

## Report to Planning and Environment Committee

**To:** Chair and Members  
Planning & Environment Committee

**From:** Scott Mathers MPA, P. Eng.,  
Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development

**Subject:** 489 Upper Queen Street  
Public Participation Meeting  
City File No: Z-9540 Ward 12

**Date:** January 30, 2023

## Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of 2863382 Ontario Inc. c/o Siv-ik Planning & Design Inc. relating to the property located at 489 Upper Queen Street, the proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "A" **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting February 14, 2023, to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, in conformity with The London Plan to change the zoning of the subject property **FROM** a Residential (R1-9) Zone **TO** a Residential Special Provision (R5-7(\_)) Zone.

## Executive Summary

### Summary of Request

The applicant has requested to rezone the subject site from a Residential (R1-9) Zone to a Residential (R5-7(\_)) Special Provision Zone to permit a cluster townhouse development consisting of 10, 2-storey, dwelling units. Special Provisions are requested to permit the desired front, rear, and interior side yard setbacks as well as to reduce the maximum allowable height permitted in the requested zone.

### Purpose and the Effect of Recommended Action

The purpose and effect of the recommended Zoning By-law amendment is to rezone the lands to a Residential (R5-7(\_)) Special Provision Zone to permit a 2-storey cluster townhouse development consisting of 10 dwelling units. Changes to the currently permitted land uses and development regulations are summarized below.

### Rationale of Recommended Action

1. The recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;
2. The recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions, City Building policies, and the Neighbourhoods Place Type policies;
3. The recommended amendment would permit development at an intensity that is appropriate for the site and the surrounding neighbourhood;
4. The recommended amendment facilitates the development of a vacant, underutilized site within the Built-Area Boundary with an appropriate form of development.

# Analysis

## 1.0 Background Information

### 1.1 Property Description

The subject lands are located on the west side of Upper Queen Street approximately 90 metres south of Commissioners Road East within the Highland Planning District. The site is 0.28 hectares in size with a frontage of 45m on Upper Queen Street and a depth of 62.7m. The property is currently vacant and nestled between single detached dwellings to the immediate north, west and south. The surrounding area primarily consists of low-rise residential development and the Highlands Country Club. Municipal services are currently available along Upper Queen Street.

### Figure 1: Photo of 489 Upper Queen Street from Upper Queen Street

### 1.2 Current Planning Information

- The London Plan Place Type – Neighbourhoods
- Existing Zoning – Residential (R1-9)
- Street Classification - Neighbourhood Connector

### 1.3 Site Characteristics

- Current Land Use – Vacant, Undeveloped
- Frontage – 45 metres
- Area – 0.28 hectares
- Shape – Rectangular


### 1.4 Surrounding Land Uses

- North – Residential
- East – Residential
- South – Residential
- West – Residential

### 1.5 Intensification

The proposed development represents intensification within the Built-Area Boundary through the addition of 10 new residential units. The site is located within the Primary Transit Area (PTA).

## 1.6 Location Map




## 2.0 Discussion and Considerations

### 2.1 Development Proposal


*First Submission – November 11, 2022*

The proposed cluster townhouse development was originally proposed to contain 11 new residential dwelling units at a density of up to 60 units per hectare (uph) and a height of up to 10.5 metres. The front building (located to the east of the site and oriented towards Upper Queen Street) originally contained six (6) new dwelling units while the rear building (located at the west end of the site) contained five (5) new dwelling units. Vehicular access is provided via a driveway off Upper Queen Street leading to 22 vehicular parking spaces that can be accessed by way of integrated/attached garages and individual driveways. An additional 4 visitor parking stalls are also included within the site design.

A massing model and site plan of the proposed development is shown on Figure 1 and 2 (below).



**Figure 1: Site Concept Plan (First Submission)**




**Figure 2: Proposed Massing Model (First Submission)**

*Second Submission (Final) – December 19, 2022*

In response to Planning and Development, Site Plan, and Urban Design staff comments, the Applicant submitted a revised site concept plan to staff illustrating the following changes to the proposed site design:

<b>First Submission (November 21, 2022)</b>	<b>Second Submission (December 19, 2022)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 townhouse units (5 in the rear and 6 oriented towards Upper Queen Street)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 townhouse units (5 in the rear and 5 oriented towards Upper Queen Street)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No dedicated pedestrian walkway from Upper Queen Street through the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of the southerly most unit in the front row has allowed for a dedicated pedestrian walkway through the site</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of front yard amenity space for the western row of units – over pavement of front yards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction of garages and driveways for the western row of units to 3.0m to allow more landscaped space has been reflected in the special provisions at the end of this report.</li> </ul>



**Figure 3: Revised Site Plan (Second/Final Submission)**

## 2.2 Requested Amendment

The applicant has requested to rezone the subject site from a Residential (R1-9) Zone to a Residential Special Provision (R5-7(\_)) Zone to permit a 2-storey cluster townhouse development consisting of 10 dwelling units. Special Provisions will also be implemented to prohibit cluster stacked townhouse dwellings on site, and to permit:

- a minimum front yard depth of 4.0m;
- a minimum rear yard depth of 1.0 metres per metre of main building height or fraction thereof but in no case less than 6.0 metres;
- a minimum northern interior yard depth of 1.8 metres when the end wall of a unit contains no windows to habitable rooms, or 6.0 metres when the wall of a unit contains windows to habitable rooms;
- a minimum southern interior yard depth of 10 metres;
- a maximum height of 9.5 metres;
- a maximum density of 36 units per hectare (uph);
- 3.0m garage and driveway widths for all units

## 2.3 Community Engagement (see more detail in Appendix B)

Staff received seventy-one (71) comments during the public consultation period, which will be addressed under Section 4 of this report. The comments can be summarized as follows:

- Inappropriate and incompatible building typology that does not fit in within the character of the neighbourhood
- Over intensification
- Increase in traffic
- Insufficient on-site parking; and
- Invasion of privacy on the nearby single detached homes

## 3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

None.

## **4.0 Key Issues and Considerations**

### **4.1 Issue and Consideration #1: PPS 2020**

#### *Provincial Policy Statement, 2020*

The *Provincial Policy Statement, 2020* (PPS) provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. In accordance with Section 3 of the Planning Act, all planning decisions “shall be consistent with” the PPS.

Section 1.1 of the PPS encourages healthy, livable and safe communities which are sustained by promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the province and municipalities over the long term. The PPS directs settlement areas to be the focus of growth and development, further stating that the vitality and regeneration of settlement areas is critical to the long-term economic prosperity of our communities (1.1.3). As well, the PPS directs planning authorities to provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area (1.4.1).

The policies of the PPS direct planning authorities to identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development and accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment where it can be accommodated. The PPS also takes into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs (1.1.3.3) and is supportive of development standards which facilitate intensification, redevelopment, and compact form (1.1.3.4). Planning authorities are further directed to permit and facilitate all housing options required to meet the social, health, economic and well-being requirements of current and future residents as well as all types of residential intensification, including additional residential units and redevelopment (1.4.3b)). Densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure, public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed, are promoted by the PPS (1.4.3d)).

Lastly, the PPS is supportive of development standards which facilitate intensification, redevelopment, and compact form (1.1.3.4) and identifies that long term economic prosperity should be supported by encouraging a sense of place by promoting a well-designed built form, and by conserving features that help define character (1.7.1 e)).

The recommended amendment is in keeping with the PPS 2020 as it will permit a compatible use within an existing residential neighbourhood and will contribute to providing an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities essential to meeting the projected requirements for current and future residents. The recommended amendment contributes to a land use pattern that makes efficient use of an underutilized parcel within an established neighbourhood and settlement area and represents an appropriate form of residential intensification, which assists in avoiding the need for unjustified, and uneconomical, expansion of land. It should also be noted that the proposed townhouse development is less than 100m from (and within walking distance to) Commissioners Road East where a number of transit stops already exist, and where the future BRT station at Wellington Road and Commissioners Road East is planned for.

### **4.2 Issue and Consideration #2: Key Directions, Use, Intensity and Form**

#### *The London Plan*

The London Plan provides Key Directions (54\_) that must be considered to help the City effectively achieve its vision. These directions give focus and a clear path that will lead to the transformation of London that has been collectively envisioned for 2035. Under each key direction, a list of planning strategies is presented. These strategies serve as

a foundation to the policies of the Plan and will guide planning and development over the next 20 years. Relevant Key Directions are outlined below.

Key Direction #5: The London Plan provides direction for building a mixed-use compact city for London's future by:

- Planning for infill and intensification of various types and forms to take advantage of existing services and facilities and to reduce our need to grow outward (Direction 4)
- Ensuring a mix of housing types within our neighbourhoods so that they are complete and support aging in place (Direction 5)

Key Directions #7 and #8: The London Plan also provides direction to build strong, healthy and attractive neighbourhoods for everyone by:

- Integrating affordable forms of housing in all neighbourhoods (Key Direction #7, Direction 10).
- Thinking “big picture” and long-term when making planning decisions – considering the implications of a short-term and/or site-specific planning decision within the context of this broader view. (Key Direction #8, Direction 3)
- Ensuring new development is a good fit within the context of an existing neighbourhood. (Key Direction #8, Direction 9)

The area surrounding the subject lands primarily consists of low-rise residential and commercial uses that cater to the surrounding community. The proposed rezoning supports these Key Directions by requesting permission to allow a form of residential intensification that is low-rise in nature and includes a type of housing that would contribute to the mix of housing options in the neighbourhood. The proposed development would maximize the use of the land to accommodate appropriate residential density within the neighbourhood thereby allowing existing residents to age in place whilst taking advantage of existing municipal services and facilities.

The site is located within the Neighbourhoods Place Type of The London Plan with frontage onto a Neighborhood Connector (Upper Queen Street) as identified on Map 1 – Place Types and Map 3 – Street Classifications. Permitted uses within Neighbourhoods Place Type at this location include a broad range of residential uses that include townhouses at a maximum height of 3 storeys (The London Plan, Table 10 and 11). When proposing residential intensification projects within the Neighbourhoods Place Type, the City will also consider a variety of design policies including the intensity of the proposed development and the compatibility and fit of the proposal with the surrounding context (The London Plan, Policy 953\_ 2 and 3). In order to determine whether a proposed residential intensification project is appropriate for the surrounding neighbourhood; the following design criteria are considered:

1. Site layout within the context of the surrounding neighbourhood, considering such things as access points, driveways, landscaping, amenity areas, building location, and parking.
2. Building and main entrance orientation.
3. Building line and setback from the street.
4. Character and features of the neighbourhood.
5. Height transitions with adjacent development.
6. Massing appropriate to the scale of the surrounding neighbourhood.

The proposed 2 storey development represents a permitted land use at an appropriate scale and intensity that is considered compatible with the surrounding properties consisting of 1 to 2 storey single detached dwellings. The development also represents an appropriate transition in intensity from the high order uses that are permitted to the north along Commissioners Road East (Civic Boulevard), and the lower density uses that exist to the south of the site along Upper Queen Street. A reduced minimum front yard setback will be implemented for the proposed units fronting onto Upper Queen Street to better align the façade with the properties to the north. Additional special regulations will also be implemented to restrict the development to a maximum height of 9.5m (2 storeys) and 36 uph to better suit the character of the surrounding area. Parking areas will also be located internally and away from the street frontage to maintain the



visual aesthetic of the street wall along Upper Queen Street. It should also be noted that townhouse units themselves are not out of scale or character for the area as this typology of housing currently exists on multiple parcels of land south of the subject site including (but not limited to) 30 Claredon Street and 678 Upper Queen Street.

Furthermore, the applicant has proposed to incorporate a 1.5 metre pedestrian walkway from Upper Queen Street to the western row of townhouses to enhance pedestrian circulation throughout the site (Figure 3) and individual private outdoor amenity space will be provided for each unit. Shared amenity space is also proposed at the northwestern corner of the site which assists in softening the transition between the proposed development and the backyards of the single-family homes along Barons Court.

As such, the proposed development is considered to implement the planned vision of the Neighbourhoods Place Type that intends to help establish an appropriate form and scale of residential intensification while complementing the character of the surrounding area. The proposed cluster townhouse development will also contribute to a mix of housing types and provide choice and diversity in housing options for both current and future residents.

#### **4.3 Issue and Consideration #3: Traffic and Parking**

The applicant is proposing to incorporate 22 resident parking stalls and 4 visitor spots (2 per unit within driveways and private garages) on site for a total of 26 off-street parking spaces. Given that the City's Parking Standards requires that only 1 space be provided for each townhouse unit (Zoning By-Law, Section 4.19) the inclusion of 2 spaces per unit plus 4 additional visitor spaces can be considered more than sufficient to successfully accommodate the increase in vehicles anticipated for the site and assists in mitigating the risk of parking spilling over onto nearby residential streets. Additionally, the site is within close proximity (1.2 kilometres) to the Wellington Road Rapid Transit Protected Major Transit Station Area and planned BRT Station which can contribute to reducing vehicle dependency. The site is also located in close proximity to bus route #4 which runs along Upper Queen Street, south of Commissioners Road East, and bus route #24 which runs directly along Commissioners Road East. There are also several bus stops located at the intersection of Upper Queen Street and Commissioners Road East (located 90m from the subject lands).

Furthermore, Upper Queen Street is considered a Neighbourhood Connector with an average annual daily traffic volume of 12,500 vehicles per day. The Transportation Division has calculated an estimated trip generation using Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates. Based on the ITE -Trip Generation Rate, AM Peak hour (7:45am-8:45am) will generate 6 trips and PM peak hour (4:15pm-5:15 pm) will generate 8 trips only, and there should not be any foreseen traffic issues generated by the proposed development. Based on the above, a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was not warranted and any increased traffic resulting from the additional 10 residential units are not anticipated to negatively impact the surrounding area.

Lastly, the City has developed a Traffic Calming and Procedures manual to assess when traffic calming measures are required. As per the point assessment table, volumes on local roads may become an issue when volumes reach 1500 vehicles a day. As per the assessment above, the addition of 6 and 8 peak hour trips will not significantly affect the capacity of the local roads.

