on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the demolition request for the heritage designated property located at 50 King

Street, located in the Downtown Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED pursuant to Section 42(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act subject to the following terms and conditions:

- prior to any demolition, photographic documentations and measured drawings of the existing building at 50 King Street be completed by the property owner and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development;
- prior to any demolition, a demolition plan shall be prepared by the property owner and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director, Planning and Development demonstrating how the heritage attributes of adjacent cultural heritage resources are conserved, mitigating any potential direct or indirect adverse impacts, and implementing the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted as part of the demolition request, it being noted that should an area(s) identified as requiring further archaeological assessment be included within the work area for the demolition of the existing building at 50 King Street, further archaeological assessment shall be required;
- prior to any demolition, a landscape plan shall be prepared by the property owner and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director, Planning and Development identifying work required to create a grass lawn on the property as an interim condition until any future redevelopment; no additional commercial and/or accessory parking will be permitted on the property as an interim use prior to the redevelopment of the property; the landscape plan should identify the cost of the work for the purpose of calculating a landscape security;
- a security for landscape be taken to ensure the condition above is implemented within an appropriate timeframe;
- prior to demolition, the plaques commemorating the opening of the Middlesex Municipal Building in 1959 and 50 King Street in 1986 be salvaged by the property owner; and,
- efforts to commemorate the Middlesex Municipal Building and the Court House Block be addressed through any future Heritage Impact Assessment required for the site and integrated into any landscape plans for the broader site;

it being noted that a separate Heritage Impact Assessment will be required as part of a future planning application for the property and Heritage Alteration Permit approval will be required before the issuance of a Building Permit;

it being further noted that the site is an important cultural heritage landscape and should continue to be part of an institutional and public realm landscape in the Downtown Heritage Conservation District;

b) on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act seeking retroactive approval for the use of the NUVO Iron railing system on the front porch of the heritage designated property located at 59 Albion Street, within the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District, BE APPROVED with the following term and condition:

- any future repair, alterations, or replacement to the railing system require the implementation of the squared wooden spindles approved through HAP21-018-D;

it being noted that the communication, as appended to the Added Agenda, from C. Siemens, with respect to this matter, was received; and,

c) clauses 1.1, 2.1 to 2.4 inclusive, 3.1, 4.3, 4.4 and 5.1 BE RECEIVED for information.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

6. Confidential (Enclosed for Members Only)

6.1 Solicitor-Client Privilege / Litigation or Potential Litigation

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the Planning and Environment Committee convene, In Closed Session, for the purpose of considering the following item:

This report can be considered in a meeting closed to the public as the subject matter being considered pertains to advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose from the solicitor and officers and employees of the Corporation; the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation with respect to an appeal at the Ontario Land Tribunal (“OLT”), and for the purpose of providing instructions and directions to officers and employees of the Corporation.

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

Motion Passed (6 to 0)

The Planning and Environment Committee convenes, in Closed Session, from 7:43 PM to 8:35 PM.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 PM.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 876 Wellington Road (Z-9380)

- Councillor Hopkins: With that I would like to go to Committee Members on this zoning change. Oh. Sorry. There is no presentation. I would like to go to the public, the applicant. Is the applicant here?
- Casey Kulchycki, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: They are. Good afternoon, Madam Chair. My name is Casey Kulchycki, Senior Planner with Zelinka Priamo Ltd. Good afternoon to yourself, Committee Members, members of the public and staff. I just want, just for some without the staff presentation, maybe being proactive and maybe addressing some of Committee's questions, this application is to permit a service trade use on the subject lands and more specifically it's to permit a plumbing and heating establishment, a local firm, Mike Pope Plumbing and Heating. You may have seen their white trucks while you have been sitting in traffic throughout the city. They're a local firm, multi-generational, and they are seeking a zoning change so that they can relocate their growing establishment to the subject lands. We've reviewed the staff report, we're in agreement with the recommendation that is before Planning Committee. I'm on hand to address any questions or comments from Planning Committee as well as Adam and Carly Pope, the owners of Mike Pope Plumbing are also on hand to address any operational questions. We thank you for your time this afternoon and look forward to your decision. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak to this application? I see none. I'll ask one more time if there's anyone from the public who would like to speak? With that I would like to go to Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 4270 Lismer Lane (Z-9494)

