

From: Brian Andrews <bgandrews@execulink.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2022 7:38 AM
To: Lysynski, Heather <hlysynsk@London.ca>
Cc: Cassidy, Maureen <mcassidy@london.ca>; City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: PEC Communication

Good morning Heather,

I have made a change to my email and hope you will disregard the first one and use this one instead. You have my permission to forward this to the Councillors and include it on the Council Agenda.

Thank you for your assistance,

Brian Andrews

I am a resident of the Stoneybrook area that will be negatively impacted by the proposed development of 517 – 527 Fanshawe Park Road East.

Given the information I have received about the traffic study I find the rationale for not doing a traffic study to be extremely short sighted. The traffic analysis using Geary Avenue misses the obvious fact that real problem will be access from Geary onto Fanshawe Park Road and exit from Fanshawe onto Geary. Using the Stoneybrook Crescent signalized intersection to access and exit Fanshawe will be insufficient unless the timing is altered, but that will only aggravate the current congestion on Fanshawe. The analysis must also take into account the impact of the two other developments in the immediate area. Fanshawe traffic has already been compromised by the Veteran's Memorial Parkway extension and continuing development north and east of Fanshawe and Adelaide.

The annexation of property at the corner of Fanshawe and Richmond indicates the City is aware of traffic volume problems. I find it undeniably amazing that no one on the Planning Committee has considered Fanshawe Park Road to be relevant to this discussion! The proposed Westdell Development Corporation 22 storey tower will only further increase congestion on Fanshawe Park Road.

Correspondence I received March 4th from Planning and Environment Committee:
Regarding my concerns about a traffic survey –

The City's Transportation Department did some preliminary analysis of the traffic to be generated by this development, and based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Rate a **Transportation Impact Assessment was not warranted**. The AM Peak (745-845am) hour was calculated to generate 32 trips and PM peak (415-515pm) will generate 40 trips only.

Correspondence I received March 22nd from Planning and Environment:
Regarding my concerns about a traffic survey –

Hello Mr. Andrews – I apologize for the delay in response. As I stated previously there was **no study provided**– the preliminary **information generated was done via a software program**. I will forward your comments to Transportation with respect to the traffic software they use and how it derives preliminary information. If you will be in attendance at the public meeting you can also choose to ask these questions.

My concerns about overflow or spillover parking onto the side streets were not addressed in the included link which only discusses on-site parking: -

In terms of parking, the typical zoning by-law requires 1.25 spaces per unit. This development is proposing 1.19 spaces per unit, which is a reduction of 6 spaces overall. . As an aside, the City is currently looking at revised parking rates across the City – I've included a link to the preliminary study <https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=87584>

In an email received March 25th the attachment Fanshawe Park Road E.pdf contained a reference:

The City has developed a Traffic Calming and Procedures manual to assess when traffic calming measures are required. As per the point assessment table, volumes on local roads may become an issue when **volumes reach 1500 vehicles a day**. As per the assessment above, the addition of 32 and 40 peak hour trips will not significantly affect the capacity of the local roads.

I am certain Fanshawe far exceeds 1500 vehicles a day. Why has the planning department not considered Fanshawe in their analysis?

I believe the incremental additions to the **traffic volume** by the developments in this immediate area will have detrimental effects on traffic volume, and the as yet to be discussed **adjacent side street spillover parking** on the delivery of services to the area.

I request that the Planning and Environment Department seek input from other effected departments such as, but not limited to Fire, Ambulance, Police, Waste Collection and Road Maintenance (particularly snow removal).

I believe the City of London has failed in it's responsibility to properly notify residents of changes that greatly impact the lives and daily activity of those residents. A development of this size impacts an area far greater than 120 metres.

I believe I have a reasonable expectation that what has been a mature, established area since I moved here in 1986 would remain as it is.

Beyond traffic implications it is incumbent to ask whether London has considered the impact on the nearby school (Safety and Capacity) and sewage and storm water sewer capacity:

I did not see any reference for implications on school capacity (which should also be a concern for the other development in the immediate area.

Part of the **Report to Planning and Environment Committee** included in the Fanshawe Park Road E.pdf received March 25th :

“As part of the circulation for this application, **Engineering staff indicated that they were not supportive of the reduced rear yard setback** (adjacent to homes along Stoneybrook Crescent) as the proposed setbacks do not appear to provide adequate space to allow for self-containment of storm

water flows. Additional information was submitted by the applicant on February 7, 2022 which indicated that the post-development flows have been significantly reduced in comparison to the pre-development flows as a result of the proposed development. Engineering staff are satisfied that adequate space will be provided in the reduced rear yard setback and any additional engineering concerns will be addressed at site plan.”

This sounds like the Engineering Department was over-riden and are just hoping for the best based on information provided the obviously biased applicant. I did not see the proposed reservoir to manage overflow in excess of the capacity of the 450mm storm sewer on Geary, unless it is part of the underground parking.

On page 98 of the **Report to Planning and Environment Committee** there is further discussion of stormwater that is not consistent:

It is to be **contained onsite, but to minimize uncontrolled flow to the east adjacent residential lands** by conveying them through the parking structure. This appears to allow flow to the neighbour while flooding the parking garage as it is directed to an (undefined Permanent Private Storm System) safe outlet.

It also says the Owner agrees to promote the implementation of SWM Best Management Practices (**BMP's**) within the plan, including Low Impact Development (LID) **where possible**, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. If the owner finds it impossible, that’s just too bad for the neighbours!

I did not see any reference to the handling of sewage.

On April 23, 2019, Council declared a Climate Emergency:

What is the response by the Committee responsible for the City’s Climate Emergency Plan? The Developer has asked to replace the existing trees, shrubs and grass with steel, asphalt and concrete. I cannot believe any portion of the proposed development meets any part of a climate change policy. Such a large structure becomes a heat reservoir and at the same time zero yard depths remove the carbon reservoirs of trees, grass and shrubs and encourage rainwater run-off onto the neighbouring property.

Appendix D – Policy Context:

I don’t see how any civilian could comprehend the enormity of Provincial Policy, The London Plan and the Official Plan (1989).

Does the Planning and Environment Committee aver that each of these policies has been accommodated?

Appendix F – Applicant’s Reply to UDPRP Comments:

The URBAN DESIGN PEER REVIEW PANEL heaps praise on the applicant, but I suggest the Panel may be favourably biased with respect to construction projects:

4.0 MEMBER SELECTION, TERM AND REMUNERATION 4.1 Composition The Urban Design Peer Review Panel (UDPRP) shall be comprised of not less than six (6) members, with at least three (3) architects and three (3) other professionals that influence the design of the built environment and are qualified in their field; these fields include, landscape architecture, urban design, planning or other professional fields that influence the design of the built environment.

The Developer was aware, or should have been aware of the zoning restrictions in this area before it purchased the property. Why does the Planning and Environment Department tolerate this “Easier to ask to be forgiven than to ask for permission” policy? Greg & Anna Ackland, et al included many of the City of London policies but the Planning and Environment Department appear to disregard them to the favour of the Developer!

The Developer was sufficiently confident of having it's way with rezoning that it spent over \$2 million acquiring the properties!

How many similar Notice of Planning Applications has the City ever turned down? If it ever happened what is the rough percentage of the occurrence?

What is the priority of the Planning and Environment Committee – to serve the citizens of London or the Developers?

What is the priority of the City Council – to serve the citizens of London or the Developers?

Regards,
Brian Andrews
62 Daleview Crescent
London, Ontario