

**From:** Dustin Gosnell  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 19, 2022 1:46 PM  
**To:** Maitland, Leif <[lmaitlan@london.ca](mailto:lmaitlan@london.ca)>; Turner, Stephen <[sturner@london.ca](mailto:sturner@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: 345 sylvan st

Yes please forward all comments and correspondence. In regards to the easement in 1956 there is a charge that refers to transfer of easement. Not sure if that confirms anything. As a kid I always played back there the Neighbour's always referred to that area as an easement. Also there are telephone poles that run through there as well. Any explanation for the trees not being shown on drawings? Considering that the intended occupants of the proposed Development are coming out of homelessness. Therefor. higher rates of drug addiction and mental health factors and are significantly more likely to have experienced trauma. Can it be considered that a design with underground parking and more green space and in general more biophilic design principles, could be dramatically more successfully in mitigating potential for relapse and foster health and healthier interactions with the community.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 19, 2022, at 10:08 AM, Maitland, Leif <[lmaitlan@london.ca](mailto:lmaitlan@london.ca)> wrote:

Good morning Dustin,

Just to confirm – you would like the first email sent, provided to the PEC on the January 31, 2022 agenda for their review.

The lighting study is attached.

As per your follow-up request – no easements are shown on any plans – the presence of any easements can be confirmed through the Land Registry Office.

Regards,

<image001.png> **Leif Maitland**  
Site Development Planner  
Development Services  
City of London

*As part of our ongoing efforts to stop the spread of COVID-19, the City of London has made changes [about City services and COVID-19](#).*

**From:** Dustin Gosnell  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 18, 2022 8:23 AM  
**To:** Maitland, Leif <[lmaitlan@london.ca](mailto:lmaitlan@london.ca)>; Turner, Stephen <[sturner@london.ca](mailto:sturner@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: 345 sylvan st

Yes please forward the appropriate people. Yourself and Stephen where the only contacts listed.

It would appear that the plan does not included approximately 50 trees that Average 50-100 ft tall, On east side of lot.

My concern is that brick on other HDC completed builds is not consistent with the sizing of the bricks on existing apartment buildings? heritage building beside property and the brick predominately used on homes surrounding the proposed building.

Can I have a copy of the lighting study? Im concerned light pollution with blue light form LED lighting and vehicles in the evenings and it's ability to inhibit melatonin producing. Disrupting circadian rhythms and Leading to Increased risks cancer.

On Jan 17, 2022, at 1:15 PM, Maitland, Leif <[lmaitlan@london.ca](mailto:lmaitlan@london.ca)> wrote:

Good afternoon Dustin,

If you would like I can have the email below made available to the Planning Committee at the January 31 public site plan meeting for their review.

In the interim I've answered your questions below:

- All trees are included on the landscape plan provided.
- A dropped first floor is not a requirement.
- The lighting study has been reviewed and no light trespass on neighbouring properties is shown.
- The brick provided is a metric modular brick.
- Additional screening plantings have been requested at first submission.
- The building will be required to meet all applicable health legislation.
- Underground parking is not required.

Regards,

<image001.png> **Leif Maitland**  
Site Development Planner  
Development Services  
City of London

*As part of our ongoing efforts to stop the spread of COVID-19, the City of London has made changes [about City services and COVID-19](#).*

**From:** Dustin Gosnell  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 16, 2022 7:07 PM  
**To:** Turner, Stephen <[sturner@london.ca](mailto:sturner@london.ca)>; Maitland, Leif <[lmaitlan@london.ca](mailto:lmaitlan@london.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 345 sylvan st

Site plan drawing doesn't include any of the very large trees on or close to property line east side. Why are they not included?

Other similar apartment buildings in area. The first floor is below grade up to window height. To reduce over all building height. Can this be considered?

Is there a lighting study I can have?

Rendering shows brick facade, will this brick match that of the heritage building and common size predominately used in area ie Ontario size.

Is any effort being made to protect adjacent homes on east side from light and sound from vehicles and parking lot?

Being that this property is city owned. Will the entire residence and property be smoke free?

Can underground parking be considered?

Can underground be considered?

**Underground parking garages** eliminate a wide range of non-sustainability issues that accompany aboveground parking, including:

- No stormwater runoff
- Control of liquid Pollution
- Control of solid waste
- More greenspace

- No obstruction of views
- No obstruction of sunlight
- Car noise abatement
- Light pollution
- No contribution to heat islanding.
- Consistent with (CPTED) concepts
- Lower snow removal costs
- Considerably more inline with original properties green space ratios

All of these benefits are equally good for residents of proposed building and overall community.

Theoretically, underground parking garages should also provide a **higher level of safety and security**. More safety comes from the virtual elimination of weather-related problems. Increased security comes from the more limited access to underground parking garages compared to aboveground parking garages: there are **fewer, more well-defined access points** for vehicles and pedestrians. This limited access would be expected to have an inhibiting effect on criminal behaviour.

### Site Plan Control By-law - C.P.-1455-541

#### 6.5. Parking Structures

Consideration should be given to the use of parking structure in higher intensity developments. These can consist of underground parking, sunken open air parking lots with usable roof decks or sundecks over individual parking spaces. Parking structures should be architecturally treated and landscaped. Parking spaces and driveway isles are to be consistent with surface parking driveway standards. The entrance drive to a parking structure should be designed in accordance with Figure 6.2.

273\_ Parking structures should be integrated into the design of buildings to ensure the public realm is not negatively affected. Structured parking will be screened.

(b) Where possible existing public view into, through and out of a development site should be maintained and improved. Community identity can be achieved by making such public view more evident or interesting, i.e. to give access to vantage points and maintain view of:

- churches;
- heritage buildings;
- open spaces;

I suggest that proposed site plan be adjusted to include modest underground parking under building or separate structure. If parking structure/bicycle storage can be incorporated into plan the remainder open space to east could remain green or turned into forest. Or be sold to create a park , That could include modest playground and community gardens. walking 1200 m to Gartshore park is not reasonable. This could reduce operating cost of proposed development having less property to maintain, cash in lieu funds could be returned approx. \$28000, money could be generated by the sale of portion of property for park creation. This would represent more efficient land use, consistent with the City of Londons inward upward and climate objectives. Underground parking will reduce cost for screening and fencing and perhaps overall operating costs.and many neighbourhood concerns It seems more than possible that City can create park space at subject site and meet housing objectives. The subject site is 100% owned and controlled by the City. It is .57 hectares in size, the minimum size of an urban park for example is .25 hectare. The lot coverage maximum required for what is proposed is 40 percent. Applicants existing proposal is at 16% lot coverage. By these terms it would seem more than possible that some park space could be afforded and could perhaps make the affordability of proposed units greater still. While satisfying gaps in open space park space/ and community infrastructure like community gardens.