- Councillor Hopkins: Committee Members this is a zoning change to facilitate townhouses. There is not a presentation from staff but I would like to go to the applicant if the applicant is here?
- Scott Allen, MHBC Planning: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. My name is Scott Allen. I'm with MHBC Planning. At this time we would like to express our support for the findings and the recommendations of the Planning staff report that was prepared by Ms. Curtis. As discussed in that report, the intent of the application is to add a site specific R5-7 Zone to 4270 Lismer Lane to permit a 66 unit cluster townhouse development within this block of the Emily Carr subdivision. I'll just briefly speak to the merits of the application in respect of the report. We agree with the conclusion set out in that report that the proposed zoning, rezoning is consistent with the planning policies, compatible with surrounding development context and will encourage greater housing choice in the community. These findings reflect our, our planning justification report that was submitted in support of the application as well. To conclude we would like to thank city staff for their attention to this application and with approval of this proposal our client is looking to move forward with the site plan approval application shortly and hoping to initiate some development this Spring. Thank you and I'll gladly answer any questions Committee Members may have.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Allen. I'd like to go to the public now if there's anyone here from the public that would like to make comments to this application? I hear and see none. I will ask one more time if there's anyone here from the public who would like to make comments to this application? I hear and see none so with that I would like to go to Committee Members and looking to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1955 Jim Hebb Way (Z-9382)

- Councillor Hopkins: I'll ask staff for a brief presentation on this zoning application. Thank you, Mr. Meksula. If, are there any technical questions of staff from the Committee Members? I see none. I'd like to move on to the applicant if the applicant is here?
- Jay McGuffin, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants: Good afternoon, Madam Chair. Jay McGuffin, Principal Planner, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants. I'm here representing Foxwood Developments (London) Inc., the applicant in this matter and I'm also joined by the Vice-President of Foxwood, Ms. Corri Marr, she is on the line as well. I'd like to thank Sean and staff for the recommendations in the report. We've had a chance to review the report and confer with Mr. Meksula. The amended report and by-law that is attached we're in support and favour of. It is consistent with the application and the planning justification report that we provided. Just wanted to also mention that we, subsequent to receiving comments from the community, held a privately initiated community engagement meeting on the 1st of November. We had five residents of the community attend where we were able to answer questions that they had on the development proposal and provide detailed information in terms of the specificity of the land use that was being asked for, what the purpose of the amendment was in terms of the relief being requested on the yards and what the overall design intent was. Following that, those are our submissions Madam Chair, we are available to respond to any questions of Committee or the public.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. McGuffin for being here. With that I'd like to go to the public if there's anyone here that would like to speak to this application? I hear and see no one. I will ask one more time if there's anyone here from the public that would like to make comments on this application? With that I will go to Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 506 Oxford Street East (OZ-9397)

