

From: Anna Ackland

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2022 10:36 PM

To: PEC <pec@london.ca>

Cc: Pascual, Audrey <apascual@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Material for Public Agenda for the PEC Meeting March 28, 2022

To Whom It May Concern,

I am giving my consent to please include the following 2 Items on the Public Agenda for the Planning and Environment Committee Meeting for March 28, 2022 at 5:15 pm, for File: 0-9426/Z-9427:

Item #1:

I had contacted Ms. Nancy Pasato, Senior Planner, Planning Implementation, Planning & Development, about the following matter of concern. Ms. Pasato informed me that she had reached out to the Applicant about my concern, however, Ms. Pasato did not anticipate that the Applicant would be able to make any changes before the March 28, 2022 meeting. Ms. Pasato suggested that I comment on the discrepancy in my comments at the public meeting so this is on the record.

I had reviewed the Site Concept Plan Elevations (revised) for this file:

<https://london.ca/sites/default/files/2022-01/2022-01-25%20-%20Site%20Concept%20and%20Renderings.pdf>

There are false drawings completed by Zedd Architecture of current homes directly south of the proposed development, on pages 19 and 20. Specifically, my neighbours live at 1536 Geary Avenue and my husband and I live at 1532 Geary Avenue. Our homes are directly south of the proposed development. The drawings shown are not drawing of our homes. They are falsely created drawings of homes showing size, style, scale and roof pitch that do not resemble our homes. When individuals review this report and these pictures, they are viewing false presentation of our homes. This is misleading to the public and this is misleading to committee members that view the report. I expect a revision of these drawings to provide accurate and truthful presentation of current homes abutting this development. My other concern here is to question what else may have been presented falsely in submitted reports with this Application.

Item #2:

My report of March 16, 2022 which I had emailed to Ms. Nancy Pasato, Senior Planner, Planning Implementation, Planning & Development:

Hello Nancy,

I am writing to you regarding the following report and please submit my comments to the Public Record:

Planning and Design Report 242593 Ontario Inc. 517 – 525 Fanshawe Park Road London August 2021:

https://london.ca/sites/default/files/2021-11/04_PLA~1.PDF

Pre-Amble:

I reside at 1532 Geary Avenue. My neighbours reside at 1536 Geary Avenue, which will be directly adjacent to the south of this proposed development.

My husband and I purchased our home 21 years ago. Our reasons for purchase included the expansive size of the lot, the feeling of space around your home/your lot while still living in the city, the serenity of the location, the enjoyment of outdoor activity time, and the enjoyment of extensive gardens on the property.

Unfortunately, at this time, all the reasons for our purchase of our home/our lot, seem to be negated and down-played by individuals who frankly have no right to denounce nor devalue our comments and thoughts, nor our property.

My Position:

The request to amend the Current Zoning, Residential R2 (R2-4) Zone, for the Subject Lands (517 – 525 Fanshawe Park Road London, to the Proposed Zoning, Residential R9 Special Provision Bonus (R9-7 ()*B-) Zone, **MUST BE DENIED.**

The Permitted Uses of Residential R2 (R2-4) Zone include: Single detached dwellings: semi-detached dwellings, duplex dwellings; and converted dwellings (maximum 2 dwelling units).

With the focus of the new London Plan on intensification of land, the intensification of these Subject Lots to fit within the current R2 (R2-4) Zone is possible and appropriate within the Stoneybrook Community. The focus, on Multi-Family dwellings, fits into the Residential R2 (R2-4) Zone and uses the resources already established on these lots which I understand to be the prudent way to proceed. The driveway into this new development must be from Fanshawe Park Road, just like it is at the development of 307 Fanshawe Park Road East and just like it is at the development of 420 Fanshawe Park Road East.

Review of the Planning and Design Report 242593 Ontario Inc. 517 – 525 Fanshawe Park Road London August 2021 Report, Per Section, referenced by page numbers, with my comments in brackets:

Page 2 – “a driveway on Geary Avenue” (The driveway must be created onto Fanshawe Park Road. Further information will be provided regarding this point later in this Review.)

