TO: CHAIR AND MEMBERS- PLANNING COMMITTEE
FROM: R. W. PANZER
GENERAL MANAGER OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
SUBJECT: APPLICATION BY: CHAI-EL HOLDINGS LTD.
859-869 ADELAIDE STREET NORTH, AND 871 ADELAIDE STREET NORTH
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING ON MONDAY, MAY 28, 2007 AT 7:00 P.M.

RECOMMENDATION

That, on the recommendation of the General Manager of Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Chai-El Holdings Ltd. relating to the properties located at 859-869 Adelaide Street North, and 871 Adelaide Street North:

(a) the proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on June 11, 2007 to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the lands at 859-871 Adelaide Street North from "Low Density Residential" to "Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential";

(b) the proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on June 11, 2007 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1 (in conformity with the Official Plan, as amended in part (a) above) to change the zoning of lands located at 863, 867 and 869 Adelaide Street North, and on a portion of 859, 861, and 865 Adelaide Street North FROM a Residential R2 (R2-2) and a Holding Residential R2 (h*R2-2) Zone which permits single detached, semi-detached, duplex and converted dwellings maximum two units, TO a Holding Residential R2 Bonus (h*R2-2*B-) Zone to permit the above listed uses and, subject to design approval, a 10 unit stacked townhouse with a maximum height of 8 metres and a 42 unit apartment building at a maximum height of 10 metres and a maximum overall site density of 87 units per hectare; and

(c) the request to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1 to change the zoning of the lands located 859-869 Adelaide Street North from a Residential R2 (R2-2) and a Holding Residential R2 (h*R2-2) Zone to a Residential R8 Bonus (R8-4*H13*B-) BE REFUSED for the reasons listed in the "Rationale" section of the Planning report; and

(d) a public participation meeting of the Planning Committee be held for consideration of the site plan required for this development;

IT BEING NOTED that the "h" holding provision will address the requirement for sanitary servicing and water capacity analysis.

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER

HZ-6583 – Municipal Council resolution on January 19, 2004

PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The purpose and effect of the proposed amendments is to permit the development of 52 units on the subject site, within two buildings – a 3 storey apartment building with 42 units, and a 2 storey stacked townhouse with 10 units only if such buildings are constructed in accordance with the agreed upon elevation, site plan, building materials, and design parameters required by the proposed bonus zoning for this site.
RATIONAL

1. The Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan both encourage infill and intensification as it promotes a range of housing types, compact urban form and uses existing infrastructure. The subject site is suited to infill and intensification given its substantial depth from Adelaide Street (350 feet).

2. The Official Plan amendment to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation is appropriate because the proposed use is compatible with existing development in the area, has access to available services, will have minimal impact on the existing road network, is of a scale and height that is in keeping with other development in the area, and has incorporated buffering measures to lessen impacts on abutting properties.

3. The site is located in close proximity to major commercial areas, transit, and public open space and recreational uses.

4. The proposed development is oriented to and accessed from an arterial road and is compatible with the existing mix of housing forms along Adelaide Street.

5. The proposed bonus zone will only allow for higher intensity residential development if the specific development proposal agreed to is constructed. Alternative medium density development will not be permitted without a zoning by-law amendment which will allow for full review and consideration.

6. The proposed development, enshrined in the bonus zone, represents quality urban design, will enhance the design amenity of the Adelaide Street corridor, and incorporates many design features to mitigate impacts on surrounding lands.

7. The recommended zoning will provide for a form of residential development compatible with the scale of development in the surrounding neighbourhood.

BACKGROUND

Date Application Accepted: February 7, 2006

Agent: Michael Hannay, Zeinika Priamo

REQUESTED ACTION: (original application) To provide sixty new residential units in the form of three, modestly scaled four storey apartment buildings; (revised application) To provide 52 residential units, 42 units within a three storey low-rise apartment building and 10 units within a two storey stacked townhouse.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

- Current Land Use — single family detached; converted dwellings
- Frontage — proposed — approximately 35.0 metres (114.8 feet)
- Depth — proposed — approximately 105.8 metres (357.0 feet)
- Area — proposed — approximately 6,000 square metres (64,585.6 square feet)
- Shape — irregular

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

- North - apartments
- South — single family detached
- East — apartments; single family detached
- West — single family detached; church
LEGEND

- DOWNTOWN AREA
- REGIONAL SHOPPING AREA
- COMMUNITY SHOPPING AREA
- NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOPPING AREA
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THIS IS AN EXCERPT FROM THE PLANNING DIVISION'S WORKING CONSOLIDATION OF SCHEDULE A TO THE CITY OF LONDON OFFICIAL PLAN, WITH ADDED NOTATIONS.