#### **4.3 Issue and Consideration #4: Zoning**

The applicant has requested to rezone the lands from the existing Residential (R1-9) Zone to a Residential Special Provision (R5-7(\_)) Zone. The intent is to permit a 2-storey cluster townhouse development consisting of 10 residential units and 26 parking spaces.

The applicant had initially requested permission to allow a maximum height of 10.5 metres and a maximum density of 60 units per hectare (uph). These regulations would


have allowed the applicant the flexibility to increase the density on site to 60uph and increase the height to 2.5-3 storeys. It is in staff's opinion that in order to ensure the development remains compatible with the surrounding properties in regard to scale and intensity, a maximum height of 9.5 metres and a maximum allowable density of 36uph should be implemented to assist in addressing both departmental and public concerns. These special regulations intend to restrict the height and density of the townhomes to 2 storeys and would not allow any flexibility for additional density.

The existing R1-9 zone is intended to be applied to most suburban low-rise developments and only permits development of single detached dwellings. The R5-7 Zone variation provides for, and regulates, medium density residential development in the form of cluster townhouses and cluster stacked townhouses and permits a maximum height of 12.0 metres and a maximum density of 60uph. In this case, a special provision to **only** permit cluster townhouses (and remove the potential development of cluster stacked townhouses) shall be implemented to align the proposed zoning with the permitted uses allowed along a Neighbourhood Connector in The London Plan (which does not include stacked townhouses outside of Central London). The provision is intended to restrict all future uses on the site to cluster townhomes to ensure development on the lands remains at an appropriate scale and building typology that is compatible with surrounding properties and does not overwhelm the neighbourhood with over intensification. Additional special provisions relating to building setbacks, height, density, and garage widths are outlined below:

*Front Yard Depth: A minimum front yard depth of 4.0m*

The intent of front yard setback regulations are to ensure that consistent street walls are maintained along streetscapes and that sufficient front yard space is incorporated into the design of neighbourhoods to accommodate landscaping. Front yard setbacks also ensure that adequate separation is achieved between buildings and roadways and that adequate distance is provided in the event of future road widening.

As previously mentioned, the proposed special regulation will ensure that the new units will be sited closer to the street to better align the eastern (front) row of units with the established street wall created by the properties to the north along Upper Queen Street. The proposed setback would also leave sufficient front yard space for landscaping at the eastern (front) row of units (Figure 5). The proposed 4.0 metre (minimum) setback also accounts for the 3.0 metre road widening dedication along Upper Queen Street.




**Figure 5: Conceptual Landscape Plan**

*Rear Yard Depth: 1.0 metre per metre of main building height or fraction thereof but in no case less than 6.0 metres*

The intent of rear yard setbacks is to ensure that buildings are designed to minimize and mitigate potential impacts and privacy related concerns on adjacent properties.

In this case, the proposed rear yard depth is intended to remain proportional to the proposed building height (9.5m) to recognize the existing low rise residential dwellings along Barons Court by providing an enhanced rear yard setback that would allow more room for individual and shared amenity space. The proposed rear yard setback further assists in providing an appropriate buffer to minimize overlook between the proposed development and the single-family homes to the west along Barons Court. The regulation will also ensure all new buildings on the project site fit within a 45-degree angular plane measured from grade, thereby mitigating potential massing and shadow impacts to surrounding properties (Figure 6).



**Figure 6: Proposed East-West Section Diagram**

*Interior Yard Depth: A minimum northern interior yard depth of 1.8 metres when the end wall of a unit contains no windows to habitable rooms, or 6.0 metres when the wall of a unit contains windows to habitable rooms. A minimum southern interior yard depth of 10 metres*

The intent of interior side yard setbacks is ultimately to ensure that there is perimeter access around buildings or structures for repairs and maintenance and to ensure adequate buffering is provided between adjacent properties to mitigate concerns relating to access, privacy, and runoff.

The requested minimum interior yard depth of 10 metres (to the south) is proposed to be increased from what is currently permitted in the R5-7 base zone (5.0m minimum required). The proposed regulation will allow for the inclusion of both a driveway and pedestrian walkway on the southern end of the site whilst still providing enough landscaped buffer between the proposed driveway and the residential property to the south.

Staff also consider the proposed 1.8 metre setback to the north (if the end unit contains no windows to habitable rooms) and 6.0 metre setback (if the end unit contains windows to habitable rooms) appropriate for the development given that the end walls of the townhouse units to the north directly abut the driveway and landscaped yard of the adjacent property. This would assist in providing a buffer between the townhomes and existing residential buildings at 481 Upper Queen Street and 297 Commissioners Road East. There are also no vehicular access points on the northern portion of the subject site and, as such, staff consider the proposed special regulations appropriate.

*Garage Widths: Garage and Driveway widths no greater than 3.0 metres for all units*

Garage width regulations within the Primary Transit Area (PTA) are in place with the intent that the width of a building will determine the permitted width of the garage. This is to ensure that the width of a garage does not interfere with porches or living space at the front of the home, and to ensure that the width of the garage remains proportional to the width of the building. This regulation, along with additional PTA regulations, were put in place to help address compatibility issues with infill developments in established communities. The proposed regulation seeks to ensure that infill developments are not dominated by garages or paved surfaces and are keeping in character with the existing built form. Furthermore, as per Section 4.19 of the Zoning By-law, parking spaces are required to only be a minimum of 2.7m wide. As such, garage and driveway widths for the proposed development will be required to be no greater and 3.0m to adequately accommodate a vehicle, whilst remaining proportional to the width of the townhouse units and leaving more space for landscaping and amenity areas.

*Height and Density: A maximum height of 9.5 metres and a maximum density of 36uph.*

As mentioned previously, the proposed building height regulation will allow for the implementation of the development as it is currently proposed to ensure that it remains compatible with the surrounding properties. Implementing a specific height and density

would restrict the cluster townhomes to be constructed at a maximum of 2-storeys and would not permit deviation to ensure the development is built at a scale and intensity that remains complimentary, and not intrusive, to the surrounding 1-2 storey single detached homes.

For the reasons identified above, staff are of the opinion that the proposed Residential Special Provision (R5-7(\_)) Zone is appropriate for the site and would permit a specific development proposal at an appropriate scale and configuration that is compatible with the surrounding area.

## **Conclusion**

The recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 and conforms to the policies of The London Plan for the Neighbourhoods Place Type. The recommended Amendment would facilitate the utilization of an underutilized residential parcel within an established low-rise residential neighbourhood and would also succeed in broadening the range and mix of housing options within the area to support the needs of current and future residents. As such, the proposed amendment is being recommended for approval.

**Prepared by:** Anusha Singh  
Planner I

**Reviewed by:** Mike Corby, MCIP, RPP  
Manager, Planning Implementation

**Recommended by:** Heather McNeely, MCIP, RPP  
Director, Planning and Development

**Submitted by:** Scott Mathers, MPA, P. Eng  
Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic  
Development

**Copy:** Britt O'Hagan, Manager, Community Planning, Urban Design and Heritage  
Michael Pease, Manager, Site Plans  
Ismail Abushehada, Manager, Development Engineering

## Appendix A

Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)  
2023

By-law No. Z.-1-\_\_\_\_\_

A by-law to amend By-law No. Z.-1 to  
rezone an area of land located at 489  
Upper Queen Street

WHEREAS Siv-ik Planning & Design Inc. has applied to rezone an area of land located at 489 Upper Queen Street, as shown on the map attached to this by-law, as set out below;

AND WHEREAS this rezoning conforms to the Official Plan;

THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

Schedule "A" to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by changing the zoning applicable to lands located at 489 Upper Queen Street, as shown on the attached map comprising part of Key Map No. A107, FROM a Residential (R1-9) Zone **TO** a Residential (R5-7(\_)) Special Provision Zone.

- 1) Section Number 9.4 of the Residential (R5-7) Zone is amended by adding the following Special Provisions:

R5-7 ( ) 489 Upper Queen Street

a) Permitted Uses

- i) Cluster Townhouse Dwellings

b) Regulations

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| i) Front Yard Depth (Minimum)            | 4.0 metres  |
| ii) Rear Yard Depth (Minimum)            | 1.0 metre per 1.0 metre of main building height or fraction thereof but in no case less than 6.0 metres   |
| iii) North Interior Yard Depth (Minimum) | 1.8 metres when the end wall of a unit contains no windows to habitable rooms, or 6.0 metres when the wall of a unit contains windows to habitable rooms. |
| iv) South Interior Yard Depth (Minimum)  | 10 metres   |

- v) Height (m)  
(Maximum) 9.5 metres
- vi) Density  
(Maximum) 36 uph
- vii) Notwithstanding the regulations of Section 4.23 of this by-law to the contrary, garage and driveway widths for each unit shall be no greater than 3.0 metres

The inclusion in this By-law of imperial measure along with metric measure is for the purpose of convenience only and the metric measure governs in case of any discrepancy between the two measures.

This By-law shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with Section 34 of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P13*, either upon the date of the passage of this by-law or as otherwise provided by the said section.


PASSED in Open Council on February 14, 2023

Josh Morgan  
Mayor


Michael Schulthess  
City Clerk

First Reading – February 14, 2023  
Second Reading – February 14, 2023  
Third Reading – February 14, 2023

AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE "A" (BY-LAW NO. Z.-1)



File Number: Z-9540  
Planner: AS  
Date Prepared: 2022/12/16  
Technician: JI  
By-Law No: Z.-1-

SUBJECT SITE 

1:800

0 4 8 16 24 32  
 Meters





## Appendix B – Public Engagement

### Community Engagement

**Public liaison:** On September 21, 2022, Notice of Application was sent to property owners and tenants in the surrounding area. Notice of Application was also published in the *Public Notices and Bidding Opportunities* section of *The Londoner* on September 22, 2022. A “Planning Application” sign was also posted on the site.

**Nature of Liaison:** The purpose and effect of this zoning change is to permit a cluster townhouse development consisting of 10, 2 storey, residential units and 26 total parking spaces. Possible change to Zoning By-law Z.-1 **FROM** a Residential (R1-9) Zone **TO** a Residential (R5-7(\_)) Special Provision Zone

**Public Responses:** 71 (see below)

---

#### 1. Gene Gordon

We are in favor of development of this property, while adhering to existing R1-9 Zoning Requirements. Nothing other than a configuration of detached single-family homes is acceptable for this property. Please do not set a precedent!

We are residents at \_\_\_\_\_, sharing a 45.54-meter boundary, and spanning the whole western side of this proposed development. We are directly affected, and negatively impacted, by the application should it be approved. We respectfully look to you at the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT this application in your report to the Planning & Environment Committee.

We are looking to your Committee (and our Councillors) to be good stewards, entrusting you to take care and careful management of the R1-9 residents and their investment into this area. We look to you for your consideration.

- a. Highland District (R1) Zoning is a single-family neighborhood with no retail/commercial plazas nearby. The proposed development is not in character with the neighborhood, which consists of large lot estate homes.
- b. Traffic, noise & sidewalk congestion so close to UQ & Commissioners Rd will intensify significantly with the proposed development
- c. Not on the Bus Rapid Transit line (BRT)
- d. Residents have purchased their properties at premium prices in this R1 zone, single detached dwellings. We built this home from property already severed from 489 Upper Queen Street. Residents have invested considerable amounts of money purchasing, building, renovating, and landscaping their homes in this R1-9 zone.
- e. Upper Queen St, is a secondary collector. The traffic count at Upper Queen St. & Commissioners Rd. intersection is currently 12.5. This proposal includes the addition of up to twenty-six cars at 489 UQ (before food & retail delivery vehicles & weekend/holiday visitors & garbage/recycling trucks) which would magnify the congestion. There is an existing laneway/right of way immediately north of the subject property serving three homes only 90 yards from the corner of Commissioners Rd
- f. A proposed new laneway on the southern boundary of the subject property would see these 26+ vehicles less than 240 yards from this already busy intersection. A bus stop exists between the right of way and the corner of UQ/Commissioners, compounding congestion. Also of note is the recent completion of bike lanes at this corner, with attendant cement curbs. At minimum, a NEW TRAFFIC STUDY IS REQUIRED by the city. Parts of Upper Queen St. has a traffic count of 13 and 14. This street is already terribly congested and cannot support more.

## **2. Karli Fajdiga and Vernon Martin**

As a resident on \_\_\_\_\_, our home will be directly and negatively affected if this Amendment is approved. 489 Upper Queen Street is located behind our backyard.

- a. Our concerns are the following:
  - i. This proposed development is entirely NOT in keeping with the character and zoning of existing single family homes on Commissioners Road, Barons Court, Highland Heights and Upper Queen Street.
  - ii. City rezoning approval for 489 Upper Queen would set a precedent for other Upper Queen and Commissioners Road properties to be sold and redeveloped in a like manner.
  - iii. The Upper Queen/Commissioners/Ridout intersection is already congested and the addition of 11 Townhomes would only add to an existing situation.

There is a group of neighbours who will be voicing their concerns and fighting this proposed amendment. Thank you for your time

## **3. Ross Bishop**

We must clearly state that we are against approval of a zoning change from R1-9 to R5-7 for an 11 unit townhouse development proposed for 489 Upper Queen Ave. Specific to our property location, the completed development as proposed will create a slowing and backing up of traffic at the corner of Ridout and Commissioners Rd with the increased number of vehicles entering and exiting this property location. Southbound traffic on Ridout at the commissioners intersection has been slowed and backed up with the newly installed island placements for the extended bike paths at the corner. Once the Ridout St bridge is completed this problem will be exacerbated though greater traffic volume loaded onto Ridout Street. The development will cause increased slowing and backing up of traffic heading North on Upper Queen towards Commissioners with vehicles attempting to turn left into the property against currently busy southbound traffic flows.

The building design has its drawbacks as well, in relation to matching existing home designs in the area and building height in relation to existing condo property neighbours to the west of the property.