- Councillor Hopkins: This is a, we are adding a new policy here. There are no changes to the building. There is no presentation. I would like to go to the applicant if the applicant is here and would like to make some comments.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Good afternoon, Madam Chair. It's Matt Campbell from Zelinka Priamo Ltd. here. I don't have anything to add to the staff report that has already been prepared. We are certainly in support of the staff recommendation for approval. For the Committee's consideration what we are looking at here is a Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a pharmacy in an existing building that has been converted from a previous residential use to a partly commercial use. There is still a unit on the upper floor. This is in an area of Oxford Street that has quite seen, quite a bit of office conversions, medical/dental office conversions and uses of that nature and is generally in keeping with those uses. Madam Chair, as you mentioned there is no physical change to the building that has been proposed at this time and we understand this is not subject to site plan approval. Again, the intent here is to permit a pharmacy on the main floor of the dwelling and that pharmacy is more or less a spin off use of some of the other medical/dental offices that are in the immediate area. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to respond to them as necessary. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Campbell. I see Councillor Turner has a question. Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you Madam Chair. Just a quick technical question to Mr. Campbell. In the public engagement one of the property neighbours had some concerns about shared driveway and the parking and some previous damage from the previous patrons of that, have there been any discussions with the adjacent property owners to try and reconcile those concerns?
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Through the Chair to Councillor Turner, thanks for the question. It's a great question. I can advise that my client has engaged the services of a surveyor to actually determine where the lot line is and they are currently working out exactly the issue of the shared driveway. That is an issue that we're actively on top of and trying to find an amicable way to deal with that issue. Thanks for the question.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'd like to go now to the public if there's anyone that would like to make a comment on this application.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Serge Babenko.
- Serge Babenko: Hi there. Yes. Thank you for allowing me to pose a question. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes Mr. Babenko. Please proceed you have up to five minutes.
- Serge Babenko: Okay. Thank you. Just a quick question. I'm a neighbour close by so I received the document. I live on St. James Street. My question is, is this pharmacy a pharmacy that is typically open to the public or is this more of the type of pharmacy, a private pharmacy dedicated to the clients of the doctor's office?

- Councillor Hopkins: We can follow up after the public participation meeting Mr. Babenko and get you an answer to your question. Is there anything else that you would like to ask or comment?
- Serge Babenko: For me and some other neighbours we were just wondering is this, in fact, a change of use to provide it to be a clinic? More of a medical clinic for those who are, for someone who is, like those other clinics in London that have popped up to deal with that need.
- Councillor Hopkins: We'll get an answer to your question. Is there anything else that you would like to say?
- Serge Babenko: No.
- Councillor Hopkins: No.
- Serge Babenko: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak to this application?
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: I don't see him on the Zoom. Jason Parker are you available?
- Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk: Madam Chair, I can confirm that that person has not come in through Zoom.
- Councillor Hopkins: Okay. With that I'll ask if there's anyone else from the public that would like to make a comment? I hear and see none. I will go to Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1408 Ernest Avenue (Z-9385)

- Councillor Hopkins: With that there is not a staff presentation on this application. It is a conversion from a commercial to residential. I would like to go to the applicant if the applicant is here.
- Jay McGuffin, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants: Good evening, Madam Chair. Jay McGuffin again, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants here on behalf of our client Wagdy Botros who is also in attendance this evening with his architect. This is a fairly simple application. It's an existing commercial building in a, at this point, in the 1989 Official Plan, medium family, medium density residential designation. The proposal is its conversion to residential zoning to allow for the development of nineteen or eighteen residential units on the interior, nine on each floor and a provision of sixty-four parking spaces in the existing parking lot to the rear of the building. Through our planning submission, our clients' architect presented renderings of the redeveloped proposal taking the two-story building and converting it using a glass façade for the improvements to the building providing pedestrian connections to the surrounding street, sidewalk and maintaining the existing built form. The London Plan also designates the residential lands for development through the Neighbourhoods place type and the requested zoning is looking for basically the acknowledgement of the existing setbacks in place four meters, sorry I am just skipping to exactly what we are looking for, four meters for the front yard and four meters to the interior side yard to represent the existing building on the property. To rezone the land it would be in to an R8-4 Special Zone. That is, we are in support of the staff recommendation for approval of the application. We've had an opportunity to review the proposed draft Zoning By-law and concur with the recommendations as they are consistent with our application and planning justification report. I will be available to answer any questions of Committee or the public. Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. McGuffin. Any technical questions from Committee Members? Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Thanks Madam Chair. Just a couple of quick ones. It looks like this is basically using the existing form. Is there a requirement for site plan on this or are we just doing the rezoning and that is all that is required because it is using the same footprint?
- Councillor Hopkins: If I can go to staff on that? Do we need a site plan for this?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair no site plan approval is required for this.
- Councillor Hopkins: Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Okay. Thanks. That leads to the second question. There were two comments from Urban Design, one was with respect to private amenity space, it looks like that might be difficult to accomplish. I am not sure if Mr. McGuffin has an opportunity to comment on that. The second one was that pedestrian connection from the rear to the sidewalk to allow for those connectivity's instead of just to the parking lot. Are those things that can be accommodated or contemplated?
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. McGuffin.
- Jay McGuffin, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants: Through you Madam Chair to Member Turner, absolutely. I would be speaking out of turn; however, I think I

