

17TH REPORT OF THE
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting held on July 23, 2013, commencing at 4:05 PM, in the Council Chambers, Second Floor, London City Hall.

PRESENT: Councillor B. Polhill (Chair), Councillors N. Branscombe, D.G. Henderson, P. Hubert and S. White and H. Lysynski (Secretary).

ALSO PRESENT: Mayor J.F. Fontana, Councillors W.J. Armstrong and J.L. Baechler, G. Barrett, P. Christiaans, M. Corby, J.M. Fleming, B. Henry, M. Johnson, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, B. Krichker, L. Mottram, A. MacLean, C. Saunders, R. Sharpe, M. Tomazincic, J. Yanchula and P. Yeoman.

I. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

1. That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

2. 2nd Report of the Agricultural Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That the 2nd Report of the Agricultural Advisory Committee from its meeting held on June 19, 2013 BE RECEIVED.

3. 6th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That the 6th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee from its meeting held on June 26, 2013 BE RECEIVED.

4. 7th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning and Advisory Committee

Recommendation: That the 7th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee from its meeting held on June 20, 2013 BE RECEIVED.

5. Properties located at 412-416 and 420-424 Rectory Street and 814-826 King Street (H-8137)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, based on the application by Western Fair Association, relating to the property located at 412-416, 420-424 Rectory Street and 814-826 King Street, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013, 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 Regional Facility Special Provision (h-147*RF(2)) Zone TO a Regional Facility Special Provision (RF(2)) Zone to remove the holding provision. (2013-D14B)

6. Properties located at 3592-3614 Isaac Court and 6951-6973 Clayton Walk (H-8175)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, based on the application of Dennis Oliver, relating to the properties located at 3592-3614 Isaac Court and 6951-6973 Clayton Walk, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Holding Residential R1 (h.R1-8) Zone TO a Residential R1 (R1-8) Zone to remove the "h", holding provision. (2013-D14B)

7. Property located at 1550 Highbury Avenue North (H-8193)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, based on the application of Louis Cooke, relating to the property located at 1550 Highbury Avenue North, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013 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 Highway Service Commercial/Restricted Service Commercial (h*HS/HS2/HS3/RSC1/RSC3/RSC4) Zone TO a Highway Service Commercial/ Restricted Service Commercial (HS/HS2/HS3/RSC1/RSC3/RSC4) Zone to remove the “h” holding provision. (2013-D14B)

8. Property located at 537 Crestwood Drive (H-8147)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Planning, based on the application of Starcevic Homes Limited, relating to the property located at 537 Crestwood Drive, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning FROM a Holding Residential R6 Special Provision (h-145.h-146.R6-2(13)) Zone TO a Residential R6 Special Provision (R6-2(13)) Zone to remove the h-145 and h-146 holding provisions. (2013-D14B)

9. Properties located at 365 and 385 Sugar Creek Trail (H-8179)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Planning, based on the application of Old Oak Properties, relating to the property located at 365 and 385 Sugar Creek Trail, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013 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 Bonus (h-1*h-18*R5-2*B11) Zone TO a Residential R5 Bonus (R5-2*B11) Zone to remove the “h-1” and “h-18” holding provisions. (2013-D14B)

10. Ballymote Woods Subdivision (Lots 88 and 89 in Plan 33M-631 and Lots 1-12 in Plan 33M-632) (P-8205)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Sifton Properties Limited, to exempt the following lands 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, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013, to exempt Lots 88 and 89 in Plan 33M-631 and Lots 1-12 in Plan 33M-632, from the Part Lot Control provisions of subsection 50(5) of the said *Act*, for a period not to exceed one (1) year; it being pointed out that these lands are subject to a registered subdivision agreement and Lots 1-12 in Plan 33M-632 are zoned as a Holding Residential R1 (h-96*R1-5) Zone and Lots 88 and 89 in Plan 33M-631 are zoned as a Residential R1 (R1-5) Zone in Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which permits single detached dwellings with a minimum lot frontage of 12m and minimum lot area of 415m²; it being further noted that the applicant shall submit to the City confirmation that the approved reference plan for final lot development has been deposited in the Land Registry Office; and,
- b) the applicant BE ADVISED that the cost of registration of this by-law is to be borne by the applicant in accordance with City policy. (2013-D12)

11. Greengate Village Limited re Asima Drive (Lots 60 to 73 and Lots 113 and 114 Plan 33M-533) (P-8199)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Greengate Village Limited, to exempt the following lands 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, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at a future meeting of the Municipal Council, to exempt Lots 60 to 73 and Lots 113 and 114 in Plan 33M-533, from the Part Lot Control provisions of subsection 50(5) of the said *Act*, for a period not to exceed one (1) year; it being pointed out that these lands are subject to a registered subdivision agreement and are zoned as a Residential R1 Special Provision (R1-3(12)) Zone, in Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which permits single detached dwellings with a minimum lot frontage of 10m and minimum lot area of 300m²;
- b) the following conditions of approval BE COMPLETED by the applicant, prior to the passage of a Part Lot Control by-law for Lots 60 to 73 and Lots 113 and 114 in Plan 33M-533, as noted in clause a), above:
 - i) the applicant shall submit a draft reference plan to the Development and Compliance Services Division 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;
 - ii) the applicant shall submit to the Development and Compliance Services Division a digital copy, together with a hard copy of each reference plan, as noted in part i) above, to be deposited in the Land Registry Office; it being noted that 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;
 - iii) the applicant shall obtain confirmation from the Development and Compliance Services Division 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;
 - iv) the applicant shall enter into an amended subdivision agreement with the City for Registered Plan 33M-533 to address all issues outlined below and provide adequate related security:
 - I) all services are to be constructed, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, including all private drain connections and water services, in accordance with the accepted final design of the lots, and is to be in compliance with all the obligations for current and proposed works and associated requirements set out in an amended subdivision agreement for Plan 33M-533;
 - II) all lot grading is to be undertaken in accordance with the final lot layout and is to be in compliance with all the obligations for current and proposed works and associated requirements set out in an amended subdivision agreement for Plan 33M-533, and on the accepted revised grading plans for Plan 39T-07508 accepted by the City on July 8, 2008 and the accepted plans for Plan 33M-533;
 - III) the Owner shall ensure all parts contained in the draft reference plan are in accordance with the draft approved lotting and road geometry for Plan 39T-07508, to the satisfaction of the City;

- IV) Parts 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 shall be restricted from development until Plan 39T-07508 for the creation and construction of Strawberry Walk over Part 9 has been registered; it being noted that the Owner shall provide a 0.3m reserve at the north limit of parts 7, 9 and 11; it being further noted that this 0.3m reserve shall remain in place until the registration of 39T-07508;
 - V) the Owner shall construct Asima Drive in accordance with the accepted engineering drawings for Plan 39T-07508 accepted July 8, 2008; and,
 - VI) clearance is to be obtained from the City that requirements I) to V), above, have been satisfactorily completed, prior to any issuance of any Certificate of Conditional Approval for the proposed lots;
- c) the applicant BE REQUIRED to submit to the City confirmation that an approved reference plan for final lot development has been deposited in the Land Registry Office; and,
 - d) the applicant BE ADVISED that the cost of registration of this by-law is to be borne by the applicant in accordance with City policy. (2013-D12)

12. Sunningdale Meadows Subdivision (39T-10502)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Planning, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to a subdivision agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Sunningdale Golf & Country Club Ltd. and 160 Sunningdale Road West Ltd., for the subdivisions of land, situated on the south side of Sunningdale Road West, midway between Richmond Street and Wonderland Road North:

- a) the Special Provisions, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Sunningdale Golf & Country Club Ltd. and 160 Sunningdale Road West Ltd., for the subdivision of land over Part of Lots 41 and 48, Registrar's Compiled Plan 1029, (Geographic Township of London), City of London, County of Middlesex (Geographic Township of London), for the Sunningdale Meadows Subdivision (39T-10502) BE APPROVED;
- b) the financing for this project BE APPROVED in accordance with the "Related Costs and Revenues" appended as Schedule "B" to the associated staff report, dated July 23, 2013;
- c) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions. (2013-D12)

13. Property located at 655 Tennent Avenue Subdivision (39T-13501)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Senior Planner, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to a subdivision agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Wastell Developments Inc., for the subdivisions of land, situated on the south side of Tennent Avenue, west of Adelaide Street North:

- a) the Special Provisions, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Wastell Developments Inc., for the subdivisions of land over Part of Lots 9, 10 and 20, Registered Plan No. 325(C), City of London, County of Middlesex, for the Wastell Subdivision (39T-13501) BE APPROVED;
- b) the financing for this project BE APPROVED in accordance with the "Sources of Financing" appended as Schedule "A" to the associated staff report, dated July 23, 2013;

- c) the financing for this project BE APPROVED in accordance with the “Related Costs and Revenues” appended as Schedule “B” to the associated staff report, dated July 23, 2013; and,
- d) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions. (2013-D12)

14. Building Division Monthly Report for May 2013

Recommendation: That the Building Division Monthly Report for May 2013 BE RECEIVED. (2013-P06)

15. Property located at 2825 Tokala Trail (OZ-8115)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, in response to the letter of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board dated April 2, 2013, submitted by Stikeman Elliott, on behalf of 1830145 Ontario Limited (York Developments), relating to Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment application No. OZ-8115, relating to the property located at 2825 Tokala Trail, the Ontario Municipal Board BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to this matter and sees no reason to alter it. (2013-D14A)

16. Properties located at 275-277 Piccadilly Street (Z-8132)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, in response to the letter of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board dated May 16, 2013, submitted by 1875425 Ontario Inc., relating to Zoning By-law application No. Z-8132, relating to the properties located at 275-277 Piccadilly Street, the Ontario Municipal Board BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to this matter and sees no reason to alter it. (2013-D14A)

17. Various Streets Listed in Section 4.21 of the Z-1. Zoning By-law (Z-8142)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, in response to the letter of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board dated May 29, 2013, submitted by 2261531 Ontario LTD, relating to Zoning By-law application No. Z-8142, relating to various streets listed in Section 4.21 “Road Allowance Requirements – Specific Roads” of the Z-1 Zoning By-law, the Ontario Municipal Board BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council has reviewed its decision relating to this matter and sees no reason to alter it. (2013-D14A)

18. Property located at 1761 Wonderland Road North (O-8131/OZ-7825)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the report dated July 23, 2013, relating to the decision by the Ontario Municipal Board, concerning the appeals by Alan Patton, on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited, FCHT Holdings (Ontario) Corporation, Barvest Realty Inc., Sunningdale Developments Inc. and Auburn Developments, with respect to an amendment to the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, a Municipal Council decision relating to the property located at 1761 Wonderland Road North BE RECEIVED. (2013-D14A)

19. Property located at 754 Maitland Street (Z-8065)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the report dated July 23, 2013, relating to the decision by the Ontario Municipal Board, concerning the appeal by Kapland Inc., with respect to an application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, which was refused by the Municipal Council concerning the property located at 754 Maitland Street BE RECEIVED. (2013-D14A)

20. London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan (O-7668)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the report, dated July 23, 2013, relating to the decision by the Ontario Municipal Board, concerning the appeal by Robert Malpass, President of the Fairmont Lawn Bowling Club, on behalf of the Fairmont Lawn Bowling Club, relating to Official Plan Application No. O-7668, relating to the London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan, described as 840 and 850 Highbury Avenue North and 1414 and 1340 Dundas Street and lands without municipal address east of 850 Highbury Avenue North and bounded by the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways, BE RECEIVED. (2013-D08)

III. SCHEDULED ITEMS

21. 7th and 8th Reports of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 7th and 8th Reports of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) from its meetings held on June 12 and July 10, 2013, respectively:

- a) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit Application of M. Furmston requesting permission for alterations to the designated heritage property located at 340 St. James Street BE APPROVED; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed alterations to the building, including a demolition of an existing garage and its replacement and has advised that the impact of such an alteration on the heritage features of the property identified in the reasons for designation is negligible; it being further noted that the LACH heard a verbal delegation from M. Furmston, with respect to this matter;
- b) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include the areas of Riverview and Evergreen Avenues in the geographic description of the potential Heritage Conservation Districts currently known as "Stanley-Becher"; it being noted that the LACH reviewed and received a communication from O. Hobson, with respect to this matter;
- c) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include the Orchard Park/Sherwood Forest Community on the list of potential Heritage Conservation Districts; it being noted that the LACH received a communication dated May 22, 2013, from T. Jones, Orchard Park Sherwood Forest Ratepayers, with respect to this matter;
- d) the report dated July 10, 2013, from the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with respect to a Heritage Alteration Application submitted by R.C. Leach for the property located at 366 Central Avenue, BE DEFERRED to a future meeting of the LACH, pending further discussions with the owner and the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Association, to review the District's heritage alteration applications and approval Guidelines, as related to the proposed property alterations; it being noted that the LACH heard a verbal delegation from R. C. Leach, with respect to this matter;
- e) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to include, as part of the Application for Heritage Alteration approvals process, an 8½ x 11 sign, as appended to the LACH Report dated July 10, 2013, to be posted by the applicant in the front window or other suitable area visible from the street, for the time period between the filing of the application and its approval by the City; it being noted that the sign should clearly indicate that an application for heritage alteration has been submitted with a phone number to contact for more information; it being further noted that the LACH received and reviewed the Planning and Policy Sub-Committee's minutes from its meeting held on July 2, 2013;

- f) that J. Manness BE REQUESTED to submit completed nomination forms for the 2013 Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship and the Ontario Heritage Trust 2013 Recognition Program to the Mayor for signature and submission to the Ontario Heritage Trust;
- g) the communication from G.W. Smith, Friends of Meadowlily Woods Community Association dated July 22, 2013, relating to their request for Meadowlily Woods to be considered as a Cultural Heritage Landscape BE REFERRED to the LACH for consideration;
- h) that clauses 4 to 22, inclusive, of the 7th Report of the LACH BE RECEIVED; and,
- i) that clauses 4 to 9, inclusive, of the 8th Report of the LACH BE RECEIVED;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard a verbal presentation from W. Kinghorn, Chair, LACH, with respect to these matters.