Again, we are against the approval of this townhouse development and request the City of London to deny approval of the proposed zoning change.

## **4. Geoff Barron**

Good morning. My name is Geoff Barron and I live at \_\_\_\_\_ and am writing to voice my objection to the zoning bylaw amendment for 489 Upper Queen St.

The plan as submitted is completely out of character for the neighborhood. The setback, lack of trees and green space being the most obvious features in the appearance of the proposed development that do not fit in. The lot which once held a single house is large enough to be divided but the overall appearance of the redevelopment should fit in with the neighborhood.

There are several other issues which come to mind as well when I reviewed the plan you sent out.

- i. Garbage. 11 units equals up to 33 garbage pails and 22 recycling buckets on Upper Queen if street collection is the plan. Seems like a lot on the sidewalk with no boulevard strip and a bike lane. It is a busy sidewalk and with the recent street widening for bike lanes

space is tight. If not out front for street collection there will be dumpsters. I did not see them on the plan. Probably would be near the back fence by visitor parking.

- ii. Building Set back from road. 11 unit plan too close to UQ . The drawings provided show a wall of townhouses that are out of place on the block. This depth of setback would work in the core where the lots are 100 deep not 200-300 deep. All other homes are 50 - 100 feet from side walk with lawns and trees. This proposal develops over 80% of property and in no way fits in. The old doctors house south of this lot set close to UQ used to front onto Commissioners and had a side entrance for the doctors office facing UQ when it was a dead end country lane.
- iii. Water runoff. The only green space is at the back on the highest elevation. All rain and snowmelt will go to street.
- iv. Trees. City tree line on street will be cut short at this property. 3 trees planted when side walk on UQ done 5+ years ago would need to be removed. Where are new trees to be planted?. Also there were other mature trees on the lot until cleared a few years back. This is not how the lot appeared before house removed.
- v. Parking . 1 outdoor parking spot per house plus 4 visitor spots for 11 units is inadequate. There is no street parking on UQ or Commissioners. If there were a proper setback driveway would allow for multiple cars as on rest of block. What happens on weekends and holidays to over flow parking? Will they park on the little bit of green space left?
- vi. Snow removal and storage on site. Where will the snow from 11 lane ways, 4 visitor parking spots, 11 walkways and 200 feet of lane be piled up. Not on the street. Not behind the back 5 units. Lots of snow falls in London.

I think a row of 3-4 townhouses set back from the road with yards , trees, gardens, and 2-3 car driveways would be fine but to develop the lot completely to within 12feet of the sidewalk is excessive. Asking to retain a lawn and trees like the rest of the street is a reasonable request.

What are the next steps to object to this project? How can I see how it compares to the city plan for this neighborhood?

## **5. David Judge**

There is a proposal to develop townhouses on the property.at 489 Upper Queen St. I would like to object to this proposal as all of Upper Queen St is made up of single family dwellings. A development as the one proposed is not consistent with the rest of the street and would be out of place. I hope you will vote against anything other than a single family house.

## **6. John Clearly**

Writing this email as a concerned neighbour/resident of this area (live on Mountsfield Drive) and to express opposition to the proposed rezoning application for 489 Upper Queen Street. The surrounding area is very conducive to single family housing and very concerned that this would alter the housing landscape of this area now and in the future if such a rezoning application is approved. Would hope to avoid setting a precedent for large lots in the area of Upper Queen Street and Commissioners Road to become stacked, high density, multi-story cluster townhomes. Hope these comments are taken into consideration with respect to this rezoning application.

## **7. Ron and Alison Smeets**

We are whole heartedly against this development, if the city allows this re-zoning it will set a precedent that would make it difficult to deny other properties along Upper Queen Street from asking for the same high-density zoning. This could lead to an unsustainable burden to the streets infrastructure and traffic patterns and change the character of the neighborhood in a negative way.

We also believe the look of this development is totally out of character with the surrounding streetscape and will make the intersection of commissioner's road and upper queen street even more dangerous when up to eleven or more vehicles may try to exit the complex northbound where traffic is already backed up every day. Zoning on Upper Queen Street should remain single family housing.

## **8. Aline**

I am a resident of London and there is a Notice of Planning Application in the works next to my home.

I'm only trying to ascertain the definitions and specifically what issues fall under each of these categories

- i. Land Use...although seems straight forward....including what specific items
- ii. Development Intensity...again, seems straight forward....including what specific items
- iii. Form of development....I'm stumped on this one.....in layman's terms what does this mean? Plus what specific items fall under this category.

I would greatly appreciate your consideration if you are able to give me the basic understanding of these 3 items.

## **9. Ken Ramer**

I must strongly oppose this planning application at 489 Upper Queen St. The current zoning R1-9 is in place to guarantee the conformity of upscale homes and properties on the street

The current residents have all paid a premium for their homes and estate sized lots, knowing that the current zoning would protect their investment. To think that a developer could buy a lot and build 11-2 storey townhouses on this street is unfathomable and preposterous.

As a very active realtor for over 40 years mainly in the south of London, I know how difficult it is to change zoning. I have always believed that the zoning was in place to maintain conformity in neighbourhoods and to protect the homeowners from developments such as this. My extensive experience over the years has also taught me how a development like this can have a serious negative impact on property values in the immediate area.

I understand what the city is trying to accomplish but this location doesn't lend itself to a townhouse development. There are certainly other locations where a townhouse development would conform to the neighbourhood

The recent changes to the corner of Commissioners and Upper Queen will cause traffic issues and I believe adding another 20 cars to that location is dangerous. If this application is approved it sets a precedent that will allow developers to buy any property on Upper Queen and erect more townhouses, further lessening property values and increasing traffic congestion.

It will also send a message to developers that they don't need to pay too much attention to current zoning as going forward it can be easily changed. It brings the effectiveness of the zoning department into question. In short, I find it hard to believe that this application is even being entertained as it so goes against the conformity of an upscale and desirable neighbourhood. There is no upside to this proposal to anyone but the developers. My wife and I live at \_\_\_\_\_ and again we strongly oppose this application and the negative affects it would have on the neighbourhood

#### **10. Debbie and Andy Mathias**

We are writing to express our concerns in regards to the planning application for the erection of townhouses at 489 Upper Queen Street.

We are strongly opposed to the proposed changing of the current zoning R1-9 which has been in place to guarantee the integrity of these upscale homes and large estate properties along Upper Queen Street. If the zone is changed then there will be no stopping further developers from tearing down existing homes on these large mature lots to construct multifamily housing along this already very busy street.

In addition to the new changes to the corner of Upper Queen and Commissioners very close to the proposed lot at 489 Upper Queen Street, has already added perilous driving conditions by adding concrete islands for cyclists and narrowing the turning lanes for cars. Adding a townhouse with 20+ more vehicles pulling in and out onto Upper Queen Street will make this area even more congested and dangerous for both motorists and cyclists.

My husband and I have lived at \_\_\_\_\_ for over 20 years. Just driving along Upper Queen Street depicts a strong respect for home ownership. We all strive to keep our properties looking nice and homes have been well maintained. People tend to stay here and not sell because of the pride we take in our homes and with our neighbourhood community.

#### **11. Val Roche**

I must strongly oppose this planning application at 489 Upper Queen Street. The current zoning R1-9 is in place to guarantee the conformity of the upscale homes and properties on the street. Residents in the area have paid a premium to reside in this local. For a developer to simply buy a lot to squeeze 11-2 storey box style townhome units onto for as much monetary gain as possible is not only unfair to us but also to the renters of the units. It has not been thought through enough as there are only four guest parking spots with an adjacent small area for the garbage truck to drive in and back out of the single lane driveway. This will also cause issues in the winter as there is nowhere to pile backed up snow. Siv-ic said at the zoom meeting that the owner of the complex will most likely hire a snow removal company to truck the snow away. This sounds logistically difficult given the small parking area and if guest vehicles are parked where the large trucks need to turn around it's unworkable.

Another potential problem is the mutual drive on the south side of the lot that is a private drive and given the small guest parking area on the townhouse complex it will only invite tenant guests to park in the private drive during holiday occasions as there is nowhere else in the area to guest park.

Zoning is in place to maintain conformity in neighbourhoods and to protect the homeowners from developments such as this. The recent changes to the corner of Commissioners and Upper Queen will cause traffic issues and I believe adding another 20 cars to that location is dangerous and as mentioned above the four guest parking spots can only become a problem.

It will also send a message to developers that they don't need to pay too much attention to current zoning as going forward it can be easily changed as the developers will believe (if not already believe) that they have an in with city planning that overrides the residents well-being. It brings the effectiveness of the zoning department into question. The only winner in this proposal would be the developer.

## **12. Lana Tangen**

In regards to the townhomes planning to be built at 489 UpperQueen str I would like to say I am totally opposed to that many homes going there . That corner is already a problem with being extremely busy , also the style if these townhomes are not going to go with this street style at all. If multi family homes are to go in I suggest one floor units and not so many crammed into that space . These will bring down the value of all the surrounding homes

## **13. Susan Stewart**

I live at \_\_\_\_\_, which is a few houses down from the proposed townhouse development. I have lived on Upper Queen for 10 1/2 yrs and during that time have seen the traffic flow become increasingly worse. It is a daily occurrence for vehicles to travel between 70-90 KPH and blow the stop signs at Chiddington. I myself and my neighbours have all had extremely close calls as pedestrians walking our dogs. All of us have nearly been hit because of people disregarding the stop signs. Because of the fact that Upper Queen St. is used as a main thoroughfare, the speed limit and stop signs are frequently disregarded. There is never any proactive enforcement by police and police cruisers, city buses and ambulances (not going to calls) all travel well above the speed limit.

The recently installed bike lanes at the intersection of Commissioners and Upper Queen have only exacerbated traffic issues. The bike lanes are a wonderful idea, as I commute daily on my bike and appreciate the lanes. The installation of the cement islands has caused chaos, with an uptick in motor vehicle collisions already. We are unable to enter Upper Queen St. from Commissioners when hauling our travel trailer home to be unloaded. We must now go to Wellington, down Baseline and up Ridout onto Upper Queen. The turn is impossible to make with the cement structures in place and I have already observed small cars turning into the narrow bike lane in error.

I implore you to examine installation of speed bumps between Commissioners and Chiddington and from Chiddington to Ferndale. I also ask you to examine the dangerous conditions the installation of the cement barriers are causing.

I believe the Townhouse proposal, if allowed to come to fruition, will degrade all property values in the immediate area. It will only add to the traffic, noise pollution and safety of all who reside on the street. This appears to be a developer wishing to capitalize on a double lot and make as much money as possible with no concern of the current homeowner dynamic that makes living on Upper Queen desirable.

Please oppose this proposal by protecting the existing residents from the instability it will impose. I fear the 1 acre lot across the road from the proposed development will be the next target if rezoning is allowed

## **14. Maher Ghattas**

I'm sure you have received volumes of emails and telephone calls regarding the proposed zoning amendment to 489 Upper Queen street. We are opposed to such a change across the street from our family home.

My family and I live at \_\_\_\_\_ which is one lot south of the proposed cluster townhouse development, on the east side of the street. It is hard to understand that a cluster townhouse proposal could be put forth in our area and possibly become the new normal for any developer to 'intensify' our neighbourhood! How would a townhouse cluster respect the existing character of single detached dwellings in our area?

There are several concerns that I have against the proposed amendment that I'm sure you've heard about, but I have a few more to add with respect to additional traffic being created in this section of our street.

- i. The recent changes for accessibility lanes/islands for pedestrian and cyclist has added congestion to an already busy intersection.
- ii. The visibility of the intersection is impeded as it is on a downhill and slight bend, making it difficult to react to stopped traffic, crossing pedestrians or cyclists (let alone winter snow and ice conditions).
- iii. There are two city bus stops across from each other, also on the downhill portion with slight bend in the road.
- iv. We had to ask our school board to move our children's bus stop from the area before the intersection, as it was unsafe for a school bus to stop, and then attempt to make a left turn onto Commissioners (they sent out traffic representatives/ consultants and agreed that this would be a dangerous pick-up point also citing the downhill, slight curve and two city bus stops).
- v. The thought of adding 20+ potential vehicles coming and going from a laneway that is so close to a busy intersection, close to two city bus stops, school bus stop and protected cycling lanes on the street, is incomprehensible and seems to be an oversight on the planning committee/developers to even consider this zoning amendment.
- vi. I was rear-ended in my car directly in front of 489 Upper Queen, while going north on Upper Queen street after leaving my driveway. A car was speeding north on Upper Queen street and did not see the traffic stopped ahead. I saw him approaching quickly and tapped my brake lights as I had no room to move forward. He impacted my car and I narrowly missed the car in front of me. I still suffer with neck pain and PTSD related issues to this day. This happened less than 15 meters from my driveway, and I am certain that the increased traffic coming and going from this site will cause similar, potentially dangerous/deadly traffic-pedestrian situations.

I would be happy to speak with you further regarding the proposed changes and hope that you will take our neighbourhood concerns seriously to stop such a proposal from happening in our area.

## **15. Shelley Galvin**

I strongly oppose this proposed amendment purely because I believe it poses a significant risk to the many pedestrians and bicycle commuters that regularly use Upper Queens and Ridout street - a significant and well used SINGLE lane thoroughfare here in our lovely Old South/Lockwood Park/Hyland Golf course neighbourhood.

I live at \_\_\_\_\_ - right on the corner of Commissioners Road and Ridout/Upper Queens. I can tell you that the density of the traffic on Commissioners Road, especially at the intersection of Ridout/Upper Queens has already reached ridiculously dangerous levels and there is no doubt in my mind that someone in our neighbourhood is going to be badly injured or worse. To propose to add an additional ELEVEN households, likely 25 vehicles into this extremely overused traffic area is completely unacceptable.