Page 10 – “DESIGN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES A key goal of the proposed development is to provide a residential apartment building that will enhance the existing streetscape along Fanshawe Park Road. The design is intended to be compatible with, and sensitive to, the surrounding mix of existing and emerging land uses.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. My opinion, and I know it is the opinion of others as well, is that this monstrosity is not compatible with, nor sensitive to, the neighbourhood community. Just because the Developer’s Consultant documents their viewpoint in a Report, certainly does not validate this as a fact. We as individuals who actually reside in this community, and myself living in the second lot to the south of this proposed development, have an actual understanding of living and being in this residential community, which would out weigh any Developer’s, his Consultant’s, a Planner’s, or a City Councillor’s viewpoints, when they do not physically live on the lots that will be affected by this development nor do they live in the Stoneybrook Community that will be affected.)

Page 11 – “a replacement driveway off Geary Ave.” (The driveway must be created onto Fanshawe Park Road. Further information will be provided regarding this point later in this Review.)

Page 14 – “Vehicular access to the surface parking area is provided by a new full-turns driveway via Geary Avenue. The new access has been positioned as far from the intersection as possible.” (The driveway must be created onto Fanshawe Park Road. Further information will be provided regarding this point later in this Review.)

Page 19 – “Character and Image The proposed building will fit within the existing and planned mix of residential uses, and enhance the existing character and image of the corridor by providing a modern and contemporary apartment building. Overall, the proposed development adds to the uniqueness of this area, providing an attractive and desirable use along transitional corridor.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. My opinion, and I know it is the opinion of others as well, is that this monstrosity is not compatible with, nor sensitive to, the neighbourhood community. Just because the Developer’s Consultant documents their viewpoint in a Report, certainly does not validate this as a fact. We as individuals who actually reside in this community, and myself living in the second lot to the south of this proposed development, have an actual understanding of living and being in this residential community, which would outweigh any Developer’s, his Consultant’s, a Planner’s, or a City Councillor’s viewpoints, when they do not physically live on the lots that will be affected by this development nor do they live in the Stoneybrook Community that will be affected.)

Page 19 – “Servicing Vehicular access to the subject lands is provided by a new, full-turns driveway on Geary Avenue.” (The driveway must be created onto Fanshawe Park Road. Further information will be provided regarding this point later in this Review.)

Page 20 – “Public Realm The public realm is primarily defined by the existing range of large-lot, single-detached dwellings surround the subject land and along the Fanshawe Park Road E streetscape and medium density and commercial uses to the east. The intent of the proposed development is to enhance this unique sense of place by providing a contemporary building with a strong relationship to the public realm with direct pedestrian connections to the building. The proposed development enhances the street scape and provides a more comfortable and diverse pedestrian experience.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. My opinion, and I know it is the opinion of others as well, is that this monstrosity is not compatible with, nor sensitive to, the neighbourhood community. Just because the Developer’s Consultant documents their viewpoint in a Report, certainly does not validate this as a fact. We as individuals who actually reside in this community, and myself living in the second lot to the south of this proposed development, have an actual understanding of living and being in this residential community, which would outweigh any Developer’s, his Consultant’s, a Planner’s, or a City Councillor’s viewpoints, when they do not physically live on the lots that will be affected by this development nor do they live in the Stoneybrook Community that will be affected. Did anyone ask the neighbours or community if we find “the proposed development enhances the street scape and provides a more comfortable and diverse pedestrian experience”? I can tell you that no one asked me, nor my husband. For the past 21 years, we have enjoyed our walks in our community, down our street and the surrounding streets, and near the Thames River, and I can tell you that “the proposed development”, monstrosity, does not enhance the street scape nor will it provide a more comfortable and diverse pedestrian experience. We enjoy the deer that walk and run down Geary Ave, the beautiful gardens that neighbours tend to on their properties, etc.

How disrespectful of the Developer and his Consultant to tell us what will give us a “more comfortable and diverse pedestrian experience”. These dictator like comments will not be accepted as facts, simply because the Consultants put them in their report on behalf of the Developer.