CITY OF LONDON
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

OFFICIAL PLAN
SCHEDULE A - LAND USE

FILE NO. OZ-7098
MAP PREPARED: May 09, 2007
CMH

SCALE: 1:30,000
OFFICIAL PLAN DESIGNATION: (refer to map on page 4)

- Low Density Residential
- 3.5.9. North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood

"The North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood is generally bounded by the Thames River on the north and west, Oxford Street on the south and Adelaide Street on the east, but does not include the St. George/Grosvenor Neighbourhood, which is defined separately in policy 3.5.3. of the Plan. North London/Broughdale is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density residential institutional and office uses located along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street corridors.

It is anticipated that there will be demand for residential intensification and infill development within portions of the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood during the planning period. Area-specific guidelines are required which will direct future residential development to suitable locations, and protect the character of the existing low-rise, low density residential community.

Multiple unit residential development is directed to those areas within the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential. Except for lands identified in Policy 3.5.9 (a), in Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock, provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale which is compatible with surrounding land uses.

For Low Density Residential areas located outside of the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock shall be encouraged. In keeping with the low-rise, low density character of these areas, residential uses will be restricted to single detached, semi-detached, duplex and converted dwellings (to a maximum of 2 units). Area-specific Zoning regulations such as floor area ratio, maximum dwelling size and on-site parking limitations will be applied in parts of the neighbourhood that may be impacted by residential intensification and infill, to ensure that future development is not out of scale and character with the existing residential community.

The following objectives will guide the implementation of Low Density Residential policies for the Old North/Broughdale neighbourhood:

i) the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with that of existing development in the surrounding area;

ii) all required parking will be accommodated on site and limited in area;

iii) development will be sensitive to the orientation or adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing residential streetscape; and

iv) any new lots created through consent will be in conformity with the minimum zoning requirements, and in keeping with the established lot pattern (in terms of frontage, depth and overall size) in the surrounding area."

EXISTING ZONING: (refer to map on page 5)

- Residential R2 (R2-2) and Holding Residential R2 (h*R2-2)

PLANNING HISTORY

The homes located at 859-869 Adelaide Street North are predominately single family detached (859, 867) and converted (861, 863, 865, 869) dwellings, built in and around the 1920's.

In September, 2003, the applicant submitted consent applications to sever the rear portions of 863 & 865 Adelaide Street North and convey to 867 Adelaide Street North. The City initiated an application (Z-6583) to apply a holding provision to 863-869 Adelaide Street North. The purpose of the amendment was to ensure that any future development would be subject to site plan
control and further review by the City.

The original development proposed three four-storey apartment buildings, with a combined 60 units. Through the original submission in February, 2006, an urban design report was submitted for the application. After discussions with the applicant, a revised urban design report was submitted in April 2006, with revised concepts and design for the site. In April, 2006, a neighbourhood meeting was also held to review and discuss the application and provide information to the neighbourhood on the proposed development. Approximately 50 residents attended this meeting and provided comments on the proposed application. These comments are summarized and provided under the “public liaison” section of the report.

A revised concept and revised building drawings were submitted by the applicant in February, 2007. The revised development included a change in building form (stacked townhouses with a total of 10 units), building height (the apartment building had been reduced to three stories, and the townhouses were reduced to two stories) and density (reduced to 52 units overall). A change in design was also proposed. A second neighbourhood meeting was held on February 28, 2007. Approximately 30 residents attended this meeting and provided feedback on the revised development. These comments are also summarized and provided under the “public liaison” section of the report.

SIGNIFICANT DEPARTMENT/AGENCY COMMENTS

Environmental and Engineering Services Department (EESD)
"The City of London’s Environmental and Engineering Services Department offers the following comments with respect to the aforementioned Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment application.