As you likely know, Commissioners Road through the Ridout/Upper Queens intersection is a MAJOR thoroughfare - for fire trucks, paramedics, police cruisers and now, in the past 24 months, is also an LTC Bus route (moved south from Baseline road for reasons that are unclear). There are many, many vehicles travelling at high speeds, regularly running red lights and there are a lot of pedestrians and bicyclists. During the construction to build the safer bicycle lanes, Commissioners Road was down to one lane and was OFTEN backed up all the way to Wharncliffe to the West and Wellington to the East during that construction.

Clearly, infilling this many units with their accompanying vehicles in an already overwhelmed traffic infrastructure would be a major mistake. I believe that the fact that Ridout and Upper Queens are single lane roads each way is one of the reasons it is currently zoned R1-9 - because the road and traffic infrastructure cannot handle that many additional families and the associated vehicles.

I am extremely concerned for the safety of the following groups, if this zoning change is allowed to proceed:

- i. Students attending Mountsfield Public school who regularly walk along Commissioners Road and Ridout several times a day to attend school
- ii. Students attending South Secondary school who regularly walk or bicycle along Commissioner Road, Upper Queens, Ridout etc several times a day to attend school
- iii. Neighbours who enjoy walking in their Lockwood Park/Hyland Gold Course/Old South neighbourhood (and there are LOTS OF WALKERS) who will be put at additional risk due to the increased traffic from this infill

Just last week, I was shocked while working from my upper floor office to hear a loud BANG and a second later to see a car come hurtling up over the sidewalk into our driveway! At first I thought it was a police car because it was white with blue lettering, but it turned out to be a dealership shuttle vehicle. There had been yet another accident at the intersection of Ridout/Upper Queens and Commissioners Road - and the impact of the crash not only completely filled the vehicle with air bags, but caused the car to come flying up over the sidewalk and partly into our driveway. I shudder to think what would have happened if I had been walking my dogs down the driveway, if my son had been waiting at the end of the driveway to head to work, if a Mountsfield or South student had been walking on the sidewalk on their way to school, if one of my neighbours was out for a walk or heading home with groceries from Metro etc.

We CANNOT afford to increase the population density in this area - it was never intended to serve an excessive number of households, all clustered together, just off a very NARROW single lane road like Upper Queens - and there absolutely will be disastrous consequences if this zoning change is approved

Thank you for considering my opinion and input

## **16. Pamela Batzold**

I do Not support the rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street. Living in London Ontario since 1975, I have seen some extremely positive growth and some things that stick out and I question how the City approved this. I feel that based on the history of the area, and with the decisions made over the last few years, that this is a situation where money speaks before common sense.

When the original home was torn down, we questioned this as a family. Personally we loved the look of that home, but after hearing that a family was going to build two houses, one for the parents and one for a child and their family, this made sense. However this did not happen since the zoning was not



there to accommodate two homes. Then the zoning is there to accommodate 11 homes? What happened? How was this even possible from a nice family environment to multi higher density homes on the same lot?

I moved to Barons Crt and back onto Upper Queens. I hear the fast moving traffic and the speeding (mostly) overnight. I can not see how this decision to increase the incoming and outgoing of this property so close to a major intersection would not cause concern for both people walking, riding their bikes and merging into traffic. it is just too close to the intersection to make any sense.

The City of London is promoting bike lanes, this was proven with the crazy new intersection at the same corner. Changing the zoning in the exact location of the support for bike lanes is a contradiction of the bigger plan I understood the City had.

We also have a property on Barons Court at the corner that is under review to be sectioned off to accommodate a single family home on a very small lot. This property went up for sale and since the current owners have not kept up the property. When we walk or driving past it daily to see the weeds growing out of control is concerning.

My understanding it takes time to subdivide a parcel of land. Once its under review i have seen multiple times where the lot is neglected.

I believe the City should monitor these situations and know the history of the land/property and move forward in a proactive way and not reactive way

## **17. Kate Keating and Jean**

I co-own the house at \_\_\_\_\_, close to the proposed development. We are very concerned and disappointed about this zoning change application and proposal, as presented.

There are many reasons to consider higher density housing options in urban areas, but the philosophy should not be to build anything, anywhere, without respecting the character and scale of established neighbourhoods. This seems especially important with an application that would set a precedent in an area that has been desirable and distinct for generations.

As discussed at siv-ik information meetings, the Upper Queen neighbourhood is unique within London, in part because R1-9 zoning has protected its heritage trees; green spaces around ponds, parks, and the golf course; and its single-family style of dwelling set back from the street. The current proposal to shoehorn many townhomes into one lot does not take this Forest City character into account at all. The developer has emphasized their efforts to not “exceed” maximum allowable building sizes and features allowed by the London Plan, but surely making new developments “less bad than they could be” shouldn’t be the goal of the city nor urban planning in general.

I co-own the house with my mother and, as has been the case for quite a few other neighbours over the years, we are now an example of both resident loyalty to the area and its multigenerational appeal. This house where I grew up continues to be where my parents stayed into retirement and have witnessed many changes to the street — including new people, new buildings and renovations, and the major transition from quiet dead-end street to a busy thoroughway — but the overall look and feel has, remarkably, stayed the same. Features that appealed when my parents bought the house in 1969 have stood the test of time. Both the houses and the area itself have ‘good bones’ and continue to offer a good foundation and quality of life for people at different life stages.

Early arguments that stuffing townhomes into this location could offer opportunities for seniors hoping to "downsize," or for young families, are unrealistic because such infill units often have vertical and stair-dependent designs, making them less accessible and less elder- and child-friendly than other building styles (such as the single family ranch-style homes found on Upper Queen). It seems likely that cars would be essential for most townhome residents because this side of Commissioners Road is more car-dependent and less pedestrian- and senior-friendly than other neighbourhoods such as Wortley Village.

In addition, this proposed development seems likely to add to ongoing challenges related to traffic volume and flooding. For example:

- i. Even if the proposed shared driveway is on the south side of the lot, adding multiple cars so close to the busy intersection and bike lanes adds reckless complexity for pedestrians, cyclists, and cars, especially at rush hours.
- ii. It is already difficult to leave our driveway by car at certain times of day, and there are new logistics related to watching for pedestrian and bike traffic from the north and south simultaneously; in spite of the new lanes, many cyclists still feel safer on the sidewalks.
- iii. Here at \_\_\_\_\_, we are currently rebuilding from our second basement flood and overland flood insurance claim in 15 years. Further infrastructure pressures risk affecting the already stressed water table. Drainage issues already affect the shared lane north of 489 because treacherous icy patches form on the sidewalk, from there to the bus stop, in winter.

Overall, this proposal doesn't suit the lot or neighbourhood and seems like an attempt to set a precedent for more drastic zoning changes in south London, rather than taking advantage of the street's natural features and truly making London more liveable for more people in innovative ways.

We are worried about this proposal because we already appreciate Upper Queen Street and don't want inadequate attempts to address housing challenges to, in reality, result in killing a goose that lays golden eggs.

Thank you for considering our concerns

## 18. Ross MacDonald

I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street. Please accept my comments and my request to the City of London, Planning and Environment Committee to REJECT (not recommend) Application Z-9540 to the City of London Planning and Environment Committee.

- i. **Current zoning:** R1, most restricted zoning, single detached dwelling. Rezoning to accommodate eleven, two story townhouses is an unacceptable and unprecedented ASK to go from R1 to R5.
- ii. **Policy/character:** Notice of Application – Planning Policies states "intensification will respect existing neighborhood character". It should not be considered that eleven, two story townhouses (plus visitor parking) respects existing neighborhood. THIS REZONING APPLICATION, DOES NOT RESPECT CHARACTER, RESIDENTS, COMMUNITY in any way, shape or form.
- iii. **Location/land Use:** Residents throughout this single detached family residential R1-9 zone, chose to purchase, build, renovate, pay taxes and live here, with the assumption that the City of London would be good stewards to protect and maintain our investments. PROPOSAL IS A DETREMENT TO OUR INVESTMENT IN THE AREA.
- iv. **Traffic:** Mere metres away from the busy congested intersection of Commissioners/ Upper Queen/Ridout. With new bike curbs,

AND 2 private drives directly off Upper Queen on south/west corner, AND immediately next to that a private right-of-way driveway serving 3 homes. AND now a proposal that would add a DOUBLE driveway (in and out) to a cluster townhouse development that will hold up to 26 cars on the property. All this before you include visitors, maintenance vehicles, postal vehicles, garbage/recycling trucks. THIS PROPOSAL CANNOT SUSTAIN VOLUME/TRAFFIC PATTERNS .

- v. **Neighborhood Impact:** A rezoning would forever change the character of this area. Families have lived here for 40 plus years.
- vi. **Intensification/infill:** can be accomplished in a manner that respects the existing neighborhood and character AND satisfies the City Plan for infill, all the while accommodating single detached dwellings, without approval of this unprecedented rezoning application. IT DOES NOT FIT HERE.
- vii. **Design:** The land use density is far too high with proposed Cluster townhouse dwellings. A visit to the area would show a variety of homes, including heritage, large lots and small lots, one story and two story detached single family homes . PROPOSED DESIGN DOES NOT SUIT 489 UQ property.
- viii. **Form of Development –** from the original home on the property, R1 detached single dwelling (now demolished), to R5 Cluster townhouses? The 489 UPPER QUEEN STREET PROPERTY IS TOO SMALL FOR R5 ZONING.

I respectfully request the Planning and Development Committee take my and all residents' comments into consideration in your recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my OPPOSITION to this rezoning application.

## 19. Bob Wood

We are writing to express our opposition to the above application as we do not believe it conforms to the Official Plan and would be bad planning if approved. The proposal would result in housing very different from that which surrounds it for blocks, while the Official Plan calls for any zoning by-law for this location to be consistent with the surrounding properties' use. Approving this application would undermine the goals of the Official Plan

## 20. Don Wilkinson

I am writing you today to state my opposition to the proposed development of 489 Upper Queen.

I speak from a position of knowledge on both the history and some details concerning and a previous Sale of this property.

One of my Real Estate clients was the long time owner of the property and SOLD in 2017 in his mid 80's after raising his family and retiring in the home. When he became a widower the 5 Level Side Split with over 3500 sq ft of living space was far to big for a single person. It was put up for Sale and subsequently SOLD to some members of Highland Golf & Curling Club who were looking to remodel/rebuild on the property. The property was approx. 2/3rds of a acre having been reduced from the original acre sized lots seen regularly on Upper Queen properties.

Common sense and a quick survey of the neighbourhood would show you very little multi-residential properties in our area. The large lots are obviously coveted by developers but I'm guessing almost nobody would support townhouses on a property located amongst million dollar properties. Mrs Aziz who owns the

property to the South has the acre property that stretches to Barron's and would clearly be impacted from a value perspective as would all other neighbours if a development like the one proposed was shoehorned into a beautiful lot like 489 Upper Queen.

The original intent when Dr Biesenthal Sold that property was for it to be a remodelled home or possibly a new home. I'm not sure why the Tobicoe's decided not to move forward with their plan and in all honesty it doesn't matter at this point. They had strongly considered the plan of building a beautiful new home on half the property with the potential to hve space to either build / or sell a lot where another Million dollar property would sit.

The size of that property could support two well designed homes and fit nicely on that 200 foot lot. To add some additional credibility to that discussion one of the most well respected Urban planners in London , Greg Priamo formerly Owner/President of Zelinka Priamo had contacted me about the property prior to the Sale to the Tobicoe's. Greg and his wife Bobbi-Lyn are long time friends. They had initially put a conditional Offer in on 489 Upper Queen that was accepted by Dr Biesenthal. Greg's condition revolved around his ability to secure his selected builder to build a family home for his family. We talked at length about how this property would best be developed. Although the lot would accommodate a beautiful single home , Greg's contention was it might be too big for a property he desired that was going to be approximately 2200-2400 sq ft Bungalow. His plan was to sever the property and either build a second home of approximately the same size with the same high end quality he desired as a way to offset the financial impact of the project.

I understand I am speaking about a person who unfortunately and tragically has his life cut short and has passed away and can not confirm this discussion but I likely not only have notes on the conversations but know his wife Bobbi-Lyn was actively involved in those discussions. My point for sharing this historical dialogue is that if someone who was involved in development throughout the city for 30 years and was respected like Greg Priamo and had looked at that property as one he might purchase but knew it was either appropriately sized for a single property or possibly at most two appropriately sized million dollar homes. To attempt to justify a mult unit townhouse complex at this location is not appropriate and was never the intention of either of the past Buyers or Sellers and certainly not a consideration for any of the many neighbours impacted by a proposal like the one being discussed. I understand that the zoning change is step 1. This property should remain Single family residential but allow for a division into two lots.

I am also a neighbour who lives just down the hill on \_\_\_\_\_ in a large Single family residential property. The distance is a surprising 320 meters from 489 Upper Queen St. I'm certain this type of a multi-unit development would take away from the feel of this neighbourhood and not conform to what was initially planned by many of us who have worked hard to add to the desirability and values of our properties. Although this area seems to be categorized as "Highland district" it is essentially and extension of OLD SOUTH and has always been bundled into the fabric of the neighbourhood. People who live on Upper Queen or Commissioners E between High & Wharncliffe call themselves Old South residents.

This proposed development does NOT respect the existing neighbourhood character and seems to be very developer centric with no regard for the neighbourhood. This plan should be opposed, and the property continue to be zoned as a single family with the flexibility for a severance and a maximum of two properties.

If you have any questions or would like to chat about this note , don't hesitate to connect with my the number in red font below.

## **21. Frank Gerrits**

Please accept this email as my opposition to the re-zoning application at 489 Upper Queen Street.

Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to reject Application Z-9540 as proposed and send it back to staff for a further review and consider reducing the number of units in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We have purchased our homes, renovated our homes, and built our homes, choosing this R1 zone to do so. We look to the City to protect our investments as good stewards. Application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, to accommodate and permit, 11 two story cluster townhouses (plus a parking lot in a residential area), should not be considered .

This rezoning will forever change the character of the area. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, at 489 Upper Queen Street, in a manner that would respect the existing neighbourhood and character, and remain R1 zone , (single detached dwelling).