22. Property located at 1615 North Routledge Park (Z-8166)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Planning, based on the application of Doman Developments Inc., relating to the property located at 1615 Northroutledge Park, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1), in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Light Industrial Special Provision(LI1(8) Zone, which permits electrical and electronic products industries, office, store and business electronic products industries, commercial schools, medical/dental offices, clinics, day care centres, bakeries, business service establishments, laboratories, manufacturing and assembly industries, support offices, paper and allied products industries excluding pulp and paper and asphalt roofing industries, pharmaceutical and medical product industries, printing, reproduction and data processing industries, research and development establishments, warehouse establishments, wholesale establishments, custom workshop, brewing on premises establishments and service trades TO a Compound Light Industrial Special Provision (LI1(8)/LI3) Zone, which permits, in addition to the above noted uses, assembly halls, commercial recreation establishments, day care centres, private clubs and private parks;

it being pointed out that there were no oral submissions made at the public participation meeting associated with this matter. (2013-D14A)

23. Property located at 36 Blackfriars Street - Request For Delegation Status

Recommendation: That C. Wilson, 36 Blackfriars Street BE DENIED delegation status at a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting as the staff is currently undertaking a Heritage Conservation District study for the Petersville/Blackfriars area and there may be programs available once the HCD is completed. (2013-D19)

24. Riverbend South Secondary Plan Terms of Reference

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Manager, Development Services and Planning Liaison, the Terms of Reference, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, to guide the process and preparation of the River Bend South Secondary Plan BE ADOPTED;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- M. Zunti, Sifton Properties Limited, applicant – expressing support for the Terms of Reference. (2013-D08)

25. Properties located at 754 and 764 Waterloo Street and 354 Oxford Street East (OZ-8121)

Recommendation: That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Farhi Holdings Inc., relating to the properties located at 754 and 764 Waterloo Street and 354 Oxford Street East:

- a) the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated July 23, 2013, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013, to amend Appendix "1" the Official Plan to change the identification of the subject property FROM a Service Station TO a Convenience Commercial and Service Station identification;
- b) the attached, revised, proposed by-law BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013, 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 Convenience Commercial/Service Station (CC/SS) Zone and a Residential R2 (R2-2) Zone and a Residential R3/Office Conversion (R3-1/OC5) Zone, which permits such uses as convenience service establishments without a drive-through facility, convenience stores without a drive-through facility, financial institutions without a drive-through facility, personal service establishments without a drive-through facility, gas bars, single-detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, duplex dwellings and converted dwellings, fourplex dwellings, dwelling units, medical dental offices and offices TO a Holding Convenience Commercial Special Provision/Service Station (h-*)h-5*h-103*CC6()/SS) Zone, to allow for such uses as bake shops without drive-through facilities, commercial schools without drive-through facilities, florist shops without drive-through facilities, pharmacies without drive-through facilities, eat-in restaurants without drive-through facilities, brewing on premises establishment, including a maximum front yard setback of (1.0m), a maximum exterior side yard setback of (1.0m), a maximum lot coverage of (35%), a maximum gross floor area of 948m² and a minimum of 28 parking spaces; it being noted that the holding h-(*) provision is to ensure landscaping enhancements are implemented within the abutting Oxford Street and Waterloo Street road allowances to achieve high quality landscaping and the creation of an attractive street edge at this strategic gateway location; it being further noted that the holding (h-5) provision is to ensure that development takes a form compatible with adjacent land uses, by requiring a public site plan review meeting; it being also noted that the holding (h-103) provision is to ensure that urban design is addressed at site plan;
- c) subject to Policy 19.1.1 of the Official Plan, the subject lands at 764 Waterloo Street BE INTREPRETED to be located within the "Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential" designation;
- d) the Site Plan Approval Authority BE REQUESTED to consider the following design elements through the site plan approval process:
 - i) consider rotating the building (general design, function and floor plate can remain the same), as illustrated in Appendices 'C' and 'D', clockwise by 90 degrees to engage the intersection and create active street frontages along Waterloo and Oxford Streets such that the proposed east elevation be situated on the south elevation (along Oxford Street) and the proposed south elevation be situated on the west elevation (along Waterloo Street) and incorporate the following design elements:
 - l) consider an entrance at the southwest corner facing the intersection of Waterloo Street and Oxford Street to service those travelling by foot or transit, with a secondary entrance located at the southeast corner of the building to service those coming from the parking lot;

- II) create a height element at the southwest corner of the building (at the intersection) to announce the entrance as well as address the intersection;
 - III) create a corner plaza at the intersection of Oxford and Waterloo Streets between the building entrance and the intersection of the public sidewalks including enhanced landscaping in order to create a welcoming forecourt that engages the intersection;
 - IV) ensure that the majority of windows located along the Oxford and Waterloo Street corridors are transparent glass to activate the street frontages;
 - V) ensure that the sign band is integrated into the building and below the height of the parapet in order to allow for the southwest corner parapet (at the intersection and entrance into the building) to act as the height element for the building;
 - VI) ensure that the materials used on all facades and the level architectural detailing are in keeping with the heritage district; it being noted that in accordance with the Bishop Hellmuth Heritage District Plan materials should include brick and masonry and architectural details are to include brick soldier courses and corbelling; and,
 - VII) provide enhanced landscaping to screen all exposed parking lots from Oxford and Waterloo Streets in order to create a positive edge condition and enhance the pedestrian experience; it being noted that this may be achieved using a landscape wall and landscaping that includes, but not limited to, shrubs, tall grasses, and trees;
- ii) install a 1.83 metre (6 feet) minimum sound attenuation fence along the property line directly abutting St. George Public School (the north property line of 354 Oxford Street East) in order to ensure continued student safety;
- e) a meeting BE HELD, prior to the end of the appeal period for this application, with representatives of the Bishop-Hellmuth Community Association, St. George's School Association, the applicant and the Civic Administration, to discuss the final design, with the date of the meeting to be provided at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on July 30, 2013; and,
- f) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed by-law as the proposed amendment is minor in nature;

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

- a communication dated July 19, 2013, from G. McCormack, Chair, Executive of School Council, St. George's Public School;
- a communication dated July 19, 2013, from N.Z. Tausky, 288 St. James Street;
- the attached communication dated July 22, 2013 from M. Loft, 784 Wellington Street; and,
- the attached communication from S. Barre and C. Scott-Barre, 774 Hellmuth Avenue;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Richard Zelinka, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – advising that the northeast corner of Oxford Street and Waterloo Street has been commercial since before most of the Bishop-Hellmuth community was built; indicating that, from the early 1880's there was one and then a second, retail store at this location, until they were replaced around 1955 by a gasoline service station which was there for over half a century; advising that the service station and two other buildings have been removed; noting that the site is now vacant; advising that, at various

times, three of the four quadrants of the intersection have had service stations on them; advising that the current application seeks to broaden the range of local service retail uses on the corner so that, in addition to the current permission for service station use and the fairly narrow convenience commercial uses, the site may be allowed to develop for a broader range of uses, specifically for the pharmacy that is being proposed at this time; indicating that the application is based on the desire of Rexall to establish a full-line drug store on the northeast corner and to convert their existing small sized dispensary on the southeast corner to medical clinic uses; advising that the applicant and Rexall have proposed, and modified, plans for a high standard of design at this location as a recognition of its importance in the City generally and its importance at the entrance to the Bishop-Hellmuth area; advising that this did not come in as a conventional store with parking in front; indicating that the common condition along Waterloo Street is front yard and boulevard parking; recognizing that, when this was a service station, there were parking and service areas extending into the boulevard; notwithstanding that the proposal is for the building to come up to the corner of the property, with the parking behind and in the side and rear yards of the property; incorporating suggestions made by the Urban Design Peer Review Panel, City staff and the public, both in the form and in the function of the site; indicating that were able to resolve the entry issue in the southeast corner of the site on Oxford Street to ensure that it is both safe and functional; advising that the garbage will be located at the rear of the site (northeast corner); indicating that there will be pedestrian connections from both Oxford Street and Waterloo Street; indicating that the original application was for the implementation of sound attenuation barriers to the north, clear glazing along Oxford Street on the store front and a variety of building materials including stone, brick and stucco, a faux entry feature at the southwest corner facing the intersection so that it would not be a blank wall but would actually have a feature that mirrored the entry; advising that, in the design of the site, there are six existing entrances that are being removed and two entrances that are being put in; indicating that there will be provision for bicycle parking; indicating that the main entrance is close to a London Transit Commission bus stop; advising that, as part of the process and the modifications that were made to the plan up to May of this year, the entrances were updated and reoriented so that there would be direct access from Oxford Street; noting that the additional entrance at the northeast corner of the building was enhanced; indicating that there will be awnings; indicating that there will be cantilevered canopies at the rear; indicating that there will be transparent windows along Oxford Street; noting that a majority of the windows along Oxford Street will be transparent; indicating that, on Waterloo Street, where there would otherwise be no windows, there will be spangled glass; advising that the most recent version of the plan adds more windows; indicating that there will be a raised parapet and large awnings over the panels in the southwest corner of the building; indicating that they will be planting large trees with understory plantings as well as a landscaped feature at the corner with understory plantings and small native species; indicating that there will be a landscaped area and a bus stop rest area on the north side of Oxford Street close to the store; indicating that there will be plantings to screen parking areas; advising that the applicant is moving towards choosing building colours and materials that will blend in with the Bishop-Hellmuth District; advising that the brick colour that will be used is a yellow brick tone, which reflects the dominant brick colour in the area with a grey stone base that would be used along the Oxford Street and Waterloo Street elevations; indicating that they have not shown changes that would undermine the function or the commercial viability of the development; advising that Rexall has prototype stores, it also has model stores that it uses; noting that this store is not one of them; advising that this building has been designed for the site for the specific location within the city and the importance that is attributed to it at the entrance to the Bishop-Hellmuth District; thanking Mr. Yanchula for his presentation which touched on some of the points that he wanted to raise; advising that, while we generally support the staff recommendation, there are some matters that he would ask this Committee to change in its recommendation to the Municipal Council; advising that they have always