Page 20 – “Proposed Planning Act Applications Multi-Family, High Density Residential Designation. This official Plan Amendment will bring the 1989 Official Plan into conformity with the new London Plan.” (Multi-Family intensification at the Subject Lots within the current R2 (R2-4) Zone would be acceptable, with a driveway from Fanshawe Park Road.)

Page 21 – “PLANNING POLICY ANALYSIS 2020 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT Section 1.1.1 Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: b) accommodating an appropriate affordable and market-based range and mix of residential types (including single detached, additional residential units, multi-unit housing, affordable housing, and housing for older persons), employment (including industrial and commercial), institutional (including places of worship, cemeteries, and long-term care homes), recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs. e) promoting the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification, and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs.” (To support the Provincial Policy Statement, appropriate Multi-Family intensification on the Subject Lots is acceptable within the current R2 (R2-4) Zone which is in keeping with the **character of the community**. This would also be an appropriate use of existing municipal services on the Subject Lots. I am certain that there would be many families who would be grateful to have the Subject Lands developed as Multi-Family intensification to allow them the opportunity to secure a residence in the Stoneybrook Community. There are also many immigrant and refugee families that would be grateful for same. Maintaining the current R2 (R2-4) Zone would also avoid possible deception of the community, by the Developer, that has been evidenced by Student Housing rentals at Masonville Yards (Richmond Street at Hillside) and on Windermere Road. Western University has mandates for Student Housing and it is not the appropriate for any Zoning Amendments to allow for such deception by Developers of the community.

Page 22 – Last Phrase on the page: “Appropriate setbacks, landscaping, tree planting, and/or fencing will allow for the 6-storey building to integrate appropriately into the existing context.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. My opinion, and I know it is the opinion of others as well, is that this monstrosity is not compatible with, nor sensitive to, the neighbourhood community. Just because the Developer’s Consultant documents their viewpoint in a Report, certainly does not validate this as a fact. We as individuals who actually reside in this community, and myself living in the second lot to the south of this proposed development, have an actual understanding of living and being in this residential community, which would out weigh any Developer’s, his Consultant’s, a Planner’s, or a City Councillor’s viewpoints, when they do not physically live on the lots that will be affected by this development nor do they live in the Stoneybrook Community that will be affected.) (When my husband and I purchased our home, the privacy of the lot, the space/air around you, and the serenity of the area, were important to us. If we wanted to live by a monstrosity, that peers over our yard like a peeping Tom violating our right to privacy, that will suffocate our space by encroaching over us, then we would have bought a home by a monstrosity. How dare anyone say that that is acceptable and permissible to do. There must be respect to the community and character of the community. This is why intensification of the Subject Lots in the current R2 (R2-4) Zone is appropriate.

Page 23 – “The subject lands can accommodate the proposed development without any significant undue, adverse land use impacts.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. I have already stated the concerns regarding privacy, and encroachment, however, the impact to the immediate eco-system is a concern as well. I have to ask, had the Developer, his Consultant, the City Planner, the City Councillor, or any members of the Environmental and Planning Committee, been to our yard to see the deer leaping over the fence lines and then graciously feeding in our yards, the humming birds sucking nectar from our flowering gardens, the wood pecker busily pecking at a tree trunk, rabbits scurrying around, the muskrat sleeping in our window well, the turtle taking a stroll on our front yard, the moles burying into a little nest in the flower beds, a racoon curiously peeking through our family room door, etc. The answer is “no”, none of you have been here and none of you have the right to say there is no impact by this Development to our lots/our homes/our lives, our Stoneybrook Community, as you have no credibility to say this or say that this is true.

Page 24 (bottom) and Page 25 (top) – “Considerable effort has gone into the conceptual design of the proposed development with the urban design comments provided in the Record of Pre-application Consultation dated January 26th, 2021. As Such, the Proposed development is well-designed and considered visually attractive.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. It is puzzling to read the date of “January 26th, 2021, given the Public was not informed of this proposed development until the “Date of Notice: November 10, 2021”. It is also puzzling why the Developer and his Consultant have had all this time to Plan/Develop their Application and Reports and the Public will be allowed only 5 minutes per individual to speak their thoughts/present their opinion at a Public Meeting on March 28, 2022. Oh yes, we can submit our reports in writing as well.