Traffic on Commissioners Road East seems to increase on daily basis, as does Upper Queen and adding more traffic congestion, to the intersection of Commissioners Rd and Upper Queen Street, cannot sustain the volume, especially since the recent reconfiguration of the the intersection which has hindered traffic flow. Although, I do not live on Upper Queen Street but use it daily as part of my commute. The proposed development would add a double drive (to accommodate in/out traffic on the property) mere meters away from a right-of-way (that serves 3 homes), and another 2 driveways right at the corner of Commissioners/Upper Queen Street. This is untenable. Proposed development will accommodate up to 26 vehicles on the property. Now add deliveries, garbage/recycling trucks and weekend and holiday visitors. This will affect all traffic on Upper Queens Street.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

## **22. John Sry**

I am writing to express my concern and opposition for the ZONING APPLICATION Z-9540 for 489 Upper Queen St. I have been a resident on Upper Queen st for 40+ years and to see such a change on the street raises concerns for traffic and safety.

Already on Upper Queen cars travel too fast coming from the light on commissioners to the stop sign and forward. More over, since the construction of the bike lane and the median built right in the middle of the right of the right hand turn on the Upper Queen from Commissioners rd, it is a very tight road. The construction and housing project being proposed to be zoned on that lot could be potential to future traffic accidents and jams. This is a very quiet street with children and elderly, the disruption of small unit housing will impede on the peacefullness of the neighbourhood.

My family and I are greatly concerned about this zoning of property and we are GREATLY OPPOSING the proposal.

## **23. Russ and Susan Scorgie**

My wife and I own a home within the notified area. We wish to indicate that we ARE NOT OPPOSED to this rezoning request. In fact, we encourage this and

other similar projects where appropriate. In this case, we believe that this proposed project is quite appropriate in terms of the very preliminary concept presented to date. Of course, the final proposal should be monitored and vetted before final approval. It would be appropriate to have the more developed design and landscape plan reviewed by the Urban Design Committee to ensure that the detailed proposal sets a good example.

We did receive a notice from the group opposing this application but do not agree with most of its rationale which we find excessively negative and very unrealistic. The usual NIMBY arguments against are there, but they do not represent the effects of this proposal in any reasonable way.

The City needs intensification and this is of a modest scale, density and number of units serving that purpose. It is located off of an arterial street and on a bus route. It is very near another even busier street and major bus route. If we had more such appropriate developments, it is more likely that there would be reduced automobile traffic on our streets, not more. It represents an approach which is also somewhat more beneficial to climate concerns, infrastructure costs, the housing crisis and community improvements.

As a city, if we do not start approving good quality modest improvements with respect to these bigger issues, we are headed down the wrong path.

#### **24. Joan Cummings & Joann Degaust**

I oppose the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street.

Please accept my comments and my request to the City of London, Planning and Development Committee to reject (not recommend) Application Z-9540 to the City of London Planning and Environment Committee.

- i. Current Zoning: R1, most restricted zoning, single detached dwelling. Rezoning to accommodate 11 two story townhouses is an unacceptable and unprecedented ASK - to go from R1 to R5!
- ii. Policy/character: Notice of Application - Planning Policies - states "intensification will respect existing neighbourhood character..." It should not be considered, in all good consciousness, that 11, 2 storey cluster townhouses (plus visitor parking) respects the existing neighbourhood. It does not represent this in any way shape or form.
- iii. Location/land use: Residents throughout this single detached family residential R1-9 zone, chose to purchase, build, renovate, pay taxes, and live here with the assumption the City would be stewards to protect and maintain our investments. This proposal is a detriment to our investment in this area.
- iv. Traffic: mere metres away from the busy, congested intersection of Commissioners/Upper Queen/Ridout. With the new bike lanes and curbs, and 2 private drives directly off Upper Queen on the south/west corner and immediately next to that, a private right-of-way driveway, serving 3 homes, and now a proposal that would add a double driveway to a cluster townhouse development that will hold up to 26 cars on the property. All this before you include visitors, delivery trucks, maintenance vehicles, postal trucks, garbage trucks. This proposal cannot sustain the volume and traffic patterns.
- v. Neighbourhood Impact: A rezoning of this property would forever change the character of this area!! Families have lived in this area for 40+ years!
- vi. Intensification/infill: This can be accomplished in a manner that respects the existing neighbourhood and character and satisfies the City Plan for infill, all the while, accommodating single detached

dwellings without approval of this unprecedented rezoning application. It does not fit here!

- vii. design: The land use density is far too high with proposed Cluster townhouse dwellings. A visit to the area would show a variety of homes, including heritage, large lots and small lots, one storey and two storey detached single family homes. This proposed design does not fit in this area or specific property.
- viii. Form of Development: from the original home on the property, R1 detached single dwelling (now demolished) to R5 cluster townhouses???. This site is too small for R5 zoning.

We respectfully request the Planning and Development Committee take all residents' comments into consideration in your recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of this opposition to this rezoning application.

## **25. Marcus Lennox**

I, along with my neighbour, Terry Clifford, who owns and lives at \_\_\_\_\_, would like to add our voices to OPPOSE the proposal before the City of London's Planning and Development department by a developer who wishes to re-zone the subject property from R-1 to R-5. The reason for the proposed re-zoning is to enable the developer to build, what is referred to as, a "cluster townhouse development"

Attached to this email are formally signed Opposition Letters from Terry Clifford and myself. Please place them on the record. As we understand it, your department is in the stage of collecting comments and reaction from the property owners and community in which the proposed re-zoning is targeted. After this stage is completed, it is our understanding that an actual public meeting or meetings will take place – please place Terry and myself on your list of recipients of notification of such meetings. Thank you.

In closing, I would like to reiterate our hand-written comments which may be a trifle illegible. And that is to observe that – over and above the documented litany of valid legal, zoning and philosophic reasons why this proposed re-zoning and cluster townhouse development is a colossal mistake – we wish to highlight yet another. As one proceeds south along Upper Queen Street from the intersection at Commissioners' Road, one goes up a steep incline, the apex of which would meet the proposed driveway into the cluster development. Aside from the heightened level of traffic congestion which has already been detailed and which will predictably cause accidents in normal weather conditions – when one adds in the snowy and icy conditions of winter, this proposal is a recipe for DISASTER! The clear foreseeability of injury and death should make any public official (or Ward 12 Councillor) reject this re-zoning proposal from a good governance perspective alone!

## **26. Joanne Baril**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

## **27. Al and Chloe Servant**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

## **28. Ann Pinchin**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

## **29. Barry Deathe and Susan Brown**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

## **30. Darren Frickey and Bevinda Braga**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**31. Frances Metz**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**32. Helena Pedenko**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**33. Jay Johnson and Joanne Baril**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**34. Jim Giannoulis**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**35. John Lee**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**36. Linda Cruden**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**37. Pat Levac**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**38. Patricia Amos**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**39. Ron and Diane Bryant**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**40. Ron and Mary Martindale**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**41. Dan and Heather Colfax**

Comments provided within a separate PDF document

**42. Cheryl Jennings**

My husband and I wish to register our concerns and objection to the rezoning of Upper Queen Street to allow for townhouses. We live on \_\_\_\_\_ near the corner of \_\_\_\_\_

Since the addition of the cement barriers for bicycles where installed at the intersection of Ridout and Commissioners, the back up of traffic to the lights has increased . As a result, it is very difficult to exit onto Ridout from Mountsfield at busy hours. When parents try to do so when picking up their children it is chaos now. Increasing the amount of traffic down Upper Queens to the intersection can only exasperate the problem. Even now drivers use our street as a shortcut to avoid the intersection.

That area has been residential for as long as I can remember. Making it multiple dwelling will change the whole character of the neighbourhood . And not for the best.

We strongly oppose this rezoning application.

**43. Patrick & Karen Levac**

I am within the 120 metre boundary of this Requested Zoning By-law Amendment Application.



I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street. Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT Application Z-9540, in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We have purchased our home and renovated our home, choosing this R1 zone to do so. We look to the City to protect our investments as good stewards. Application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, to accommodate and permit, 11 two story cluster townhouses (plus a parking lot in a residential area), should not be considered .

This rezoning will forever change the character of the area. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, in a manner that would respect the existing neighbourhood and character, remain R1 zone , (single detached dwelling).

Immediately, after turning right off Commissioners Rd. onto Upper Queen, there already exist, two parking driveways, and then next to a private right-of-way (serves 3 private homes). Proposed development would add a double drive (to accommodate in/out traffic on the property) mere meters away from the right-of-way. This is untenable. The proposed development will accommodate up to 26 vehicles on the property. Now add, deliveries, garbage/recycling trucks and weekend and holiday visitors. There is no emergency outlet on any other side of the property for 11 cluster townhomes that would allow access through the proposed development for Ambulance or Fire, if required, which would block townhouse driveways, and their exits.

Street parking is not permitted on Upper Queen, Ridout, Commissioners Road, nor Baseline Road. Neighbouring interior streets would see an influx of these vehicles to park to access 489 Upper Queen Street.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my OPPOSITION to the rezoning application

#### **44. Andrew Marlowe**

I just received a flyer in my mailbox asking me to oppose a new townhouse development at 489 Upper Queen Street West (Zoning By-Law Amendment, File: Z-9540). It's a bit heated, and I get the impression you might get some not-so-fun emails from a small but loud minority of residents in my neighbourhood. I apologize in advance if either of you do get a flood of negativity!

Hopefully I can balance that out with some cheerful comments in support of the project! The area is a great one for infill development- it's readily accessible by public transit, walking distance to amenities like grocery stores, and walking distance from two of London's largest employers (LHSC- Victoria Hospital, and St. Joseph's Healthcare London- Parkwood Institute). As an employee of both organizations, I can tell you that both are struggling to with staff being unable to handle the rising cost of housing in the area, and the lack of transit in London to get people to work- we need MUCH more housing nearby (or a more reliable bus system, but I know that's out of your hands).

I STRONGLY believe this is within the existing character of the neighbourhood- literally around the corner from this site there are existing townhouses, and even some denser 8 story developments. I'd love if this property could be turned into a nice midrise instead, but will settle for the 11 townhouses.

London desperately needs as much infill development as it can get, and I'll happily take some of it in my backyard. I'll also try to attend whenever the rezoning meeting is set to lend my support.

#### **45. Tim and Wendy Carroll**

As an affected homeowner and a thirty eight year resident of Upper Queen Street I am very disappointed that the city would even think of allowing a cluster of townhouses on this section of Upper Queen Street. I am particularly saddened since I recently encouraged my daughter to purchase a house across the street from me on Upper Queen St.. Had I known that the street was to be re-zoned multi family I certainly would have told her to look elsewhere.

I VERY STRONGLY OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street. Please accept my comments and my request to the City of London, Planning and Development Committee to REJECT (not recommend) Application 2-9540 to the City of London Planning and Environment Committee.

The City of London Planning Policy states: "intensification will respect existing neighbourhood character...". I am echoing the feelings of many of my neighbours that I have spoken with, that Eleven (11), 2 Story cluster townhouses (plus visitor parking) DOES NOT respect existing neighbourhood character in any way, shape, or form.

Friday I spoke with my elected representative Elizabeth Pelozza who agreed with me that the proposed development was excessive and out of character with the neighbourhood. The proposed change will undoubtedly set a precedent, so in the future, every time a large property comes to market, it may be 'snapped up' by a developer and a multifamily dwelling constructed in its place. When my wife and I purchased this property and our daughter bought the place across the street, we never dreamt that the city would casually allow such ruinous changes to the zoning bylaw and thus the look and feel of this proud community.

Many folks I talked to, felt infilling was acceptable as long as it conformed to the single-family designation. (R1) Surely infilling can be accomplished in a manner that respects the existing neighbourhood and character AND satisfy the City Plan for infill, while, accommodating single detached dwellings, without approval of this unprecedented rezoning application. THIS PROJECT DOES NOT FIT HERE!

Suggestion: Perhaps the lot at 489 Upper Queen St. could be divided into 2 lots with a minor variance and that would yield a 100% increase in density! I feel infill should be accomplished reasonably with minimal impact to the 'look and feel' and infrastructure of the neighbourhood.

We respectfully request the Planning and Development Committee take all residents' comments into consideration in your recommendation to the Planning & Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my STRONG OPPOSITION to this rezoning application.

#### **46. George Kerhoulas**

I'd like to begin by reminding all involved we are discussing a Single-Family neighbourhood. We walk our dogs, ride our bikes, bbq with folks down the street, send our kids off to great nearby schools...just like other mature neighbourhoods.

Many of us have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars restoring or renovating our homes. We have resisted the urge experienced in other areas to add density to our lots. Some residences are recognized by local heritage and conservancy groups. Our municipal tax bills are shockingly high.

If one stands at the corner of Commissioners and Ridout/Upper Queen and looks a kilometre or more in all directions, there is almost no apartment/townhouse development. The minimal low impact commercial here services the area. Just because these are busy streets with bus routes does not warrant more commercial or denser residential development. That growth can be easily accommodated along the pending BRT route steps away on Wellington Rd.

I quote directly from the City of London Zoning By-Laws "SECTION 5 RESIDENTIAL R1 ZONE 5.1 GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE R1 ZONE The R1 Zone is the most restrictive residential zone, and provides for and regulates single detached dwelling" or "5.2 PERMITTED USES No person shall erect or use any building or structure, or use any land or cause or permit any building or structure to be erected or used, or cause or permit any land to be used, in any Residential R1 Zone variation for any use other than the following use: a) A single detached dwelling."

Personally, and not necessarily representing the position of the local group challenged by this development, I believe this site is a viable, moderate frontage, small lot, single family in-fill of a few detached homes.

Approval of this project will begin the un-stoppable erosion and eventual destruction of the fabric of our neighbourhoods along Ridout/Upper Queen and Commissioners. There is no valid reason to approve this development as there are many infill options available elsewhere.