asked for the addition of uses to the existing convenience commercial service station/commercial zoning combination; advising that, although in the Official Plan amendment that is being recommended, the convenience commercial to the service station/commercial is added on Appendix "A" of the Official Plan; advising that it was not carried forward in the Zoning By-law; advising that the existing service station zoning was requested to be carried forward into the new zoning; advising that we are asking the Committee to reinstate the existing service station zoning provisions in the by-law that is recommended to the Municipal Council; advising that the h-103 holding provision will ensure that urban design is addressed at the site plan stage; indicating that section d) of the recommendation does include, under i) is a matter for consideration at the site plan stage; advising that we are willing to continue to work with staff to enhance the presence of the use at the intersection; however, staff have added that first bullet that requests that the building be rotated by 90 degrees; advising that this is a directive, not a consideration; advising that this is a hammer and he ask this Committee to consider that it is not an appropriate hammer to put in the Council resolution for the site plan stage; advising that it does not recognize the functional imperatives of the pharmacy operation; advising that it does not recognize that the store is not square, but rectangular; advising that if the building is to be rotated, it does have an adverse effect on the rest of the site; noting that as a directive, instead of a consideration, it could undermine the entire proposal; asking the Committee to remove the first bullet from the recommendation to the Municipal Council; indicating that there is already consideration at the site plan stage for the entrance to be at the southwest corner and another at the southeast corner; noting that there is also a similar situation in part iv); indicating that the consideration is a proper and valid one, encouraging as much transparent glass rather than spangled glass is a reasonable consideration; however ensuring that that happens would not be proper as it does not recognize functional imperatives of the store and undermines the ability of store to go in; reiterating that he is asking the Committee to reword, where possible, to have the windows along the Oxford Street and Waterloo Street corridors as transparent glass to activate the street frontages; noting that that is a proper submission and we can work with staff but to require by ensuring that the majority of the windows be transparent glass does not give us any room for error; indicating that the other "ensure" directives, we do not have a problem with, they can be achieved; advising that the revised by-law with the change from minimum front and rear yard setbacks to maximum, recognizing that this is not a perfectly square site, building wall can't be parallel to both streets; making sure they are avoiding the necessity for any minor variance that may come; noting that the intent of having the maximum at 1.0 metre properly covers it; requesting that the Committee makes the changes that he has submitted; advising that if the service station commercial use was an additional use that we were requesting, this would have to go back for further notice; however, it is part of the existing zoning on the site and will continue to be the existing zoning on the site if the by-law is not passed; and requesting that the recommendation also be made that no further notice be given with respect to the changes being made to the zoning by-law.

- Don Clark, Director of Design, Store Planning and Construction, Rexall – expressing excitement about the opportunity to develop on this site; indicating that they are looking forward to providing healthier choices to the neighbourhood and their customers; noting that this will also be a first class retail environment; advising that they are adding 20 additional jobs as well as a tax base to this site; indicating that they will be spending millions on this site; and advising that this is a one of a kind development for them.
- Scott MacDougall-Shackleton, 802 Hellmuth Avenue – advising that he lives within the Bishop-Hellmuth Conservation District; noting that he is a member of the Community Association and a member of the St. George's School Council, which is steps away from this site; advising that he has talked to a lot of his neighbours and a lot of people in the school neighbourhood; expressing appreciation to the Planning Department for recognizing the communities concerns in their report; noting that the staff did a great job of recommending some holding provisions that are very important for this site; expressing appreciation to the applicant for

acknowledging the importance of heritage and the importance of this Conservation District for the wellbeing of the core of this City; reiterating that these holding provisions are important; advising that the history of this site is that they lost a heritage building on this site because of demolition by neglect; advising that with the approval of the demolition of that house, there were holding provisions that included landscaping on the site; advising that the landscaping has never happened; indicating that the site has not been maintained and they have to call in to have the property mowed; advising that the community is not secure in taking people's word that the site will be developed properly; urging the Committee to stick with the holding provisions as outlined by Planning staff; recommending that it is ensured that heritage elements are included and this includes having a streetscape along Waterloo Street and along Oxford Street, not a streetscape along a parking lot; expressing excitement about having a vibrant new business rather than an empty gravel lot that is not being maintained; advising that they would rather see a business on site; noting that the business needs to fit into the community and that the community is going to be supporting; indicating that they are a large community and they want to support their local businesses but we want them to fit in and have a streetscape along the streets; expressing concern with the garbage, at the northeast corner of the site, backs onto St. George's public school, which is a Kindergarten to Grade 8 public school, with a developmental centre for severely developmentally challenged children; reiterating that this is an important local public school; advising that development of this site will not only impact the heritage district but the school as well; and indicating that both of these need to be addressed and the best way to do this is to ensure that the holding provisions are included in the Committee's recommendation to the Municipal Council.

- Greg McCormack, Chair, Executive of School Council, St. George's Public School – expressing appreciation for all of the work that has gone into this; echoing the comments of Mr. MacDougall-Shackleton; enquiring as to what is the worst property that can go on that site if the zoning is approved; requesting that the Committee consider that as they do not want that built in this location; advising that the school is a community school with a large number of students that walks to school, especially along the Waterloo Street corridor; indicating that they are concerned about security elements, especially the driveway on Waterloo Street; advising that the School Council requests that the driveway be removed and just have a single entrance across Oxford Street; and advising that, with the trees, it is a blind entrance and it is only a matter of time before someone is hurt.
- John Dickinson, 873 Hellmuth Avenue – advising that he is on the Bishop-Hellmuth Community Association; advising that he has had the opportunity to meet with the landowners in the past and that it is nice to see the potential occupant representative at the meeting as well; indicating that what the City Planners recommended in their report makes a lot of sense, especially during the slide presentation where slides were shown of what a pharmacy looks like when it is not live windows; advising that the walls without windows make him quite concerned; having really solid recommendations, maybe even a minimum requirement for a certain amount of glass is what I would like to see; expressing support for the safety concerns; advising that one of his children would be passing the pharmacy every day; and reiterating that he would like to see many of the staff recommendations adopted along with minimum requirements.
- Laura Kaufman, 778 Hellmuth Avenue – requesting that the entranceway be moved from the southeast corner to the southwest corner and make it more of a streetscape in keeping with the local neighbourhood; advising that she purchased her house five years ago; noting that part of her decision to purchase was because of the architecture and to put something that resembles suburban strip mall blight on a corner that is a gateway to a historic neighbourhood just is not right; and hoping that the Committee follows the guidelines and the recommendations and makes them stipulations instead.