- A road widening dedication to allow for 15.5 meters from the centerline of Adelaide Street North to the subject sites property line may be required.
- There are a number of transportation engineering issues regarding development of these properties including the number, type and location of accesses, the potential for mutual driveways with abutting properties and left turn lane requirements. These and other transportation issues will be dealt with in greater detail during the site plan review process.
- The owner’s professional engineer must complete a sanitary sewer capacity analysis study to prove there is enough capacity in the existing sanitary sewer system for the proposed development(s). Therefore, a holding provision should be applied to the entire subject lands until it is proven there is enough sanitary capacity in the existing sanitary sewer for the proposed development(s).
- Engineering analysis is required by the developer to determine the extent of external waterworks that may be required, satisfactory to the General Manager of Environmental and Engineering Services and the City Engineer. In addition, the existing water service should be checked; it may not be adequate for the proposed development.
- The subject lands are located in the Central Thames subwatershed. Stormwater management will be required in accordance with the Central Thames Subwatershed Study at the time of redevelopment. In addition, depending on the parking arrangements for the proposed buildings and the connectivity of the proposed apartment buildings, one or more oil/grit separators may be required. The need will be assessed and implemented if required at the time of site plan application.

This, among other engineering and transportation issues will be addressed in greater detail through the site plan approval process, if required."

Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
"The TAC noted that a traffic impact study should be completed due to safety concerns along this portion of Adelaide Street North, and also asked that the site development take into consideration the principals within the forthcoming Access Management Guidelines document."
On March 10, 2006, notice of the application was sent to 138 property owners in the surrounding area. Notice of the application was also published in the "Living in the City" section of the London Free Press on Saturday, March 11, 2006. A revised notice of application was published in the "Living in the City" section of the London Free Press on Saturday, March 3, 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC LIAISON:</th>
<th>On March 10, 2006, notice of the application was sent to 138 property owners in the surrounding area. Notice of the application was also published in the &quot;Living in the City&quot; section of the London Free Press on Saturday, March 11, 2006. A revised notice of application was published in the &quot;Living in the City&quot; section of the London Free Press on Saturday, March 3, 2007.</th>
<th>95 responses; 1 in support; 2 no objections; 92 objections; 1 petition with 159 names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Public Liaison:**

**(Original Application) Nature of Liaison:**

1. **859-871 Adelaide Street North** - Change the Official Plan land use designation from a Low Density Residential designation to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation.

   The purpose and effect of this Official Plan amendment is to permit residential intensification in the form of three 4-story apartment buildings and to recognize an existing 3 story apartment building at 871 Adelaide Street North.

   The purpose and effect of this Official Plan amendment is to permit residential intensification in the form of three 4-story apartment buildings and to recognize an existing 3 story apartment building at 871 Adelaide Street North.

2. **Portions of 859, 861 & 865 Adelaide Street North, and 863, 867 & 869 Adelaide Street North** - Change the Zoning By-law Z-1 from a Residential R2 (R2-2) and a Holding Residential R8 Bonus (R8-4.B- ) Zone to a Residential R8 Bonus (R8-4.B- ) Zone to permit apartment buildings at a maximum density of 75 units per hectare and a maximum height of 13 metres (43 feet) or approximately 4 stories. The bonusing provision would permit an additional 25 units per hectare of density on the site (total 100 units per hectare) in exchange for certain design features.

   The purpose and effect of this zoning change is to permit the construction of three 4-storey apartment buildings, with a total of 60 units. Additional permitted uses could include: handicapped persons apartment buildings; lodging house class 2; stacked townhousing; senior citizen apartment buildings; emergency care establishments; and continuum-of-care facilities.

**Public Liaison:**

**(Revised Application) Nature of Liaison:**

The purpose and effect of this zoning change is to permit the construction of one 3 storey apartment building and one 3-storey stacked townhouse, with a total of 52 units. 859-871 Adelaide Street North - Change the Official Plan land use designation from a Low Density Residential designation to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation. Portions of 859, 861 & 865 Adelaide Street North, and 863, 867 & 869 Adelaide Street North - Change the Zoning By-law Z-1 from a Residential R2 (R2-2) and a Holding Residential R2 (h*R2-2) Zone to a Residential R8 Bonus (R8-4.B- ) Zone to permit apartment buildings at a maximum density of 75 units per hectare and a maximum height of 13 metres (43 feet) or approximately 4 stories. The bonusing provision would permit an additional 25 units per hectare of density on the site (total 100 units per hectare) in exchange for certain design features.

Additional permitted uses could include: handicapped persons apartment buildings; lodging house class 2; stacked townhousing; senior citizen apartment buildings; emergency care establishments; and continuum-of-care facilities.