Page 25 – “iii) Promote, in the design of multi-family, high density residential developments, sensitivity to the scale and character of adjacent land uses and to desirable natural feature on, or in close proximity to, the site. “ (I have already spoken to the fact that the “scale and character” of the monstrosity dose not fit within the community. The neighbouring lots are R1-10 – Large Estate Lots Zone. Designing a Multi-Family development within the current Residential R2 (R2-4) Zone in keeping with the scale and character of adjacent lots would be welcomed.)

Page 25 – “Location (Section 3.4.2) iii) Traffic to and from the location should not have a significant impact on stable low density residential areas.” “It is anticipated that municipal services can be provided to the proposed development, and that traffic generated from the proposed development will not have significant impact. City Staff have confirmed that a servicing capacity study and traffic impact assessment was not required for a complete application.” (“Traffic generated from the proposed development will not have a significant impact”. At the Developer Open House, the Consultant was asked about traffic, cars turning out of the development onto Geary Avenue and then onto Fanshawe Park Road, or cars turning out of the development onto Geary Avenue proceeding to Stoneybrook Crescent, through a 40 km school zone, to Fanshawe Park Road and her response to direct questioning was repeatedly, “we hope” that people turn right onto Fanshawe and “we hope” that they do not go around to Stoneybrook Crescent, and “we hope” that the traffic levels are not impacted. **“We hope” is not an objective measurement, nor is it an acceptable response.** My neighbour who brought up the traffic volume and safety issue, also spoke about the infrastructure of Geary Avenue as a road itself and the concerns with its age, stability etc.. The proposal is for a 99 unit apartment building. When you consider this number and the number of vehicles, there will certainly be an impact on the traffic on Geary Avenue and on Stoneybrook Crescent. As I work on my garden beds, or shovel snow, I have seen 6

or more cars lined up at the top of Geary Avenue, waiting to turn right onto Geary Avenue. We do not have traffic control calming measures on Geary Avenue and speeding remains an ongoing issue. I had reached out years ago to the Traffic Control Officer London Police Service, and he had kindly written an article in the Londoner about the speeding situation on our Street and his attempts to address this issue generally. The people who live in this community know objectively that one cannot make a left turn onto Fanshawe Park Road from Geary Avenue at times due to intense traffic volumes and one must go around Stoneybrook Crescent to Fanshawe Park Road to the traffic light to safely make a left turn. The proposed driveway must be from Fanshawe Park Road, not Geary Avenue. This would be in keeping with the driveway directly entering Fanshawe Park Road at the developments at 307 Fanshawe Park Road and 420 Fanshawe Park Road.)

Page 28 – “City Staff did not request any form of environmental impact study as part of a complete application” (This is puzzling to read as there will be an impact to the environment related to the wildlife which I outlined previously, increased volume of vehicles in the neighbourhood producing vehicular pollution, noise, and shadowing of our lots by the monstrosity.)

Page 29 – “High Design Standards – The proposed development provides a contemporary building design that makes use of modern design practices and materials, enhancing the streetscape along the corridors.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. This development is not “Enhancing the streetscape”; it is a monstrosity. The Developer and Consultant seem to have this written as a fact through their report, however, as I continue to review their report, a pattern is clearly emerging regarding how many times I have repeated that this is their viewpoint and not mine, nor the community’s. With us living in the community, I think our opinion is of more weight than individuals who do not live here.

Page 33 – “Given the subject lands location to the surround neighbourhood, the proposed development enhances the existing neighbourhood character by adding a well-designed apartment building, creating a unique and attractive sense of place for resident of the area and for those passing by.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. Please refer to the rest of my point in the Page 29 section. The Developer and Consultant continue to consistently try to present this monstrosity to “enhance” the existing neighbourhood character. After living here for 21 years, it is clear the Developer and the Consultant have no idea what the character of this community is, what we as the community are passionate about, what we value, and the monstrosity that is proposed is certainly not at all an enhancement of the community. It is a blatant eye sore encroaching on privacy, a sense of space and serenity.