- Mohamed Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue – advising that he grew up in Old North and that he presently still resides in Old North; indicating that he has never made a submission to a Committee or to staff in any shape or form, but what they have on the site is a vacant lot; advising that they have the opportunity to develop this land into something usable; indicating that they want to keep the character of the neighbourhood; indicating that asking Rexall to put in a new door that could possibly make it unfeasible for them is a shame; reiterating that he would like to keep the character of the area, but not to handcuff the applicant, whether it is Rexall or someone else; advising that this is an opportunity to take a vacant lot and get tax money out of this for the next 15, 20 or 30 years; and advising that the infrastructure is there and to handcuff a business coming in here would be very sad.
- Mari Parks, 798 Hellmuth Avenue – advising that she has been involved with the Community Association for a very long time; indicating that she has been before the Committee for two or three other issues in this neighbourhood; expressing concern about the architectural design of this indicating that Shell worked with the community over its redevelopment many years ago; advising that Shell representatives met with the Community Association and that has not happened in this instance at all; indicating that Mr. Farhi was asked to meet with the Community Association and the community when the house was demolished over some landscaping and other plans at the time; noting that that still has not happened; indicating that, other than the landscaping issues, these two proposals have not addressed the architectural features or the compatibility concerns that have been mentioned in many letters to staff and the Committee members; advising that this design would be more appropriate if Appendix “E” of the staff report was considered; noting that this would address the aesthetics of the building, make the connection with the community and the pedestrian traffic more appropriate for this area; indicating that we need to get this right as this building is going to be there for a long time; noting that it is not something that is going to be put up and torn down in five to 10 years; indicating that the building has to be used if Rexall decides to pull out; noting that this building has to be useful for other purposes as well; and recommending that the Committee add the recommendations in Appendix “E” to the zoning application so that the community knows that they can go forward with consistent historic aspects for this community.
- Sandra Boersen, 310 Huron Street – advising that this is the entrance that she uses to get into her neighbourhood; noting that she tends not to go in through Huron Street or Adelaide Street or Richmond Street; expressing surprise for where the building sits on the site; advising that she was expecting to see something that mirrored the northwest corner where the Shell is; advising that she was expecting to see a mirroring as it is a gateway into the neighbourhood; indicating that she does not object to what this is, she just did not expect to see this; advising that she expected to see some tie in to being a part of the historical area by having a wall similar to what the other side has; expressing concern with the service entrance because there will now be delivery trucks coming in and out of Waterloo Street and that is not the intention of Waterloo Street; noting that it was never the intention for Waterloo Street, even when it was a commercial facility before; advising that two houses were removed to make this site into one larger commercial spot which now encroaches more into the neighbourhood than normal; echoing the concerns of the school about what comes in and out of that service entrance and whether that would be restricted in some way so that those service trucks do not end up coming into the neighbourhood further and start using Waterloo Street as a bypass instead of going down Oxford Street, which they should be using; advising that she has not seen much in the way of any historical features going into this building besides the brick colour; indicating that she thinks that this is a Waterloo Street address and putting in faux windows and doors does not address the fact that this is a Waterloo Street address; indicating that this reminds her of the silos that were built on Huron Street where there were no entrances and windows and the concerns that were raised over that at the time; noting that putting up faux windows does not address that; advising that it just flies in the face of what we consider a historical area and what we would consider appropriate; indicating that the difference in terms of

width and length is 10.5 feet; indicating that 10.5 feet is not enough to stop the internal flow inside a building; advising that she echoes the concerns that have been raised about the length of time the building will be standing and how it is the entrance to the neighbourhood and what that represents; understanding that jobs will be coming to this facility, but they will be coming to this facility whether it faces 90 degrees or not; they will come to this facility whether they build this correctly or not; advising that her concern is in building something appropriate; indicating that a slow erosion of a historic district ends up being no historic district at all; advising that a lot of effort has gone into making this a historic district and we are asking that that concern be honoured; requesting that when people buy something in a historic area, they actually build something that fits into the historic area; indicating that when she travels, she travels to areas that have mostly historic buildings because she likes architecture; indicating that when she goes to places like Niagara-on-the-Lake it always shocks her how well national chains are able to accommodate older buildings and work within them and still maintain a sense of history yet they can do it without having to do this; indicating that it can be done, there needs to be a will to do it; and noting that if there is a will to do it, you will make it work and you will make it work for everyone.

- Jim Kogelheide, 373 Byron Boulevard – advising that he has an education in architecture; noting that it was always fascinating for him when pushed by the teachers, when we were doing mock designs, how they would go about thinking of the history of an area and using that history to incorporate some of the technologies of the present to create something that was a blending of the two to further enhance the integrity and architectural aspects of the area as well as to consider the needs, both commercially and economically in terms of employment for local communities; advising that when he hears that another national chain is coming to town is the amount of garbage that will be created; and advising that national chains do nothing to enhance local economic development as most of their products are shipped from overseas.
- Shmuel Farhi, Farhi Holdings Corporation, applicant – advising that it was not easy to find an international client like Rexall prepared to build a flagship store at this location creating construction and retail jobs; noting that it is 25 new jobs for the site, with over 170 jobs during construction; indicating that the only other serious inquiry that they had in the last year plus was from petroleum dealers looking to open another gas bar as the current zoning allows; advising that this pharmacy development will generate an additional \$2,000,000 in taxes for the City; indicating that Rexall is sensitive to the concerns, the standard layout was significantly modified to create a design more harmonious with the neighbourhood; indicating that the finished building will be far more attractive than the old drugstore on the southeast corner and the gas bar and office building on the northwest corner; advising that when talking about heritage, he takes credit to say that he owns more heritage buildings in the City of London than any other individual or corporation; noting that he owns over 52 buildings to date; indicating that he looks after them; indicating that he understands what heritage means and that he understands what is at stake; however, looking at this corner, he thinks that this application is the best use of what can be done with this corner; advising that they are taking a small store and bringing it into this century; reiterating that this development will be a much better fit than any other gas station or anything else than can be built there; and advising that he welcomes international companies into London any day. (see attached photographs) (2013-D14A)

26. Land Needs Background Study for the 2011 Official Plan Review (O-7938)

Recommendation: That, the following actions be taken with respect to the ReThink London Official Plan Review process:

- a) a Public Participation Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee BE HELD on October 8, 2013 to consider the Land Needs Background Study, as a background document for the Rethink London Official Plan Review process; and,
- b) the development community BE ASKED to work with the Civic Administration to further review the analysis and assumptions used to determine the urban growth boundary and to further review the requests for expansions to that boundary, to determine if certain lands have unique or strategic qualities that would warrant them being added to or removed from the urban growth boundary;

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

- a communication dated July 10, 2013, from E.F. Brown, 3133 Colonel Talbot Road, et al;
- a communication dated July 15, 2013 from D.R. Schmidt, Development Manager, Corlon Properties Inc.;
- a communication dated July 17, 2013 from M. Jackson-Brewer, 1996 Bradley Avenue;
- a communication dated July 19, 2013 from P. Masschelein, Vice President, Neighbourhood Developments, Sifton Properties Limited;
- the attached communication dated July 23, 2013 from R. Knutson, Knutson Development Consultants Inc.; and,
- the attached communication dated July 23, 2013 from C.M. Weibe, MHBC Planning Consultants, on behalf of J-Aar Excavating;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the following individuals made oral submissions in connection therewith:

- Shmuel Farhi, Farhi Holdings Corporation – discussing a parcel of approximately 137 acres in East London; indicating that he believes that East London deserves to have development close to the work force; advising that there should be affordable homes for people working close to the Industrial Park; and discussing a parcel of 500+ acres along Highway 402, Colonel Talbot Road, Longwood Road and Murray Road; indicating that this property borders Highway 402 and is outside of the urban growth boundary.
- Tom Brown, 3133 Colonel Talbot Road North, on behalf of the West Talbot Road Landowners Association – advising that he represents the landowners on the west side of Colonel Talbot Road, south of Southdale Road, north of Pack Road and east of Dingman Creek; quoting the “Vision” statement; indicating that their lands are surrounded by urban growth; advising that, in years past, they were able to rent lands across the road and down Southdale Road; noting that renting land is no longer available to them; advising that the viability of farming this land is very restrictive; indicating that moving farm machinery around the arterial roads is not only cumbersome, but it could be dangerous; advising that the machinery can be quite large; indicating that a large portion of their lands either abut or include the Dingman Creek ecosystem and watershed, which is a very strong area of natural heritage; noting that approximately 35% of their lands are either woodland or part of the Dingman Creek ecosystem; reading Section 2.10 of the Official Plan; advising that, at one time, they had approximately 600 acres of land; noting that they no longer have that amount of land; advising that the economist scale is lost for them; indicating that the viability of farming that land is not an option; indicating that the urban development and commercial development in the area is separating their land and forcing them into a position where they can no longer move machinery and farm like they used to; advising that trespassing is one of their major problems

with urban development on three sides; noting that they have people snowmobiling, driving all-terrain vehicles, off-leash dog walking and dumping garbage on their lands; indicating that their farms are running into a compatibility issue with the surrounding urban areas as they cannot move their machinery around and they cannot farm like they used to; advising that they used to have dairy, beef and cash crops; noting that the revenue from the cash crop will cover the cost of the crop itself, pay the taxes and insurance; noting that this is what they are limited to now; advising that their land is no longer productive as farm land; indicating that they have servicing on three sides of their properties; noting that Southdale Road, Colonel Talbot Road and Pack Road are all fully serviced; indicating that including their properties inside the urban growth boundary would not be a significant cost or pose a difficulty to include their lands in the South West Area Plan; advising that there was recently a memo that stated that the South West area is anticipated to have significant growth over the next 20 years; advising that they are in that area; noting that the Dingman Creek would add significant access to the citizens of London; and reiterating to please include their lands in the urban growth boundary.

- Ali Jomaa, 1431 Sunningdale Road West – indicating that he owns 108 acres of property northwest of Sunningdale; advising that there is a major transportation route being planned for Sunningdale Road; indicating that the Heard Drain, which is being developed, is part of that land; advising that his land slants towards the drain very slightly which is excellent for the reduction of costs; advising that the land is very smooth all the way across; indicating that the reduction of costs is very important; and advising that if the City is looking to make sure that this is profitable, he is making the argument that this is a natural position for it to be positioned because of the services and the transportation route.
- William Hill, on behalf of Margaret Jackson-Brewer – requesting that the lands on the north and south side of Bradley Avenue from Old Victoria Sideroad to the present urban growth boundary be put into the new urban growth boundary; indicating that it is consistent with putting building lots where people work and it is becoming impossible to farm on Bradley Avenue because of the traffic; indicating that there is no cattle farming left in the area; noting that it is all cash cropping as you cannot take the risk of having an animal get loose on Bradley Avenue; advising that they believe that it is a great piece of land for the City for several reasons, including the fact that the City spent a lot of money providing hydro and water to the area to service the industrial area; indicating that the south side of Bradley in this area goes right to Highway 401 so that you have three kilometers of land along Highway 401; indicating that you have the Highbury Avenue interchange as well as the Veterans Memorial Parkway interchange, with approximately four kilometers of land in between that is serviced already; suggesting that the south side of Bradley Avenue be zoned Industrial and the north side of Bradley Avenue be zoned Residential, which would then be consistent with Bradley Avenue as it goes back into the old part of the City; indicating that another reason he believes this land should be included in the urban growth boundary is because when the City expanded the Industrial area and went from Commissioners Road down to Highway 401 and over to Old Victoria Sideroad, he does not believe that there was any consideration given, and there was no consultation with the people who lived on Bradley Avenue, as to the impact that the expansion that the Industrial lands will have; indicating that a number of plants have now been built; indicating that the amount of traffic that they have on Bradley Avenue now as compared to what they had before, has turned it from a great place to live in the countryside, to living in the City; noting that it is probably even noisier because there are not the barriers around to break the noise; looking at it from the point of view of the residents on Bradley Avenue, they should be in the plan and the City needs to correct that; and indicating that they are an island with nothing happening in between Veterans Memorial Park, the Industrial area and Summerside.

- Dave Schmidt, Corlon Properties Inc. – advising that their property is approximately 82 acres on the northwest side of Sunningdale Road and Wonderland Road North; indicating that they were before the Committee five years ago as part of the 2006 Official Plan review; indicating that the subject property is uniquely positioned because the municipal boundary is immediately along the northerly property line all the way across the end of the City, but the urban growth boundary follows Sunningdale Road, then goes up Wonderland Road North and continues along the municipal boundary; indicating that full municipal services already exist on their property; advising that there is a 900mm watermain existing all the way down Sunningdale Road, there is a 375mm sanitary sewer stub metres away from the intersection that was part of the Medway Trunk sanitary sewer project that has just been built in the last five years and was sized to service this area; the stormwater management environmental assessment has been done and included these lands; indicating that everything is here to allow this land to move forward; advising that the problem is that there is a line on the map that has it on the wrong side of it; indicating that there is a big difference between today and the last Official Plan that was completed because at that time the Municipal Council recognized many of the presentations that were done, there were unique opportunities here that probably should have been reviewed in a different way than has ever been reviewed to date; indicating that the Municipal Council resolution from August 13, 2007 (reads part d) of the resolution); indicating that he reviews the Agendas every week as part of his job, he has reviewed the 2011 ReThink process, he has reviewed the 2001 Land Needs Background Study (reading the Terms of Reference for the 2011 Official Plan review); indicating that he has not seen this done to date; noting that he has not seen the report from the 2007 resolution relating to this matter and he has not seen an evaluation of the lands that possibly could be considered for inclusion in the urban growth boundary being done, other than an analysis that says that we have “x” amount of land, we need “this” amount of land and we have more than we need, none of them represent an emergence opportunity, nothing to do; indicating that he is not sure that this is the way we should be proceeding forward; advising that we are rethinking the Official Plan in the City of London; indicating that we are not reaffirming a growth boundary that was drawn in 1996 as part of the Vision 96 process based upon thinking that was in place at that time; noting that lots of things have changed; advising that lots of infrastructure has gone in the ground; indicating that some very big decisions have been made by this Municipal Council since then with respect to servicing (ie. Southside Sewage Treatment Control Plant); believing that the Municipal Council needs to take into consideration not expanding the growth boundary but looking at the viability of adjusting the growth boundary, not necessarily adding any more growth acreage in, but taking a look at the requests that are before you and deciding whether they represent good, sound, logical planning that is cost effective and efficient to this municipality, its existing residents and its future residents; noting that our development charges rely on this; indicating that, if we continue to develop land that is not the most economical to service, our development charges will put us at a continuous economic disadvantage compared to our neighbouring municipalities around us where people will continue to go to to seek residential homes when we price ourselves out of the market because we are not developing the most efficient land that we possibly can; reiterating that, with the piece of land that they have, the services are bought, paid for and installed; noting that capacity exists at the Plant, but the line drawn on the maps says that we have enough, there is no reason to consider it; indicating that the methodology that was employed the Land Needs Background Study that was just completed was the same that was done five years ago; advising that land needs equals supply minus demand; noting that it is impossible for anyone here today to contest those findings; indicating that there is a lot of land inside the growth boundary; enquiring as to whether or not this land is efficiently positioned to optimize the services that we have already bought and paid for; noting that he is not sure that anyone here can answer that question today; indicating that the analysis that the Municipal Council requested back in 2007, as part of the Municipal Council resolution previously mentioned, has never been done; noting that it is not here today as part of the Land