would have to ask our client's architect to speak in regard to the design related matters. Certainly, from a physical perspective, the installation of the sidewalk is not an issue. There are sidewalks that have been proposed as part of the development submission that extend to the entryways to the various units that will be ground oriented.

- Councillor Turner: Through you Madam Chair thank you Mr. McGuffin. I think the other question probably answers itself but just looking at the proposed form there's probably no opportunities for balconies or anything like that as recommended in the Urban Design comments. Is there any opportunity for any amenity space for the residents of this building?

- Jay McGuffin, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants: Through you Madam Chair there is quite a lot of amenity space. Pre-consultation meeting notes may have been on a different variation of this particular application so the plan that was put forward does provide a significant amount of amenity space both before and after the existing building and then a larger open green space at the back of the building as well so there is a fair amount of green space provided on the site.

- Councillor Hopkins: Councillor Turner.

- Councillor Turner: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I'll go to Councillor Hillier. We are right now on technical questions of the applicant.

- Councillor Hillier: Yes. Thank you. Just to continue the line that Councillor Turner was running with, I'm looking at this and it's showing sixty-four parking spaces and I understand when it was a commercial building it did require that many. Has any thought been given to increasing the green space amenity location because I don't think, I'm looking at eighteen units, that sixty-four spaces, that's a lot of spaces for eighteen units.

- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. McGuffin.

- Jay McGuffin, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants: Thank you Madam Chair. To Councillor Hillier there is a subsequent development proposal being considered going forward for the intensification of the rear portion of the property. That was my comment back to Mr. Turner in the pre-consultation some of the comments provided addressed a more densely developed site plan than the one that was actually landed on and coming forward. There will be an opportunity for intensification on the remainder of the property. At this point in time there has been no consideration in terms of reducing the number of parking spaces should the proponent decide not to proceed with an intensification at the rear of the property in the future then I would anticipate that there would be such a requirement or an ability, pardon me, terms of reducing the amount of parking.

- Councillor Hopkins: Councillor Hillier.

- Councillor Hillier: Yes, thank you. First of all, in case of intensification in the rear of this property how many parking spaces have been allocated for this unit?

- Jay McGuffin, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants: I believe your requirement is one point five spaces per unit so sixteen units times one point five is twenty-four units.

- Councillor Hillier: Okay. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I see no other questions from Committee Members. Technical only. I would like to go now to the public. Is there's anyone here from the public that would like to make comments on this application? I see none. I will ask one more time. If there anyone here that would like to speak, please come forward. I see none. I will go to Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 978 Gainsborough Road (Z-9247)

