

From: LORNA BOWMAN

Sent: Thursday, June 9, 2022 10:37 AM

To: City of London, Mayor <mayor@london.ca>; Lehman, Steve <slehman@london.ca>

Cc: Morin, Benjamin <bmorin@london.ca>; Hillier, Steven <shillier@london.ca>; Turner, Stephen <sturner@london.ca>; Pelosa, Elizabeth <epelosa@london.ca>; Van Meerbergen, Paul <pvanmeerbergen@london.ca>; Morgan, Josh <joshmorgan@london.ca>; Cassidy, Maureen <mcassidy@london.ca>; nsalih@london.ca; Hopkins, Anna <ahopkins@london.ca>; van Holst, Michael <mvanholst@london.ca>; Helmer, Jesse <jhelmer@london.ca>; Lewis, Shawn <slewis@london.ca>; Hamou, Mariam <mhamou@london.ca>; Fyfe-Millar, John <jfmillar@london.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Revised Application & Public Meeting Notice Re: File: O-9206 & Z-9199 689 Oxford Street West now File Z-9199 & O-9206

Dear Mayor Holder, Councillor Lehman and City Councillors,

It is with some dismay that I learnt on June 3, 2022 in the London Free Press on of the upcoming Public Meeting on June 20th to consider the revised application of the Westdell Development plan. The next day I received notice in the mail. This provides less than three weeks notice at a time when many people are already away for the summer.

The revised application was submitted July 7, 2021. I do hope that this has given the members of Council time to not only review the file but also to visit the site in person. Although the address is 689 Street West one must enter and exit from Capulet Walk. There is no access onto Capulet Walk from the west. If you wish to return east, you will need to drive north to Capulet Lane and then go south to Oxford.

I have included my letter of June 15, 2020 for information and comparative purposes. I was pleased to read in the Free Press that Councillor Lehman, City Councillor for this Ward, had heard "from concerned neighbours about the proposed development" and that he realized that the proposed development "would loom over the single-family homes (LFP)." This fact is not addressed in the revised application submitted by Westdell or, is the information given by the Councillor that: "When it was first announced there was a lot of concern from the community.... I had hoped, when it was sent back for revisions, that I would see a substantial decrease in the height and the density... three buildings of that size, on a little triangle (of land), seems pretty intense." Nothing of substance was changed in the revised application submitted to you last July.

Westdell's revised application is for a total of 490 units or **2 less than the original proposal**. The actual percentage increase in density over that currently approved for this area is not stated nor are the total number of proposed so-called affordable units. In fact, the staff report recommending whether to allow for rezoning has not yet been published (LFP). Has it been done? What, if anything, was required of Westdell to be eligible to resubmit the application? As you are aware, the province has dispensed with rent control for all apartment buildings erected from 2018 onwards; and there is no rent control in effect when a tenant moves out. Thus, the very few so-called "affordable" housing units Westdell promises (10 or approximately 6.8 % in Building A with maybe a rent of 10% less than market rate) will not only be out of reach of most prospective low-income tenants -- but will carry no long-term guarantee. In the past year alone, rents have increased by 18% in London, the highest rate of increase in the province. This alone should disqualify them for such a density increase.

Westdell's proposed provision for off-street parking remains a concern. For Building A, it is 152 parking spaces for 146 dwelling units; for Building B, 200 spaces for 160 units; and for **Building C, 137 for 184 dwelling units**. This is a total of 489 off-street parking spaces, or one less than the number of proposed 490 rental units. Many families need two vehicles. Is Westdell proposing on-street parking on Capulet Walk? If permitted, congestion would be compounded.

No mention is made of parking provision for visitor parking and the commercial facilities proposed. What provision for accessible parking will be made for residents, visitors and business customers?

Since the 1989 plan and the London Plan of 2016 (six years ago), this area of London has undergone significant development. We are extremely well-served by grocery stores, restaurants and other essential services. There are few, if any, "commercial" needs. Westdell is seeking to meet a need that is not here.

Below, in my letter of two years ago, I also addressed questions of traffic flow, including accessibility and exit from Oakridge Glen at 43 Capulet Walk and safety concerns when turning north, the difficulties with the proposed recreational use of the Stormwater Management Pond by future Westdell tenants as their "green space" with entrance on foot from Oxford Street, and the overall impact on adjacent property values in the area. The artist's depiction of the shadow from Westdell's proposed development incorrectly shows the shadow ending at the property line proposed for the development itself. **This is false and was not the finding of the original shadow study**. Further, the initial traffic study was done after the end of the academic year in 2019. We are just recovering from the pandemic. An updated traffic study during the upcoming academic year is essential to assess the feasibility of this proposal at all.

It also appears that Westdell does not take into account the traffic congestion that will take place entering and leaving its own proposed development. This will be of especial concern in case of a fire or other emergency. Westdell president Lyman Meddoui's statement cited in the Free Press that "It's going to improve the area There's no doubt development spurs other development" (LFP, 06.03.2022) is not only inaccurate but self-serving. Responsible development, under the purview of London City Council, is required.

It would seem in this process of consultation that the letters sent, the petitions signed and the concerns raised by those who will most be affected that were made known to city officials and councillors both in 2020 and when this revised plan was first shared in 2021 are not of importance to City Council. Is this an example of development for development's sake rather than an effort by City Council to meet the needs of the people of London? if approved, it is a poor legacy for the outgoing Council.