Would any City planner or Councillor support the demolition of two or three homes on another mature Single-Family street, in a R1 Zone, to generate a lot of this size to build the project in question? Not a chance. We strongly oppose this project ask that it be denied

•  
**47. James and Virginia Glannoulis**

I am attaching a letter stating my opposition to the Zoning By-Law Amendment - 489 Upper Queen Street - File Z-9540.

Our family resides at \_\_\_\_\_ for more than 35 years. We enjoy our neighborhood consisting of single family homes with large lots. The reason we have invested in our property and continue to live there, is strictly due to the character of Upper Queen Street. Zoning R1- single detached dwellings.

I strongly state that existing neighborhoods should be protected .Rezoning would forever change the character and the historic elements that are embedded within the Upper Queen Street and the surrounding residential R1 area. Cluster housing will devalue the R1 detached homes and the existing residents will be faced with the loss of enjoyment and pride they have for their properties.

Neighborhoods similar to the Upper Queen street R1 zone area that exist throughout London serve to enhance the image of our City, and therefore, draw outside residents and new businesses to relocate here. They are designated R1 for a reason, and our City benefits as a whole. Let's keep it that way!

**48. Maria Gitta and Doug Mitchell**

My husband, Doug Mitchell and I are against the rezoning of 489 Upper Queen St. from R1 zoning to R5-7 which would allow 11 two-story townhouses. This

would be the death knell for this and other neighbourhoods that have a uniform zoning and similar appearance.

We have lived at \_\_\_\_\_ for over 26 years and want this small neighbourhood to maintain its lovely character.

What is the point of having zoning if not to protect neighbourhoods -- especially the smaller ones like ours?

#### **49. Susan and Ron Fenney**

We live at \_\_\_\_\_ and wish to oppose the proposed zoning amendment for 489 Upper Queen Street.

We have lived on Barons Court since its inception in 1984. Over the years we have seen London's Official Plan change to an "inward and upward" philosophy at the expense of the existing R1 designations. The direction we fear is happening is no single-family dwelling is safe in this environment. Any developer can come in and go against current neighborhood standards and try to turn it into something more.

This is similar to allowing single-family dwellings to be turned into VRBOs at the expense of others. There appears to be no integrity left in what can happen to residential neighborhoods.

Would it not be in the best interest to keep 489 Upper Queen as R1 period? We as taxpayers deserve to be treated better by our city and our concerns heard.

#### **50. Martha Hauk**

Our property is located opposite this proposed build site and would like to make it clear we completely oppose this zoning change. It is disappointing that it has gone as far as it has but we urge you to halt it in its tracks. Please see our attached opposed position letter and let us know if there is anything further, or more formal, that you require to acknowledge our position.

I am sure you have received the many indicators of why this is not being received well in the community. I understand the request for zoning change is motivated purely by financial gains of the property owner but we should not have to suffer because of this. Please protect our community

- a. I am within the 120 metre boundary of this Requested Zoning By-law Amendment Application.
- b. I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street.
- c. Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT Application Z-9540, in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.
- d. The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We have purchased our homes, renovated our homes, and built our homes, choosing this R1 zone to do so. We look to the City to protect our investments as good stewards.
- e. Application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, to accommodate and permit, 11 two story cluster townhouses (plus a parking lot in a residential area), should not be considered. This rezoning will forever change the character of the area. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, in a manner that would respect the existing neighbourhood and character, remain R1 zone , (single detached dwelling).
- f. Immediately, after turning right off Commissioners Rd. onto Upper Queen, there already exist, two parking driveways, and then next a private right-of-way (serves 3 private homes). Proposed development would add a

- double drive (to accommodate in/out traffic on the property) mere meters away from the right-of-way. This is untenable. Proposed development will accommodate up to 26 vehicles on the property. Now add, deliveries,
- g. garbage/recycling trucks and weekend and holiday visitors. There is no emergency outlet on any other side of the property for 11 cluster townhomes that would allow access through the proposed development for Ambulance or Fire, if required, which would block townhouse driveways, and their exits.
  - h. Street parking is not permitted on Upper Queen, Ridout, Commissioners Road, nor Baseline Road. Neighbouring interior streets would see an influx of these vehicles to park to access 489 Upper Queen Street.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my OPPOSITION to the rezoning application.

**51. Nancy Hind**

- a. PDF comments

**52. Ted and Lynda Donaldson**

We would like to go on record as OPPOSING the Zoning By-Law Amendment - 489 Upper Queen Street.

Approval of this Zoning Amendment will start an unstoppable march to the destruction of the Ridout, Upper Queen, Commissioners Rd neighbourhoods.

City of London Planning Policy states that "Intensification will respect existing neighbourhood character and offer a level of certainty". This proposed amendment to permit 11 townhouses takes a sledgehammer to that Policy statement. There is NO respect for neighbourhood character and it injects a level of UNCERTAINTY for every existing and future homeowner.

Please do not confuse my objection to this Amendment with that of a knee jerk NIMBY response. I am not opposed to infill and intensification. Those objectives can be satisfied with single family homes in a way that would respect and be consistent with the existing neighbourhood character. Without question, this site is a viable candidate for moderate frontage, single family, infill detached homes. The developer would be able to fulfill the Economic Viability standard to the City and proceed with a reasonable Application that would be supported by the Neighbourhod.

You will be receiving a more thorough and broader group response that has the backing of more that 80% of the affected homes within 120 meters. Surely such an overwhelming vote of dissent must mean something to the Planning Department and City Councillors.

As responsible stewards of development in the City of London, you cannot allow this project to proceed.

**53. Jean and Jim Young**

We hope you will support our opposition to the possible rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street to accommodate 11 cluster townhouses.

Major increase in traffic volume near a busy intersection of upper queen and commissioners, especially with a newly installed bike turning lane that impedes traffic flow

Out of character for the single family neighbourhood that is zoned single family. Also such a high density project, jammed on this lot, is not in keeping with the large private backyards in this area. London needs to respect and maintain such existing lots which add to the character of this city and neighbourhood

#### **54. Brad Lindsay – Highland Country Club – 610 Members**

We urge you to reject this proposal. Upper Queen is zoned R1-9, which is one of the most restrictive in the city, containing large lot estate homes. All such homes on Upper Queen which border our Club's east boundary on our 17th and 18th fairways are complimentary to the course, mostly without fencing. The concern for Highland is the establishment of a precedent to build barrack style cluster townhomes within the R1-9 zoning. We fear developers would, as quickly as possible, acquire properties along Upper Queen on our 17th and 18th hole border to build similar style townhomes, which would require Highland to implement fencing, cedar hedges, etc.

We would ask the Planning Department and city Council to function as good stewards by not providing exemptions to this zoning to protect land values of existing residents, most of whom are Highland members.

#### **55. Pat Ramsden**

- a. PDF Document with comments

#### **56. Charlene Jones**

I live across the street of this Requested Zoning By-law Amendment Application. I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street to accommodate and permit, 11 two story box style cluster townhouses. This application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, should not be considered for such a development on this property. I am in favor of development of this property but the proposed development is not in character with the neighborhood. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, in a manner that would respect the existing character of the neighbourhood, and protect the homeowner's property investment. This development does NOT!

As a resident of \_\_\_\_\_. for 16 years, I can see a few safety issues with this development. London is a snow belt city, with more and more snow fall every year, there is nowhere to pile snow. Siv-ic said at the zoom meeting that the owner of the complex will most likely hire a snow removal company to truck the snow away. This will be logistically difficult given the small parking area and if guest vehicles are parked where the trucks need to turn around. The space is unworkable. Snow will accumulate and flow onto the road.

Home delivery is rapidly increasing. Due to the limited space on this 11 unit develop, there's no place for deliveries to park or turn around. Delivery cars and trucks will park along Upper Queen Street blocking traffic and cutting off the new bike lanes. Creating a dangerous situation for everyone in the area.

The Proposed development has no emergency outlet on any other side of the property for 11 cluster townhomes that would allow access through the proposed development for Ambulance or Fire, if required, which would block townhouse driveways, and their exits.

This proposed development will accommodate 22 resident and only 4 guest parking on the property. Street parking is not permitted on Upper Queen, Ridout St. or Commissioners Road. This design is untenable. Weekends, holiday visitors and party gatherings would overflow into all the residential area.

Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT Application Z-9540, in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

### **57. Doug Michell**

I am opposed to the change in zoning at 489 Upper Queen St. as it will set a precedent on this street for multi-dwelling units to be constructed on this street causing serious traffic congestion on an already very busy street. It is used by ambulances, fire trucks and the police. The development couldn't be in a worse place so close to the intersection of Commissioners Road and Upper Queen St. There are line ups at this location already and they will be much worse when the bridge on Ridout Street is completed. Adding a multi-dwelling development will make an already serious situation worse. Please reject this application.

### **58. L. Martin**

I live on Chiddington, near the location of 489 Upper. I OPPOSE THE change from a R1 to an R5 designation. I assumed, probably like many, that this empty lot would accommodate another gorgeous single family home like the other recent new builds in recent past which have been built North of Commissioners on Upper Queens.

There are gorgeous, and prestigious homes all along Upper Queens. There has not been any cluster homes built along this section (Baseline to Southdale Road) and I believe they do not fit in.

I do think if these cluster homes are built that it will only add to the confusion at the Intersection of Commissioners and Upper Queens.

The city recently installed bike lanes and specific raised lanes for bikers to use..... what a nightmare. I had recently seen a car actually trying to navigate these narrow bike lanes OMG! The density that 11 more inhabitants of these proposed cluster home would provide to an already busy and confusing intersection is, in my opinion daunting. This is, I believe, another money grab for the developer and the city of London. I vote NO for this rezoning change.

### **59. Ellen and John Haasen**

We've been made aware of the ridiculous request to change the zoning at 489 Upper Queen Street from R1 to R5, changing this plot from what was once a ONE family home into a space that accommodates 11 two story townhouses. This corner, a major thoroughfare from north to south crossing Commissioners Road in London, is already too congested...even more so with the recent addition of bike lanes and curbs. Adding further congestion a few hundred meters going south on Upper Queens from the corner would be an insane and dangerous addition to an already busy length of vehicle roadway.

The construction stage of such a misguided development would be an additional nightmare of inconvenience to those driving on this section of roadway. This sort of infill does not belong on this relatively small plot of land and is not fair to the families in single homes around it. Clearly the developer of this thoughtless plan is not concerned with the integrity of the neighbourhood, nor the investment people had made in their single detached dwellings.

It is our feeling that this sort of infill proposition does not respect the existing neighbourhood and the traffic inherently found traversing this street. In view of this, the request for rezoning should be resoundingly rejected. Please acknowledge the receipt of our OPPOSITION to this rezoning application

### **60. Kathy King**

I am within the 120 metre boundary of this Requested Zoning By-law Amendment Application. I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street.

Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT Application Z- 9540, in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

I live at \_\_\_\_\_, one home away from the intersection of Commissioners/Upper Queen/Ridout. I am very concerned that the already busy intersection would become even more congested and dangerous. On top of that, the recently installed bike curb lanes have made it even harder for traffic to get through and around this intersection, and difficult for ambulances to make their way to the hospital. With the proposed development adding even more cars, up to 26 on the property, trying to access Upper Queen Street, Ridout and Commissioners, would only add to the congestion that already exists.

I think this rezoning, for the townhouse proposal, does not suit the character of the area. More suitable use of the property would be detached single family homes.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my OPPOSITION to the rezoning application, by mail, as noted above.

#### 61. Pat Amos

- a. **Current zoning:** RI, most restricted zoning, single detached dwelling. Rezoning to accommodate 11 two story townhouses is an unacceptable and unprecedented ASK ....to go From RI to R5.
- b. **Policy/character:** Notice of Application - Planning Policies - states "intensification will respect existing neighbourhood character...". It should not be considered, in all good consciousness, that Eleven (11), 2 story cluster townhouses (plus visitor parking) respects existing neighbourhood. THIS REZONING APPLICATION DOES NOT RESPECT CHARACTER, RESIDENTS, COMMUNITY in any way, shape, or form
- c. **Location/land use:** Residents throughout this single detached family residential RI-9 zone, chose to purchase, build, renovate, pay taxes, and live here, with assumption the City would be stewards to protect and maintain our investments. PROPOSAL IS A DETREMENTTO OUR INVESTMENT IN THE AREA.
- d. **Traffic:** mere metres away from the busy, congested intersection of Commissioners/Upper Queen/ Ridout. With new bike curbs, AND 2 private drives directly off Upper Queens on south/west corner, AND immediately next to that, a private right-of-way driveway, serving 3 homes. AND, now a proposal that would add a DOUBLE driveway (in and out) to a cluster townhouse development that will hold up to 26 cars on the property. All this, before you include visitors, delivery trucks, maintenance vehicles, postal vehicles, garbage/recycling trucks. THIS PROPOSAL CANNOT SUSTAIN VOLUME/TRAFFICE PATTERNS!
- e. **Neighbourhood Impact:** A rezoning of this property would forever change the character of this area.
- f. Impossible to say really.....families have lived in this area for 40+ years, HISTORY WORTH SAVING!
- g. **Intensification/infill:** can be accomplished in a manner that respects the existing neighbourhood and character AND satisfies the City Plan for infill, all the while, accommodating single detached dwellings, without approval of this unprecedented rezoning application. IT DOES NOT FIT HERE!



- h. **Design:** The land use density is far too high with proposed Cluster townhouse dwellings. A visit to the area would show a variety of homes, including heritage, large lots, and small lots, one story and two story detached single family homes. PROPOSED DESIGN DOES NOT SUIT 489UQ property.
- i. **Form of Development** - from the original home on the property, R1 detached single dwelling (now demolished), to R5 cluster townhouses?  
489 UPPER QUEEN ST PROPERTY IS TOO SMALL FOR R5 ZONING

## 62. Marge Wikinson

I am within the 120 metre boundary of this Requested Zoning By-law Amendment Application. I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application.

The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We would like to protect our investments we have in our homes. I support keeping the character of the area, remain R1 zone, (single detached dwelling). There is no street parking on Upper Queen, Ridout, Commissioners Road, nor Baseline Road. Our street and neighbouring streets could see an influx of vehicles to park to access 489 Upper Queen Street.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

## 63. Alexandra Canie

I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street.