- Councillor Hopkins: Committee Members I know there has been a request for a referral here, but I would like to proceed with the public participation meeting that we have on hand. We do have a, maybe, a staff presentation. If I can go to staff to proceed. Thank you, Ms. Riley. Any technical questions from Committee Members? Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Just a quick one. I think Ms. Riley might have mentioned it at the beginning but Mr. Froussios submitted a letter asking for a deferral and indicated that staff was supportive of that. Is, could I just get confirmation of that?
- Alanna Riley, Senior Planner: Through you Madam Chair staff is supportive of the deferral.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I see no other technical questions. I will move on to the applicant.
- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. It's Harry Froussios, Senior Associate with Zelinka Priamo Ltd. before you this evening on behalf of Highland Communities. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak on behalf of my client this afternoon. I'll be brief. I just wanted to start off by thanking staff for their efforts. Unfortunately, we don't always agree with staff, with the recommendations. The recommendation before you is proof of that but we certainly recognize and appreciate their efforts in processing these applications, especially under the challenging times that we are still faced with over the last couple of years. The request for referral before you this evening is to allow more discussion with staff regarding a revised development proposal for the subject lands and includes some element of bonusing in exchange for community benefits such as affordable housing. As was mentioned, the site is currently designated in the 1989 Official Plan and is zoned to permit a high-rise apartment building up to fifty meters, approximately fifteen storeys high and a density of up to one hundred fifty units per hectare. Based on the City's desire for the creation of more affordable housing units in our community, our client saw this as an opportunity to increase the height and density permissions for these lands in exchange for affordable housing units as well as public daycare space and contributions for local park improvements. As we're all aware, the principle mechanism currently in place to secure affordable housing from the private development community is through bonusing of additional height and/or density beyond what the current OP Official Plan policies and zoning allow for and while our current, our client currently remains willing to provide these community benefits as part of the ultimate development scheme for these lands it should be noted that there is no requirement to provide any of these benefits under the current zoning permissions. We acknowledge and appreciate staff's efforts on this application. It was pointed out to us early in the process that the proposed height might not be supported and through subsequent back and forth discussions there was no indication that any level of intensification or bonusing could be supported and that it would ultimately be left up to Council to either support it or refer it back for more discussion; however, based on recent events and outcomes of a similar application that was brought forward by our firm we are hesitant to proceed with a PEC recommendation on that basis and feel that more discussions are warranted to give, prior to PEC providing a recommendation on this application. Notwithstanding staff's recommendation to refuse the current design, we believe there is merit in having more discussions with staff to come up with a revised design that would allow our client to

achieve some additional intensification that is in keeping with existing high rise built form in the area and still be able to provide the city with the community benefits that have been mentioned. I want to thank staff for taking the time over this past week to discuss this matter with us more thoroughly and agreed to work with us towards providing an appropriate development scheme and avoid what I believe is a missed opportunity to provide a benefit to both the city and our client. We are confident that a mutually agreed upon development proposal can be reached and we look forward to Planning Committee's referral of the application back to staff. Again, Madam Chair thank you for the time to present on behalf of our client and I'm able to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you and I would like to move on to Councillor Turner. Technical questions.
- Councillor Turner: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. Perhaps through you to Mr. Froussios it's my understanding that affordable housing could be incorporated into any building design and an applicant could work with the Housing Development Corporation to incorporate that. Why does that need to be in the context of bonusing?
- Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Through you Madam Chair that, it's one of the mechanisms that is available to us right now to encourage affordable housing. I mean this development could have affordable housing regardless of the bonusing approach but it wasn't something that we have brought forward on behalf of this client or other clients as sort of an opportunity to be able to get more intensity on a property in exchange for the affordable housing units.
- Councillor Turner: Thank you.
- Councillor Hopkins: Councillor Turner.
- Councillor Turner: Okay. Thanks. That leads to the second question. There were two comments from Urban Design, one was with respect to private amenity space, it looks like that might be difficult to accomplish. I am not sure if Mr. McGuffin has an opportunity to comment on that. The second one was that pedestrian connection from the rear to the sidewalk to allow for those connectivity's instead of just to the parking lot. Are those things that can be accommodated or contemplated?
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. I see no other questions from Committee. I would like to go to the public if there's anyone here from the public that would like to make comments on this application. I would like to go to Committee Rooms 1 and 2. Please come forward, keeping your mask on and just if you can give us your name and address if you wish and you have up to five minutes. Please proceed.
- Paul Rachar, 1030 Coronation Drive: I don't represent the Board necessarily or anybody on the Board or others in the building but my unit looks directly over the proposed development and I look over that property and to me everything that they say that they want out of here and reduced spaces and stuff like that like I just and I look at their planned development and I say they are trying to shoe horn a size nine foot into a size six shoe basically. There's no room for this place and when they built that commercial development just off Gainsborough to the North I remember they hauled in a real large amount of granular fill before they built the building and they pushed all the water to the South and the property parcel that we're talking about is basically a swamp right now so I can imagine only that they'd have to haul in a bunch of more fill and that to build this structure, a super high structure. The drainage, this water, is it going to get pushed back onto our property now? What kind of access are they looking at to get to this place off of Coronation or wherever, off of Gainsborough I don't know how they get to it but in any event all of the setback concessions that the city might be considering to me I just can't see it. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you sir and we did not get your name. If you could just come forward to the microphone again and state your name please.
- Paul Rachar: Paul R a c h a r.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Rachar. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to make a comment on this application? I'll ask one more time if there's anyone else from the public that would like to make comments please come forward. I see none so I will go to the Committee to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 414-418 Old Wonderland Road (SPA20-103)