Needs Background Study; advising that he is not sure anyone will be able to tell how much 100 acres inside the urban growth boundary is going to cost to develop as opposed to any of the applications that are before the Committee today; indicating that other municipalities have swapped land; noting that the Township of Middlesex Centre swapped land in their last Official Plan review; indicating that it is not a question of whether or not we have enough land in the urban growth boundary, but whether this land is strategically located to achieve sufficient development patterns and optimize the investment in infrastructure and public service facilities; indicating that a review of the City of London Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement would suggest, to him, that a realignment of the urban growth boundary needs to be considered; reiterating that he is not talking about an expansion of the urban growth boundary, but a realignment of the urban growth boundary; and advising that the road that we are going down today is not consistent with the City of London Official Plan, but also not with the Provincial Policy Statement.

- Carol Weibe, MHBC Planning Consultants, on behalf of J-Aar Excavating – indicating that she was before the Planning Committee in 2007 requesting that J-Aar Excavating be included in the urban growth boundary; indicating that this is a unique property that is currently licensed as an aggregate extraction property; noting that the urban growth boundary runs along the west and the south property limits; also noting that it is adjacent to existing residential property development on two sides, the west side and the south side; indicating that it is currently designated Agriculture in the Official Plan and zoned for extraction; indicating that, in the six years since she was before them, there has been a considerable amount of development in this immediate area; noting that the lands to the south and west, those subdivisions, those lands have been developing at a very brisk rate; showing a map of the Kilally North Area Plan; noting that the property was intended, at the appropriate time, to complete this area plan; noting that Blackwell Boulevard terminates at the property line and Cedar Hollow Boulevard to the south is also intended to connect through and loop through that property to provide that collector road system and to provide transit and to really round out this Area Plan; indicating that the issues brought to the Committee's attention in 2007 are still relevant today; advising that what is unique about this property is that it is a current extraction operation, under their license they are required to extract the aggregate that is there and every year that they are remaining outside of that urban growth boundary they continue to extract so the grades on that property continue to get lower and lower; advising that that means that when they have exhausted the aggregate, in order for these lands to develop as they were planned, an equivalent amount of fill will need to be brought in to bring that land back up; indicating that the services for this property have already been installed; noting that the services have been oversized, constructed and paid for; reiterating that these lands can be serviced today; advising that the concerns that J-Aar Excavating has is that if the lands continue to be left outside of the urban growth boundary, they are going to come to the point where the land is no longer economically feasible to service due to the amount of fill that will need to be brought in; indicating that the only way that they can relinquish their license is that they would have to demonstrate to the Ministry of Natural Resources that their rehabilitation plan required them to keep the elevations as they are today; asking the Committee and the Municipal Council to look at this service and say if we do not bring these lands in in the immediate future, we are going to forever prevent them from being brought in because it will not be economically feasible to do so; indicating that, as this Area Plan clearly demonstrates, it was intended to complete this Area Plan and to have these road stubs just terminate and never be completed is really bad planning; advising that she believes that this site warrants consideration; and reminding the Committee that when she brought these points to the Committee's attention the last time, there were three properties that were singled out and staff was directed to go back and to look at them, noting that this was one of them and it was because of the severity of the policies that said that if you have sufficient lands within that 20 year horizon, it does not matter how justified a parcel is and because staff did not want to go down that road of the trade-offs and the swaps, it did not get in, even though, back in 2007, there was recognition

that it warranted further consideration; asking the Committee to now take that extra step, look at the property and ask if we want to lose this opportunity because that is exactly what will happen; indicating that the property is approximately 40 hectares; however, there are a lot of ponds on the land and chances are the northern half of the property will not be built on.

- Carol Weibe, MHBC Planning Consultants, on behalf of the London Development Institute (LDI) – see communication dated July 19, 2013.
- Maureen Zunti, Sifton Properties Limited – reiterating the concerns about the Land Needs Background Study that Ms. Weibe just mentioned; expressing concern with respect to some of the assumptions for intensification; advising that one of the ones that she has a specific concern about is that 88% of high density development will occur in the infill areas; noting that that is above the trend for the past 10 years; advising that what that means is that, if you assume that a typical apartment building being constructed these days, particularly in suburban areas, is an average of 150 units, the intensification assumption would require approximately 77 apartment buildings to be constructed in the built area over the next 20 years, with only 10 buildings in the greenfield areas; indicating that she does not believe that that is reflective of what the City is looking for in terms of building complete communities; advising that there are some questions about how these assumptions are being put forward that we have to look at and get more information on; reiterating the concern about the table on page 335 on the PEC Agenda; noting that the variation in the average densities between the five categories is far too wide as it does range from 3.5 to 34.4 units per hectare; further noting that some of the numbers may be too low and some of the numbers may be too high; indicating that, particularly with the designated residential lands, that they are assuming there to be almost 34,000 units to be constructed; noting that the low density units there are actually 41%, the percentage of low density units is higher than is actually existing in the draft subdivision plans which are currently under review and the density is still much higher than that; advising that there are some numbers that do not make sense that they need to have more background information on; indicating that she submitted a letter to staff approximately one week ago outlining some of these concerns; indicating that on page 23 of the staff report relating to this item, the “Land Use Background Study”, it indicates that there were five adjustments made to the residential greenfield supply numbers so we cannot really test those numbers because the numbers are different than the Vacant Land Inventories for 2011 and 2012; indicating that they do not know what the adjustments are and they do not know how the densities were calculated, whether they are net or gross; advising that it is really critical for them to meet with staff and get more information on their questions and concerns because the Land Needs Background Study is essentially a mathematical exercise and if you do not have the right numbers at the front, then everything else can be quite wrong.
- Phil Masschelein, Sifton Properties Limited – see attached presentation.
- Nick Sauter, 204 Tremont Road – advising that he lives in Argyle, which is the largest neighbourhood in London, with 55,000 people living there; indicating that he speaks on behalf of the people living in Argyle who have unique problems that no one in other areas of the City have ever faced; advising that, in 1959, Argyle was not part of the City; noting that they were not annexed until 1961; indicating that anyone who knows the City knows that not all planning in the past has gone well; noting that, in the past, the Planners divided the City into two, with all of the industries in one end of town, which they did in the 1960’s and 1970’s; indicating that, eventually, Airport Road (Veterans Memorial Parkway) was built, which was deemed to be the first part of a ring road; noting that that did not work out either; advising that the Argyle Community Association was started because they did not feel they were being treated fairly; indicating that their five Councillors are on board with what is going on; indicating that, in 2010, Mr. Farhi approached him to get the Argyle Community Association’s support for a project that he wanted to propose to them; indicating that he bought some land that was formerly Lagrou Farms and he has some wonderful plans for a subdivision with houses that people can afford; noting that the Argyle Community Association supports Mr. Farhi’s idea and has lobbied for it; requesting that this request not be

rejected because we have enough land, that parcel of land, east of Crumlin Road is the only spot left in all of Ward 2 where you can build a small residential development; indicating that he believes that ReThink London is a great idea; and advising that this is the first time that he has heard of people thinking about building a city thriving on the idea of neighbourhoods.