Page 34 – “It is anticipated that the proposed development will enhance the existing neighbourhood character and maintain the level of certainty for existing residents that development will be located at an appropriate distance away from their properties and at locations that are beneficial for the broader area.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. I find that as their Report continues, the excessive repetition that this Developer and his Consultant use, stating that this development “will enhance the existing neighbourhood” is quite repulsive to read. The lack of knowledge and understanding of what the Stoneybrook community defines as its character and what we find “enhancing” is grossly evident in their report.)

Page 35 – “Given the location of the subject lands at an Arterial Road within an existing residential are, the proposed access point/driveway via Geary Ave. is proximate to Fanshawe Park E., the primary

access point to the surround neighbourhood. As such, traffic flows will be directed off the busy arterial road but still far away from the existing neighbourhood.” (Please refer to page 25 section for feedback as it is applicable to Page 35.)

Page 37 – “Character The proposed design contributes to the planned vision of the “Neighbourhoods” Place Type, by providing a compatible development that fits well within the existing context, enhances the existing character of the neighbourhood, maintains predictability and stability within the neighbourhood, and forms a unique sense of place for residents, the surrounding neighbourhood, and the public. The location of the subject lands within an existing neighbourhood, along an arterial road, creates a strong pedestrian environment and frame the street, away from the existing low density residential uses beyond the subject lands to the south and east. For these reasons, and for reasons noted throughout this report, it is designed to fit well within the existing context.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. I find that as their Report continues, the excessive repetition that this Developer and his Consultant use, stating that this development “enhances the existing character of the neighbourhood” is quite repulsive to read. The lack of knowledge and understanding of what the Stoneybrook community defines as its character and what we find “enhancing” is grossly evident in their report.)

Page 43 – “301_A diversity of materials should be used in the design of building to visually break up massing, reduce visual bulk and add interest to the building design.” “A range of materials varying in colour and texture are proposed to vertically and horizontally articulate the buildings and break up the massing. Additionally, architectural features such as canopies, balconies, and plane changes help create interest and assist in defining the various components of the buildings, such as the entrances, base, middle, and top components of the buildings.” (Once a monstrosity, always a monstrosity; covering up with lipstick and make up does not hide what it really is, a monstrosity invading privacy, encroaching community space, and not in keeping with the character of our community.)

Page 45 – “Height and Density The height and density of the proposed development have been determined to be appropriate, as described throughout the analysis of the relevant planning documents. The proposed development maintains the purpose and intent of the applicable, existing land use designations, does not present any undue, adverse significant impacts to surrounding existing and planned land uses, and a bonus zone will be implemented to ensure there are bonusable features that are commensurate with the requested height and density of the proposed development. As such, the proposed height and density maintain the intent and policies of all the Official Plans, and are considered appropriate.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. The Consultants note “The height and density of the proposed development have been determined to be appropriate” and again, this is their viewpoint, not the community’s and I know that the neighbours and the community do not find the height and density of this proposed development as “appropriate”. It is concerning how such a report tries to present the Developer’s proposal as the only right end point.

Page 46 – “Conclusion The proposal appropriately provides an efficient and cost-effective development that is compatible with the surrounding context, is appropriate for its location, and fulfills the planned function of the subject lands.” (Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint. As noted previously, the development is **not compatible with the surrounding context**, nor is it compatible with the neighbouring lots and community.

Conclusion:

It is eye-opening to review the number of times I noted “Certainly, this statement is from the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint.” This must noted and the Developer’s & Consultants’ viewpoint cannot be accepted as objective fact(s) – it is their opinion. The objective opinions and feedback of the individuals physically living on Geary Avenue and surrounding community need to be taken into account and valued.

An acceptable option would be maintaining the current R2 (R2-4) Zone and designing a Multi-Family High Density Development within this Zone that is compatible to the character of the abutting large estate lots and constructing a driveway onto Fanshawe Park Road.

Sincerely,

Anna Ackland

1532 Geary Avenue

This concludes my 2 Items for submission to the Public Agenda for the Planning and Environmental Committee Meeting on March 28, 2022 at 5:15 pm.

Sincerely,

Anna Ackland

1532 Geary Avenue