Please accept my comments and concerns to you, as Ward 12 Councilor. I have sent the Planning & Development Department my concerns and comments, and that I OPPOSE Application Z-9540. I encouraged them to reject the Application in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We have purchased our homes, renovated our homes, and built our homes, choosing this R1 zone to do so. We look to the City to protect our investments as good stewards. Application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, to accommodate and permit, 11 two story cluster townhouses (plus a parking lot in a residential area), should not be considered .

This rezoning will forever change the character of the area. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, in a manner that would respect the existing neighbourhood and character, remain R1 zone , single detached dwelling, and still see the developer fulfil their economic viability to the city to be able to proceed with a reasonable Application.

Immediately, after turning right off Commissioners Rd. onto Upper Queen, there already exist, two parking driveways, and then next a private right-of-way (serves 3 private homes). Proposed development would add a double drive (to accommodate in/out traffic on the property) mere meters away from the right-of-way. This is untenable. Proposed development will accommodate up to 26 vehicles on the property. Now add, deliveries, garbage/recycling trucks and weekend and holiday visitors. There is no emergency outlet on any other side of the property for 11 cluster townhomes that would allow access through the proposed development for Ambulance or Fire, if required, which would block townhouse driveways, and their exits.

Street parking is not permitted on Upper Queen, Ridout, Commissioners Road, nor Baseline Road. Neighbouring streets would see an influx of these vehicles to park to access 489 Upper Queen.

We are most hopeful that you, as Councillor for Ward 12, where this proposal is located, will listen to all residents' concerns and comments and take them into consideration. We hope you endeavor to explain our well-founded position on our opposition of this Planning Application, to the Planning & Development Committee and the Councillors, who will make up the Committee that will make the final decision on this Application.

#### **64. Geoff Baron**

I live at \_\_\_\_\_ and am writing you to express my objection to the planned rezoning of 489 Upper Queen St.

The proposed development is in no way fits in with the residential homes on the street. The limited greenspace is mostly at the rear of the property at the highest elevation. All runoff will go to the street. The plan to fill the lot completely with townhouses will create a high traffic area with up to 40 - 50 separate lease holders depending on the number of bedrooms created in the final plans. Separate lease holders have their own families and friends and with visitors it will be a busy location. 11 outdoor and 4 visitor parking spaces is not enough. Garages in rentals are rarely used for cars and fill with bikes and used for storage.

I have been a landlord in London for several years around the university and I know what a development like this would turn into up there. Parking, garbage, high traffic of guests to property all cause issues where this has been allowed to happen. 40 - 50 tenants is not fitting with every other lot in the Upper Queen area.

This proposal increases the density from a single detached home to that of a small apartment building. The lot is wide and could be split under current zoning rules to create multiple dwellings on this site. There are lots of townhomes being built on south Warncliffe and Southdale creating lots of inventory with current interest rates. I see no need to change the zoning for this lot other than the profit of the developer/landlord.

This change will have a negative affect on the properties that surround the lot. Once the zoning changes the builders plans will be revised to add more bedrooms and maximize their profit. The developers interest is not improving the neighborhood or building a beautiful house it is profit. If this were allowed to proceed I worry the finish of building and landscaping will be minimal at best and absentee landlord will not be around to properly manage what they want to create.

There are other areas in the city where this type of development fit in which are currently zoned to allow it. This lot will be quickly filled with a house if this rezoning application is stopped. It is not a vacant lot in an indeseable area to build a home. Someone would invest in building a high end home on this site. I oppose this zoning change.

#### **65. Erin Carroll**

As an affected homeowner and a resident of Upper Queen Street I am very disappointed that the city would consider allowing a cluster of townhouses on this section of Upper Queen Street. I am discouraged since I recently bought a house s on Upper Queen St. Had I known that the street was to be re-zoned multi family I certainly would have looked elsewhere.

I VERY STRONGLY OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street.

Please accept my comments and my request to the City of London, Planning and Development Committee to REJECT (not recommend) Application 2-9540 to the City of London Planning and Environment Committee.

The City of London Planning Policy states: "intensification will respect existing neighbourhood character...". I am echoing the feelings of many of my neighbours that I have spoken with, that Eleven (11), 2 Story cluster townhouses (plus visitor parking) DOES NOT respect existing neighbourhood character.

My elected representative Elizabeth Pelosa who is aware of the general dissatisfaction in the neighborhood residents with the proposal. The proposed change will undoubtedly set a precedent, so in the future, every time a large property comes to market, it may be purchased by a developer and a multifamily dwelling constructed in its place. When I purchased this property, I never imagined the city would casually allow such detrimental changes to the zoning bylaw and thus the look and feel of this proud community.

Many folks I talked to in the neighbourhood, felt infilling was acceptable as long as it conformed to the single family designation. (R1) Surely infilling can be accomplished in a manner that respects the existing neighbourhood and character AND satisfy the City Plan for infill, while, accommodating single detached dwellings, without approval of this unprecedented rezoning application. This project does not fit here.

Suggestion: Perhaps the lot at 489 Upper Queen St. could be divided into 2 lots with a minor variance and that would yield a 100% increase in density! I feel infill should be accomplished reasonably with minimal impact to the 'look and feel' and infrastructure of the neighbourhood.

I respectfully request the Planning and Development Committee take all residents' comments into consideration in your recommendation to the Planning & Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my strong opposition to this rezoning application

## **66. Jason Sleziuk**

I wanted to reach out to you and the City of London Planning and Development team to share with you my objection to a planned cluster of stacked townhomes on my street (on record). My wife and I live at \_\_\_\_\_, we are approximately 160 meters away from the planned development at 489 Upper Queen St. Although we do not fall within the 120 meter radius I understand that our concerns will still carry the same weight as those that do.

Let me first start by saying that I can appreciate the need for intensification within our city. However, we (my wife and I) feel that the proposed development of 11 clustered town homes is a little ridiculous and is in no way consistent with the current neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood consists of detached single-family homes on larger lots. The residents in the area have spent a lot of money on the initial purchase price of our homes and most have done extensive renovations. My wife and I feel like this proposed development is not even close to being consistent with the look and feel of this neighbourhood. Furthermore we are deeply concerned about the precedent that this would set for all properties along our street. If this requested zoning change passes it would open the potential flood gates for similar developments. Our family neighbourhood could be decimated and along with it the property values (our investment) will suffer greatly.

I have to assume that there are better options for intensification that would allow us to maintain the existing character of our neighbourhood. The property at 489 Upper Queen St is large enough that it could easily support 2 or maybe even 3 detached homes.

I really appreciate your time, and I would ask that you reject the requested proposal for 489 Upper Queen St.

## **67. Mark Vaandering**

I am writing this email to address some concerns with a proposed development at 489 Upper Queen St. We have been residents of Upper Queen St for 22 years, and even in the 22 years of being on Upper Queen St we have seen many changes and additions to the street scape.

I understand the city has a mandate for intensification of urban growth within city limits and is encouraging infill developments in existing neighbourhoods. In theory development is good, but in principle there seem to be a number of elements that get lost along the way to create good development. With this particular development it looks like the developer is taking the plans they have designed for Southdale Road and just relocating the same development on Upper Queen St. What works in one neighbourhood may not be the right fit in another area.

Upper Queen St was initially a "Subdivision" of Old South and was developed in the 1860's as an estate lot neighbourhood with a dead-end street. As we all know time marches on and the lots have been divided into smaller lots (but of still good size) and the street is no longer a dead end becoming a secondary arterial road due to urban growth coming from the south. The flavour of Upper Queen still stands with large lots with mostly bungalows with a few 2 storey homes, but the integrity of the street scape still remains.

### **a. Architectural Landscape:**

- i. Development is essential in all cities in order to sustain growth and economic stability within its boundaries, but development also needs to take into consideration of its surroundings. I think with some good planning and taking in the architectural landscape of the surrounding properties, a great development could be created on this property. The intensification of 11 units on this property may be too many and something geared to the socio-economic demographic of this area may be more advantageous to the developer and present a more cohesive pocket neighbourhood on Upper Queen St. Putting the same development on Upper Queen as is also being proposed for Southdale are two completely different communities and the developments should also reflect that in the development plan. You don't need to look very far away of another development (352 Ridout St. Ridout Village) that has blended in with the neighbourhood and has also given some intensification of development.

The condos behind this property are low one storey units and most of the houses are 1 storey homes in the area with a few 2 storey homes. The development would blend better with the surrounding community with 1 storey units with maybe a few 2 level units mixed in giving the new development a blended use and may give more appeal to different types of homeowners. The style of the development could reflect better the surrounding community with low pitched roofs, brick exteriors with some siding or stucco. A minimum sq footage for each unit could be added, which could limit the number of units on this property, but increases the value of each unit.

The proposed change in zoning could be disastrous to a development not well planned or designed. More needs to be added to make this proposed

development a great development that will be a benefit to the community it is looking to live in and be a part of.

In saying that, I am not opposed to development on this property, I am just opposed to the orientation of a big wall of units so close to the street and allowing the units to not blend better with the street scape of Upper Queen St. The design is wrong for Upper Queen St. Good design, and being aware of the street scape around the new development is as important..... or more important than the allowing development for the sake of development.

#### **68. Vince Bezzina**

I am within the 120 metre boundary of this Requested Zoning By-law Amendment Application.

I OPPOSE the Notice of Planning Application for proposed rezoning of 489 Upper Queen Street.

Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT Application Z-9540, in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We have purchased our homes, renovated our homes, and built our homes, choosing this R1 zone to do so. We look to the City to protect our investments as good stewards. Application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, to accommodate and permit, 11 two story cluster townhouses (plus a parking lot in a residential area), should not be considered .

This rezoning will forever change the character of the area. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, in a manner that would respect the existing neighbourhood and character, remain R1 zone , (single detached dwelling).

Immediately, after turning right off Commissioners Rd. onto Upper Queen, there already exist, two parking driveways, and then next a private right-of-way (serves 3 private homes). Proposed development would add a double drive (to accommodate in/out traffic on the property) mere meters away from the right-of-way. This is untenable. Proposed development will accommodate up to 26 vehicles on the property. Now add, deliveries, garbage/recycling trucks and weekend and holiday visitors. There is no emergency outlet on any other side of the property for 11 cluster townhomes that would allow access through the proposed development for Ambulance or Fire, if required, which would block townhouse driveways, and their exits.

Street parking is not permitted on Upper Queen, Ridout, Commissioners Road, nor Baseline Road. Neighbouring interior streets would see an influx of these vehicles to park to access 489 Upper Queen Street.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my OPPOSITION to the rezoning application

#### **69. Mary Bezzina**

- a. PDF Letter with comments

#### **70. Judith Blackburn**

Please accept my comments and concerns to the Planning & Development Committee to REJECT Application Z- 9540, in their report and recommendation to the City of London, Planning & Environment Committee.

The current zoning is R1-9 single detached dwelling. We have purchased our homes, renovated our homes, and built our homes, choosing this R1 zone to do so. We look to the City to protect our investments as good stewards. Application for Rezoning from R1-9 to R5-7, to accommodate and permit, 11 two story cluster townhouses (plus a parking lot in a residential area), should not be considered .

This rezoning will forever change the character of the area. London City Plan intensification/infill can be accomplished, at 489 Upper Queen Street, in a manner that would respect the existing neighbourhood and character, and remain R1 zone, (single detached dwelling).

Adding more traffic congestion, to the intersection of Commissioners Rd and Upper Queen Street, cannot sustain the volume. We live on Upper Queen Street and use it to commute daily. The proposed development would add a double drive (to accommodate in/out traffic on the property) mere meters away from a right-of-way (that serves 3 homes), and another 2 driveways right at the corner of Commissioners/Upper Queen Street. This is untenable. Proposed development will accommodate up to 26 vehicles on the property. Now add, deliveries, garbage/recycling trucks and weekend and holiday visitors. This will affect all traffic on Upper Queens Street.

I respectfully request the Planning & Development Department to take all area residents' concerns and comments into consideration in your report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Please acknowledge receipt of my OPPOSITION to the rezoning application

#### **71. Laurie Baines**

My husband and I have lived in the Lockwood Park area for over 15 years. We noticed the sign on the currently vacant property at 489 Queen Street and would like to know if the proposed townhouse units will be rentals or sold to individuals/families.

We would prefer to see single family dwellings along the section of Upper Queen between Commissioner's to Mitches Park. However, if the townhouse units are approved, then it would definitely be preferable that they NOT be rentals.

Please keep me advised if a public meeting is being scheduled in the near future.

---

#### **Agency/Departmental Comments**

##### October 26, 2022: Ecology

- This e-mail is to confirm that there are currently no ecological planning issues related to this property and/or associated study requirements. No Heritage Features on, or adjacent to the site have been identified on Map 5 of the London Plan or based on current aerial photo interpretation.

##### October 26, 2022: Engineering

No comments for the rezoning

**The following items are to be considered during a future site plan application stage:**

***Wastewater:***

- The municipal sanitary sewer available is the 200mm diameter sewer on Upper Queens.

**Water:**

- Water is available via the municipal 300mm high-level watermain on Upper Queen Street.