Please review my original letter below. I do not wish to repeat information that was previously brought to your attention. It is my hope that you will give careful consideration to these issues and those raised by other residents residing in this area at the upcoming meeting.

Yours sincerely,
Lorna MA Bowman
18-43 Capulet Walk
Oakridge Glen

On Monday, June 22, 2020, 09:21:43 a.m. EDT, LORNA BOWMAN <

> wrote:

Re: **Notice of Planning Application 689 Oxford Street West** -- File: 0-9206 & Z-9199

Dear Mayor Holder

This letter is regarding the above Notice of Application and its implications for the condominium complex at 43 Capulet Walk known as Oakridge Glen – MSCC no. 536 --as well as the impact it would have on the surrounding area and the consequential resultant increased impact on the residents of Oakridge Glen.

Height of Building(s) Proposed and Population Density

It is my understanding that **the highest building in London currently stands at 24 storeys – One London Place**. This is also the height of the now infamous Grenfell Tower in London, England that burned so dramatically 3 years ago. The latter building held just 120 apartments on the top 20 floors. The rezoning application (23999731 Ontario Limited c/o Westdell Development Corporation) is seeking to obtain an official Plan and Zoning Plan Bylaw Amendment **to allow for the construction of a 22 storey High Rise** and then at a later date, to request an **additional amendment** for two more apartment buildings of **18 and 20 storeys respectively for a total of 492 units**. The land on which it is proposed that these be built is probably comparable to that occupied by One London Place.

Present zoning allows for a maximum of 15 storeys. This proposal, for the first building, is an increase from 150 units per hectare to 293 units per hectare, that is 166 units in the building. This is, for all practical purposes, **a doubling of the present bylaw maximum allowance**. What is the rationale? The 6 units of affordable housing are a token compensation for the proposed density increase. Is the intention to create a densely populated low rent development? Does the City of London Canada want its own Grenfell Tower(s)?

The proposal indicates that there are 166 parking spaces proposed for the 166 units with a single entrance and exit. In a time when most household have two working adults, even the present by-law approval of 1.25 spaces per unit is problematic. Where will tenants park? Off-site parking along Capulet Walk would create an additional problem.

Traffic Flow

I am an original owner in Stage 1 of the Oakridge Glen, having purchased my townhouse in 2003. At that time, the City of London had not repositioned Capulet Lane to provide stop lights at Oxford Street West and “created” Capulet Walk. Since doing so, Capulet Walk has become a shortcut for cars driving south on Wonderland Road via Beaverbrook and Capulet Lane to travel west on Oxford Street. There has been no effort to control the flow of traffic nor drivers’ speeds. When one turns right from Capulet Lane onto Capulet Walk, and then makes a sharp right into Oakridge Glen, one always runs the risk of being rear-ended. Further, with the proposed building(s) at 689 Oxford Street West it will be next to impossible at many times of the day for the residents of 43 Capulet Walk to turn left out of Oakridge Glen onto Capulet Walk to access Capulet Lane.

Since 2003, Drewlo has built four 12 story apartment buildings south of Beaverbrook and another four north of Beaverbrook. These buildings, with the older ones on the east side of Capulet Lane, have significant student populations. The traffic study done for this application was completed in June 2019

at a time when most students have left London for the summer. Additionally, it considers only the immediate area on Capulet Walk and does not note the further development of the area such as the additional high-rise north of Beaverbrook (in the process of completion) and the expansion of the Rona shopping plaza. Nor does it examine overall traffic congestion. Each morning and afternoon there are two bottlenecks at the four-way stop of Capulet Lane and Beaverbrook. One is caused by school buses and the other by commuters going to and from work. Will there be a study to look at the overall traffic impact on this area and the consequences for local residents?

City Responsibility for Safety if Access Provided to Stormwater Management Pond from Oxford Street West

Since 2019, the Stormwater Management Pond built by Auburn Homes has been the responsibility of the City of London. If access is provided from Oxford Street West as proposed will this be considered a City of London Park? Will the City provide the same services it presently affords to City parks? See: [Parks Maintenance](#) Will there be controlled hours and access? What provision will the City make for the protection of children accessing the park (there is no perimeter fence around the pond)? The remnants of a campfire were observed beside the pond the morning of June 14, 2020. What safety provision will the City make to prevent increased break-ins for the homes at Oakridge Glen and on Silversmith Avenue that back onto the pond?

Parks Maintenance

Impact on Property Values at Oakridge Glen

Owners of condominium townhouses pay property taxes at the same rate as other homeowners in London. A Condominium Corporation complex, however, does **not** receive City services other than garbage removal. The Corporation pays for all roadway maintenance, street lighting and electricity, etc. As a Corporation, Oakridge Glen seeks to maintain the units and common elements in a manner reflective of the property's value. If the Westdell rezoning proposal is approved, the increased population density, traffic flow and safety issues will negatively impact the value of all residential single-unit townhouses and houses in the area.

It is my opinion that should this plan move forward at all, no more than two buildings of 12 storeys be approved. It also strikes me that for the sake of stability in the area, rezoning for the full area under consideration should be done at the same time. The present proposal is for the 22-storey building only. In this way, present owners at Oakridge Glen will be able to make their own long-term plans.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,
Lorna MA Bowman
18-43 Capulet Walk