- Councillor Hopkins: I will look to staff for a brief presentation. I know when this came to us originally it was a bit contentious, and I think it will warrant a brief presentation. Thank you, Ms. Vivian. Any technical questions? I see none. I will go to the applicant if the applicant is here.
- Colin McClure: Hello Madam Chair. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes Mr. McClure.
- Yes. Colin McClure with 414. I don't have a whole lot to add to Melanie Vivian's presentation there. I think she has addressed all of the major concerns appropriately and I'm just happy to be on the invite here and to answer any questions that yourself or members of the Committee or the public might have. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. McClure. Any technical questions? I see none I will go to the public. If there's anyone here from the public that would like to make comments. I hear and see none. I'll ask one more time. If there's anyone that would like to make comments to this application. I see none. With that I will go to Committee members. Councillor Turner to close the PPM.
- Councillor Turner: Madam Chair, if I may. I see somebody identified for 3.7 Harry Goossens. Is he with the applicant or is he one of the community members?
- Harry Goossens: I am with the applicant.
- Councillor Turner: Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to be sure.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. With that I would like to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.8 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Environmental Management Guidelines

- Councillor Hopkins: I would like to go to staff for a presentation. Thank you, Ms. Williamson. I'd like to go to Committee Members if they've got any technical questions for staff? I see none. I would like to now go to the public.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Sandy Levin, Chair, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Levin. Welcome.
- Sandy Levin, Chair, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee: Thank you Madam Chair and Members of Committee. I want to start by thanking staff for being involved and leading this very extensive process but it's the right process for a document that is important to the municipality in so many ways and I encourage you to adopt this guideline document. The other piece that I'd like to recommend that the Committee add to the recommendation is that the bi-annual update that's referred to in the staff report be added to your deferred list. Having been around as long as I have, I know that once it's on a deferred list it then gets the attention it deserves. I know staff have already put it into their work plan for 2023 but I think it would be appropriate for this Committee to add it to its deferred list. Other than that, Madam Chair, again I want to thank staff, the consultants, we've come a long way and it might be a precedent that both EEPAC and LDI are in the same place. We urge you to adopt and we look forward to the bi-annual review. Thank you, Madam Chair.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Brendon Samuels.
- Brendon Samuels: Hi. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes.
- Brendon Samuels: Excellent. Thanks. Sorry I'm just calling from the road. I want to echo Sandy's comments. I have been working with EEPAC on the review of the Environmental Management Guidelines for a few years now. I want to thank staff for all of the work that they did and for including us in the process. The guidelines definitely strengthen protection for the natural heritage system compared to their 2007 predecessor. I would urge the Planning Committee to adopt the current draft of the Environmental Management Guidelines. I would also suggest that given that we are incorporating the language into the guidelines we're not going to know how effective the updated input is until the guidelines are put in place so I would suggest that it be recommended that this be revisited in the future and that the regular follow-up from staff to comment on how the implementation of the updated guideline is going. I would also like to ask the city if they can verify with staff the nature of a certain piece of the guidelines specifically the use of citizen science data. I included a letter in the meeting agenda about why this is important. In Appendix C, Data Collection Standards, it says "It is recommended that reputable citizen science data sources, such as iNaturalists and the Ontario Reptile and Amphibian Atlas, be reviewed when conducting a background review to supplement data obtained by the consultant team." I would like to clarify whether this means that reviewing citizen science data sources is optional or if it is expected and required. The reason this is important is because when consultants go out and do studies they only get a snapshot of what exists in a given study area. The species that are present, the features and function and there are now with today's technology databases contributed by the public we have records