**Stormwater:**

Specific comment for this site

- As per attached Drainage Area Plan 16073, the site at C=0.40 is tributary to the existing 525mm diameter storm sewer on Upper Queen St. The applicant should be aware that any future changes to the C-value will require the applicant to demonstrate sufficient capacity in this pipe and downstream systems to service the proposed development as well as provide on-site SWM controls. On-site SWM controls design should include, but not be limited to required storage volume calculations, flow restrictor sizing, bioswales, etc.
- Any proposed LID solution should be supported by a Geotechnical Report and/or hydrogeological investigations prepared with focus on the type of soil, its infiltration rate, hydraulic conductivity (under field saturated conditions), and seasonal high ground water elevation. The report(s) should include geotechnical and hydrogeological recommendations of any preferred/suitable LID solution.
- As per the Drainage By-law, the consultant would be required to provide for a storm PDC ensuring existing peak flows from the 2 through 100 year return period storms are maintained pre to post development with any increase in flow being managed onsite. The servicing report should also confirm capacity in the existing sewers.
- If the number of at grade parking spaces exceed 29, the owner shall be required to have a consulting Professional Engineer addressing the water quality to the standards of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Applicable options to address water quality could include, but not be limited to the use of oil/grit separators, catchbasin hoods, bioswales, etc. along with the required sampling/inspection maintenance hole.
- The proposed land use of a medium residential density will trigger(s) the application of design requirements of Permanent Private Storm System (PPS) as approved by Council resolution on January 18, 2010. A standalone Operation and Maintenance manual document for the proposed SWM system is to be included as part of the system design and submitted to the City for review.
- As per the City of London's Design Requirements for Permanent Private Systems, the proposed application falls within the Central Subwatershed (case 4), therefore the following design criteria should be implemented:
  - - the flow from the site must be discharged at a rate equal to or less than the existing condition flow;
    - the discharge flow from the site must not exceed the capacity of the stormwater conveyance system;
    - the design must account the sites unique discharge conditions (velocities and fluvial geomorphological requirements);
    - "normal" level water quality is required as per the MOE guidelines and/or as per the EIS field information; and
    - shall comply with riparian right (common) law.
    - The consultant shall submit a servicing report and drawings which should include calculations, recommendations, and details to address these requirements.

- As per 9.4.1 of The Design Specifications & Requirements Manual (DSRM), all multi-family, commercial and institutional block drainage is to be self-contained. The owner is required to provide a lot grading plan for stormwater flows and major overland flows on site and ensure that stormwater flows are self-contained on site, up to the 100 year event and safely convey the 250 year storm event.
- All applicants and their consultants shall ensure compliance with the City of London, Design Specifications and Requirements Manual, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation & Parks (MECP) Guidelines and Recommendation, and the SWM criteria and targets for the Central Thames Subwatershed.
- Stormwater run-off from the subject lands shall not cause any adverse effects to adjacent properties.
- The Owner shall allow for conveyance of overland flows from external drainage areas that naturally drain by topography through the subject lands.
- Additional SWM related comments will be provided upon future review of this site.

#### General comments for sites within Central Thames Subwatershed

- The subject lands are located within a subwatershed without established targets. City of London Standards require the Owner to provide a Storm/Drainage Servicing Report demonstrating compliance with SWM criteria and environmental targets identified in the Design Specifications & Requirements Manual. This may include but not be limited to, quantity control, quality control (70% TSS), erosion, stream morphology, etc.
- The Developer shall be required to provide a Storm/drainage Servicing Report demonstrating that the proper SWM practices will be applied to ensure the maximum permissible storm run-off discharge from the subject site will not exceed the peak discharge of storm run-off under pre-development conditions up to and including 100-year storm events.
- The Owner agrees to promote the implementation of SWM Best Management Practices (BMP's) within the plan, including Low Impact Development (LID) where possible, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. It shall include water balance.
- The owner is required to provide a lot grading plan for stormwater flows and major overland flows on site and ensure that stormwater flows are self-contained on site, up to the 100 year event and safely conveys up to the 250 year storm event, all to be designed by a Professional Engineer for review.
- The Owner shall allow for conveyance of overland flows from external drainage areas that naturally drain by topography through the subject lands.
- Stormwater run-off from the subject lands shall not cause any adverse effects to adjacent or downstream lands.
- An erosion/sediment control plan that will identify all erosion and sediment control measures for the subject site and that will be in accordance with City of London and MECP (formerly MOECC) standards and requirements, all to the specification and satisfaction of the City Engineer. This plan is to include measures to be used during all phases of construction. These measures shall be identified in the Storm/Drainage Servicing Report.
- **Transportation:**



- Right-of-way dedication of 13.0 m from the centre line be required along Upper Queen St
- Detailed comments regarding access design and location will be made through the site plan process

#### August 15, 2022: Landscape Architecture

The City's Landscape Architect has reviewed the TREE ASSESSMENT REPORT for 489 UPPER QUEEN STREET for ZBA prepared by RKLA in June 2022.

In summary, the inventory captured 20 individual trees and 5 vegetation units within the subject site, within 3 meters of the legal property boundary, and within the City ROW of Upper Queen Street adjacent to the site.

No endangered or threatened species were identified; the subject site is NOT within or adjacent to a City of London Tree Protection Area and there are no boundary trees associated with the subject site.

The Tree Preservation Plan contained in the report illustrated that a handful of offsite trees will be impacted during development as proposed. In particular trees #1-3 growing at 20 Barons Court will loose up to 20%, 40% and 40% root mass loss respectfully. The removal of vegetative unit 1 from site will damage these root systems. Is a retaining wall proposed along this property line? Can the young trees in this vegetative be retained and thus cause no disturbance to adjacent trees?

Off-site trees #15 and #16, 495 Queen St, while growing in close proximity to the property line will not have significant root encroachment into site due to a retaining wall on the property line and will suffer little impacts.

At time of application for SPA, coordinate with City of London Forestry Operations for removal of 3 City owned trees (tree IDs 10, 11 & 12)

#### September 12, 2022: London Hydro

Servicing the above proposal should present no foreseeable problems. Any new and/or relocation of existing infrastructure will be at the applicant's expense, maintaining safe clearances from L.H. infrastructure is mandatory. A blanket easement will be required. Note: Transformation lead times are minimum 16 weeks. Contact Engineering Dept. to confirm requirements & availability

London Hydro has no objection to this proposal or possible official plan and/or zoning amendment. However, London Hydro will require a blanket easement.

#### November 3, 2022: Heritage

There were no heritage or archaeological issues related to this application. In this instance, there is no need for heritage follow-up.

#### September 8, 2022: Site Plan

The only change from the SPC I noticed was a coniferous row along the rear. Regarding, I included all my comments from the consultation below, which largely ask for them to clarify plan details.

Zoning Considerations:

Z.-1 9.3: To permit a Front of Yard of 5.2 metres whereas a minimum of 6.0 metres is permitted.

Z.-1 9.3: To permit northern Interior Side Yards of 1.8 metres whereas a minimum of 6.0 metres is permitted.

Z.-1 9.3: Additional minor variances may be required, if identified. A Zoning By-law Amendment or Minor Variance(s) may capture zoning discrepancies.

Z.-1 4.21: Clearly illustrate the 13-metre road allowance on the site plan.

Z.-1-93172: Please confirm that the total number of bedrooms does not exceed five bedrooms (Z.-1-041300 – OMB Order 0780 – March 15/06).

General Comments:

1. Draft approval for a Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium is required prior to Site Plan Approval.

Comments based on current site plan:

1. Provide elevations from all sides in metric. Provide a consistent height on the elevations and site plan legend (i.e. provide both the absolute peak and midpoint of the roof, as defined per the Z.-1 Zoning By-law). Illustrate the hardscape design and materials on plans. Building design should have regard for surrounding context, especially for elevations visible from a roadway. Avoid materials that readily deteriorate, stain, or fade.
2. Please illustrate each tree, whether existing or proposed, on the site plan. For landscape strips along a public street, add at least one tree per every 12 metres, or every 15 metres otherwise (C.P.-1455-541 Table 9.4). Provide a 1.8-metre-tall privacy fencing along property line adjacent to residential parcels.
3. Clarify if basement ceiling height is 1.8 metres or more (Z.-1 2). Please state the total Gross Floor Area of each dwelling by including all applicable storeys. Label any proposed decks, porches, or other platforms on the site plan with dimensions to ensure compliance with the Z.-1 Zoning By-law.
4. Ensure enough space for collection access to recycling and waste. Clarify how snow storage is stored and accommodated on-site. Show all above ground utilities within the road allowance (e.g., hydro poles, hydrants, etc.). Please detail the shape of the access (street entranceway) and its connection to the roadway – ensure that the access corner radii do not encroach into designated road space nor extend beyond the projected property line (i.e. road access design is not to extend in front of a neighbouring parcel) (C.P.-1455-541 5.5.b).
5. Include a 1.5-metre setback from parking area(s) to property lines (C.P.-1455-541 6.2.b). Ensure visitor parking spaces are a minimum of 3 metres from dwellings containing windows to habitable rooms. Include parking curb stops between parking spaces and erect structures (e.g., building, light pole).
6. Show turning movements of emergency vehicles (C.P.-1455-541 6.7). Given the pronounced depth of this development, consider how firetrucks would access various parts of the site. For the design of the fire route, if required, refer to Table 6.2 of the Site Plan Control By-law. Label all entrances (barrier-free, fire, etc.), ensuring access to nearby fire department equipment as per 9.10.20.3 of the Ontario Building Code.
7. Pedestrian pathways should be graded to alleviate verticality and where applicable, prioritize ramps over staircases or steps (C.P.-1455-541 7.2). Ensure pedestrian circulation and access refinements are done with the Accessibility Review Checklist. Make sure to connect any amenity space to the other portions of the site with a pathway.

#### November 3, 2022: Urban Design

Please see below for UD comments related to the planning application at **489 Upper Queen St**. Many of these comments were provided at SPC but were not addressed through this process.

- Provide a pedestrian connection from the city sidewalk to the front entrances of the rear units as well as the common amenity space.
- Remove a unit from each of the townhouse blocks to allow for the pedestrian connection and a buffer between the drive aisle/parking area and the townhouse building edges.


- Reduce the driveway and garage widths for the rear units to not exceed 50% of the unit façade width.
- The applicant is to submit a completed “Urban Design Peer Review Panel Comments – Applicant Response” form that will be forwarded following the UDPRP meeting scheduled for September 2022. This completed form will be required to be submitted as part of a complete application.

September 28, 2022: UTRCA

The subject lands **are not** affected by any regulations (Ontario Regulation 157/06) made pursuant to Section 28 of the *Conservation Authorities Act*.

# Appendix C – Relevant Background

## The London Plan – Map 1 – Place Types



Legend					
	Downtown		Future Community Growth		Environmental Review
	Transit Village		Heavy Industrial		Farmland
	Shopping Area		Light Industrial		Rural Neighbourhood
	Rapid Transit Corridor		Future Industrial Growth		Waste Management Resource Recovery Area
	Urban Corridor		Commercial Industrial		Urban Growth Boundary
	Main Street		Institutional		
	Neighbourhood		Green Space		

This is an excerpt from Planning & Development's working consolidation of Map 1 - Place Types of the London Plan, with added notations.

<p><b>CITY OF LONDON</b> Official Plan</p> <p><b>LONDON PLAN MAP 1</b> - PLACE TYPES -</p> <p>PREPARED BY: Planning &amp; Development</p>	<p>Scale 1:30,000</p> <p>0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 900 1000 METERS</p>	<p><b>File Number:</b> Z-9540</p> <p><b>Planner:</b> AS</p> <p><b>Technician:</b> JI</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 2022/12/16</p>
---	--	---

# Zoning By-law Z.-1 – Zoning Excerpt



**COUNCIL APPROVED ZONING FOR THE SUBJECT SITE: R1-9**

**1) LEGEND FOR ZONING BY-LAW Z-1**

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| R1 - SINGLE DETACHED DWELLINGS            | RF - REGIONAL FACILITY            |
| R2 - SINGLE AND TWO UNIT DWELLINGS        | CF - COMMUNITY FACILITY           |
| R3 - SINGLE TO FOUR UNIT DWELLINGS        | NF - NEIGHBOURHOOD FACILITY       |
| R4 - STREET TOWNHOUSE                     | HER - HERITAGE                    |
| R5 - CLUSTER TOWNHOUSE                    | DC - DAY CARE                     |
| R6 - CLUSTER HOUSING ALL FORMS            | OS - OPEN SPACE                   |
| R7 - SENIOR'S HOUSING                     | CR - COMMERCIAL RECREATION        |
| R8 - MEDIUM DENSITY/LOW RISE APTS.        | ER - ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW         |
| R9 - MEDIUM TO HIGH DENSITY APTS.         | OB - OFFICE BUSINESS PARK         |
| R10 - HIGH DENSITY APARTMENTS             | LI - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL             |
| R11 - LODGING HOUSE                       | GI - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL           |
| DA - DOWNTOWN AREA                        | HI - HEAVY INDUSTRIAL             |
| RSA - REGIONAL SHOPPING AREA              | EX - RESOURCE EXTRACTIVE          |
| CSA - COMMUNITY SHOPPING AREA             | UR - URBAN RESERVE                |
| NSA - NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOPPING AREA         | AG - AGRICULTURAL                 |
| BDC - BUSINESS DISTRICT COMMERCIAL        | AGC - AGRICULTURAL COMMERCIAL     |
| AC - ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL                  | RRC - RURAL SETTLEMENT COMMERCIAL |
| HS - HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL           | TGS - TEMPORARY GARDEN SUITE      |
| RSC - RESTRICTED SERVICE COMMERCIAL       | RT - RAIL TRANSPORTATION          |
| CC - CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL               |                                   |
| SS - AUTOMOBILE SERVICE STATION           | "h" - HOLDING SYMBOL              |
| ASA - ASSOCIATED SHOPPING AREA COMMERCIAL | "D" - DENSITY SYMBOL              |
| OR - OFFICE/RESIDENTIAL                   | "H" - HEIGHT SYMBOL               |
| OC - OFFICE CONVERSION                    | "B" - BONUS SYMBOL                |
| RO - RESTRICTED OFFICE                    | "T" - TEMPORARY USE SYMBOL        |
| OF - OFFICE                               |                                   |

**CITY OF LONDON**

PLANNING SERVICES / DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**ZONING  
BY-LAW NO. Z-1  
SCHEDULE A**



FILE NO:  
Z-9540 AS

MAP PREPARED:  
2022/12/16 JI

1:1,000  
0 5 10 20 30 40 Meters

THIS MAP IS AN UNOFFICIAL EXTRACT FROM THE ZONING BY-LAW WITH ADDED NOTATIONS