- Alan R. Patton, Patton Cormier and Associates, on behalf of the Wickerson Land Owners Association – indicating that the area is south of Byron Baseline Road, Wickerson Road (the north/south road on the east side), part of Southdale Road and over to West del Bourne; advising that the area is approximately 87 hectares; indicating that the lands are boundary serviced and the stormwater management ponds been the subject of an environmental assessment; advising that the entire property is easily serviceable and is a logical extension of land in the west end of the City which has schools and other infrastructure; indicating that the plan picks up the proposed planned realignment of Byron Baseline Road to meet with Elviage Drive on the west side of West del Bourne; advising that this is not a hypothetical situation; indicating that this is a very real, logical extension of the urban growth boundary; advising that they have cost the project out, as Mr. Masschelein said, for another area in the City, this is a net benefit in terms of development charges of \$23,000,000; indicating that it provides transportation plans, the realignment of Baseline Road/Boler Road; advising that it also relates to the Altus Growth Study because they play off Mr. Barrett's presentation; noting that a lot of the statistics are from 2006 to 2011 in terms of demand and building permits; further noting that, during this time, there was a down turn in the economy, in terms of the building economy and the worldwide economy and that had an effect on London, so that it is not the best five year period to take for your analysis; indicating that another problem with the Study is that it includes a number of verifiable assumptions and a number of non-verifiable assumptions, which Ms. Weibe went over to a considerable degree; indicating that the reliance on the Altus Study is much on reliance on take-out yet those have been depressed over the last five years, we are not at a take-out where we should be but we are in a recovery; requesting, for verification of net benefit, refer to Agenda Item 26 e), Sifton Properties (Mr. Maschellin's) communication verifying the development charges and the net benefit to the development charges funds; advising that the infrastructure is planned; indicating that, logically, the Stanley estate on Wickerson Road should have been included as there is a master plan that provides for open space, stormwater management and represents a very logical extension of the urban growth boundary in an area of the City, in the west end, where there is a demand for growth and the other infrastructure and amenities already exist and are development charges positive; and reiterating that it really should have been included earlier, but it was left out.
- Sergio Pompili and Ryan Pompili, Sergio E. Pompili & Associates Ltd. – see attached presentation.
- Paul Hinde, Tridon Group of Companies – speaking in generalities, we have heard from Planning staff that they believe that there are sufficient lands within the boundary right now for 20 year growth and there has been a substantial amount, and very compelling arguments to encourage the Municipal Council to consider some flexibility and consideration of bringing additional lands in, both from an economic standpoint from servicing but also from other standpoints such as economic growth throughout the City; advising that, although City staff is saying that they have sufficient lands, they have also asked staff to look at, not on a micro basis, but really is there sufficient lands within the 20 year growth boundary to accommodate the growth that they actually need; indicating that Tridon Group of Companies is in partnership with Thames Village Joint Venture for a residential subdivision, in the southeast corner, in Old Victoria (Hamilton Road and Commissioners Road) and that draft plan of subdivision is 31.5 hectares in size, of which only 14 hectares is being developed for residential purposes; noting that the other 18 hectares is either Thames River floodplain or natural heritage feature and non-developable lands; advising that, on that micro analysis, out of a 31 hectare parcel of land, only 40% of the land is going to be developed for residential purposes, accommodating the growth that the City is looking at; noting that this is an example of only 40% of the land is being

developed; and encouraging the Municipal Council to listen to the compelling arguments/suggestions that have been made for some flexibility, for some swapping and to maybe consider some new lands being brought in to accommodate those lands already within the urban growth boundary which will not be developed because of constraints associated with natural features or corridors or any other feature.

- Mauro Castrilli, 2156 Highbury Avenue North – advising that he has 4.5 acres that border the urban growth boundary line on the south and west sides; indicating that it is currently zoned R1-11; noting that, in 2005, the Municipal Council passed a resolution severing the property into three lots; indicating that he attended a Stoney Creek Sanitary Trunk Sewer meeting; noting that the sanitary trunk sewer was adopted by the Municipal Council in 2010, which would service along Highbury Avenue North; advising that the Municipal Council has already committed to servicing the property along Highbury Avenue North; and requesting that his property be included in the urban growth boundary.
- Phyllis Matthews, #10-947 Adirondack Road – indicating that she owns property on the west side of the City; advising that, during the Vision 96 process, her property was in the southwest option; indicating that her property is located immediately next to the current urban growth boundary; noting that the property is 31 acres (12.6 hectares); advising that it has been suggested to her by urban planners that the property is suitable for commercial development at the corner of the two arterial roads – Oxford Street and Gideon Drive; noting that the rest of the property, along Gideon Drive, would be high density, medium density and low density along the Parkland, which is now owned by the City; indicating that she submitted a communication for inclusion in the urban growth boundary along with the servicing feasibility of the land, which was prepared by ENG Plus; indicating that there are no servicing issues; stating that the Eagle Ridge subdivision will be required to build the sewer to the corner of Gideon Drive and Oxford Street, which will be right across the road; advising that stormwater management will be looked after by the regional stormwater management facility that will be located on the north side of Oxford Street, opposite Gideon Drive; advising that the Woodhull subdivision, which is immediately to the west will be constructing a municipal watermain along Gideon Drive; noting that this will be paid for by the developer; further noting that this will provide water to her property; and reiterating that her property be included in the urban growth boundary.
- Joe Platino, Mainline Planning Services – indicating that he is representing an owners group who own approximately 160 acres south of Highbury Avenue South, south of Highway 401 and adjacent to the urban growth boundary; thanking the Committee for the opportunity to speak; expressing that it is clear that the Committee is invested in this process and has an open mind for those who wish to be included in the urban growth boundary; expressing support for the submissions, there have been a lot of passionate people speaking and a lot of comprehensive work has been done; noting that he does not believe that that could happen if the municipality had not done the work it has; requesting to be included in the urban growth boundary; noting that they are not on the list that the staff have compiled; indicating that they will be making a very comprehensive submission in the coming days; .
- David Cousins, CBRE – see attached communication.
- Stephen Turner, 463 Tecumseh Avenue East – advising that one of the cruxes of the situation before the Committee is how to determine whose property gets put in the urban growth boundary and whose does not; indicating that there are 13 applicants before the Committee; realizing it is a question of fairness; advising that the Planning staff is well paid and well educated; indicating that the Planning staff have advised that there are more than adequate lands in the 20 year horizon to be able to complete all the growth forecasts of the Lands Needs Assessments; indicating that the arguments that he has heard about the potential to swap lands in and out to create an urban growth boundary that is about the same size but he believes it would be a fair question to ask all 13 proponents if they have land inside the urban growth boundary that they would be prepared to swap out; advising that there is speculation opportunity for those who have lands adjacent to the urban growth boundary whose lands go up in value significantly as soon as you move

it; expressing concern about not seeing a lot of members of the Committee at the ReThink London events and he thinks it is really important for the context of the discussion that is happening on the part of the citizens of London, about what they are saying about what they would like to see the urban form look like and it really is the antithesis of expanding the urban form further; indicating that it is time to pay attention to what the people are saying, to incorporate a lot of the principles and visions that have been articulated through the ReThink London process and take a good look at what is happening here tonight; indicating that he believes that the burden of proof is on the applicants to show that there is a compelling need to expand the urban growth boundary and he does not think that that has gone any further than what the Planning staff have said that there is not. (2013-D08)

IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION

27. Council Committee Recommendations Source Identification

Recommendation: That the communication from Councillor M. Brown dated July 3, 2013, with respect to Council Committee recommendations source identification BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration for consideration. (2013-C03C)

28. Property located at 13 Blackfriars Street - Request For Delegation Status

Recommendation: That B. Storonianski, 13 Blackfriars Street BE DENIED delegation status at a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting; it being noted that the staff will work with the applicant to try to resolve this matter.

V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 PM