going back many years [inaudible]. I would like to clarify whether reviewing those data sets is something that is expected of [inaudible] because I think it would only contribute more data to make these studies [inaudible]. Thank you.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Samuels.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Mike Wallace.
- Councillor Hopkins: Mr. Wallace welcome.
- Mike Wallace, London Development Institute: It's Mike Wallace I'm the representative of LDI. I've been here many times. I wore my green tie tonight because environmental guidelines I thought I would look the part at least any way. Listen, I am also here, there was a letter we put forward in support of the guidelines as presented to be adopted. First of all I also want to thank staff they did include us and the Home Builders Association actively in discussing the present guidelines, future guidelines, the guidelines that you see in front of you. I'm assuming Emily Williamson will be glad she won't be hearing from me again for a while. I do appreciate all of the effort that went into this because these guidelines were from 2007, that's 15 years ago. There's a lot of work involved, you had obviously the issues with the Covid challenge and making sure we got this done so we do appreciate that. A few things in here that we do appreciate, let's be frank, we didn't agree with everything that's in here. I have ten pages of changes that we wanted that we didn't get, we got some of them but there were things we wanted but what was missing and what we are looking for is what the previous speakers talked about is an opportunity to review this and it's every other year at this point and as we review the Design Manual I don't know if you know this but we reviewed the Design Manual every year. We think this kind of document, these are guidelines that need to be, that are going to be part of The London Plan. They need to be reviewed, science changes and we need to make sure we know what's working and what isn't working. We are fully supportive of protecting and helping the natural heritage in London. This document affects our industry 100%. We are the implementers of the Design Guidelines. The development, it says right in there, it's for development, it's for the development community on how they should operate with the natural heritage that is here in London. We like the changes that are happening in terms of there's an opportunity for compensation that wasn't in the previous document, there are improvements to monitoring. We are supportive, not necessarily agreeing with everything but we are supportive of an update that was well overdue. We appreciate staff's effort; we appreciate the recognition that this needs to be done on a more regular basis and I can guarantee we will be at the table giving you our input as we did this time and again thank you for putting this together and making it happen and we look forward to working with you guys in the future. Thanks.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Wallace. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to make a comment? I see none. I will ask one more time if there's anyone from the public that would like to make comments? I see none. With that Committee I would like to close the public participation meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.9 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 50 King Street – Demolition Request

- Councillor Hopkins: I will look to staff for a brief presentation. Thank you, Mr. Gonyou. Any technical questions from Committee Members? I see none. I will go to the applicant. If the applicant is not here, I would like to go to the public.
- Heather Lysynski, Committee Clerk: Kelley McKeating.
- Kelley McKeating, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, London Region: Thank you. You can hear me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes, we can.
- Kelley McKeating, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, London Region: Okay. The mandate of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario is to work to protect the best examples of Ontario's architectural heritage and also to protect its places of natural beauty and specific to London region, that is what ACO London works towards. The building at 50 King Street, excuse me, is not as Mr. Gonyou said, it's not an outstanding example of architecture, of any era even though it does have some important municipal and county significance. We're expecting that both this Committee and Council will accept the staff's recommendation to approve the demolition request and we don't object to that but what we would like to state our support for is the staff's recommendation to require an appropriate temporary landscape plan. The County Courthouse is a beautiful building surrounded by grass, surrounded by trees and that parklike setting would be detracted from if there was a parking lot or something put in place of that building so hopefully that condition will be put on the demolition application. The other thing that the ACO would like to ask about is in the past City Council has on occasion made an approved site plan for replacement building a condition for the demolition. That's probably not something that Council would be interested in entertaining at this juncture given the uncertainty of the timeline given the property owner's plans for that site but just in general I wanted to remind that that has been done in the past. I thank you for listening to my comments.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Ms. McKeating. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak to this demolition request? I hear and see none. With that I would like to go to Committee Members to close the public participation meeting.