The City may also consider a zoning by-law amendment for 859-869 Adelaide Street North to a Holding Residential R2 Bonus (h*R2-2'B- ( )) Zone. The base zone would permit single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings on the site, while the bonusing provision would permit a density of 87 units per hectare on the site (52 units total) in exchange for design features.
Responses: the following is a summary of the main issues raised through the circulation process. It should be noted that many of these responses were based on the original submission by the applicant:

1) **Compatibility** - not sensitive to surrounding built form; predominately single family in immediate area; height, bulk placement not consistent with existing housing stock; continuity not maintained on streetscape

2) **Traffic** - increased cut-through traffic; potential access onto William Street; pedestrian safety; increased vehicle load on Adelaide Street from development; Adelaide Street – site lines no good – safety is an issue with cars pulling out;

3) **Parking** - 60 spaces not enough - overflow parking on adjacent streets;

4) **Decreased Property Values** - will the City be decreasing property taxes when property values drop?; examples in area where people have tried to sell house recently and price of house has dropped significantly

5) **Security & Tenancy** - increase in crime in area/crimes against property/break-ins; low income residents and/or students; if townhouse/condos then homes are owner occupied – people who own home care more for it; transient nature of renters – no sense of community

6) **Official Plan, Zoning By-law, PPS** - Policy for North London directs development to areas already designated medium density or high density; why/how does the applicant qualify for bonusing?; PPS speaks to “appropriate” infill; Heritage priority - 857 Adelaide St; 33% bonusing not in keeping with OP; high density residential is supposed to be confined in “nodes” – this is not; medium density residential “does not permit densities intended for HDR”; Richmond Interim Control By-law – commitment to Old North

7) **Design Considerations** - building design - poor choice in building materials, design; orientation of buildings – not street-facing; landscaping – how can this be accommodated on the site?; continuous streetscape not maintained – demolition of homes; a berm with significant plantings, plus a high security fending should be installed/reduce noise; should include rear portions of William Street as well; design/development should be similar to Carleton Street application

8) **Nuisance** - increased lighting for parking lots, noise from garbage trucks, additional people, cars, snow removal, pollution from cars; increased trash around site; loss of sunlight, amenity space, privacy; potential for vermin/rodents; pedestrians jumping fences/creating paths; construction/debris and associated noise and dust; already flooding in basements – made worse by this development

9) **Precedent** - one of many applications to come?; may affect neighborhood stability; why must the neighbourhood have to constantly defend itself from these sorts of applications?;

10) **Greenspace & Environmental** - loss of greenspace and amenity, trees, sunlight, privacy; snow, salt and oil runoff leading into yards and water; removal of old mature trees and replaced with smaller trees; how can landscaped open space be accommodated?

11) **Servicing** - stormwater management/snow melt and runoff - where will this go?; existing water and sewer cannot accommodate; existing infrastructure old/over used/taxed – how can this development be accommodated?

12) **Density** - 60 units x 3 bedrooms = 180 people – too many; what is the overall existing density in this area?; density is more high density than medium density; infill townhouses do not achieve true urban densities

13) **General** - Should measure the impact of the development from property line – not from building to building; developers track record not impressive – affordable housing only; legal ramifications if proceed with application; why are there “additional permitted uses”?: “intensification as an objective to forestall urban sprawl should not be used as a license to eliminate longstanding communities”; this development supports walking, transit and convenient retail; this allows people to live close to the downtown without actually living downtown

---

**ANALYSIS**

**Subject sites**

The subject sites are located on the west side of Adelaide Street, north of St. James Street. All five parcels have a combined lot area of 0.7 hectares (1.7 acres) but the total area proposed for the development is 0.6 hectares (1.5 acres) and has a combined frontage of approximately 35 metres (115 feet).
Adelaide Street North from Cheapside Street to Oxford Street is composed of a mix of residential and commercial uses within a range of building types. The two major intersections (Adelaide/Cheapside, and Adelaide/Oxford) are anchored by a mix of commercial uses, including grocery stores, pharmacies, gas bars and convenience commercial uses, both free standing and within plazas. The predominant land use along this corridor is residential, with some office uses and convenience commercial uses also located along this section.

The subject sites are located on Adelaide Street North, a busy arterial road with an annual average daily traffic volume of 28,500 vehicles.
What is the nature of the application?
The applicant, Chai-El Holdings Ltd., has requested an Official Plan amendment from Low Density Residential to Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential. The applicant has also requested a zoning by-law amendment to a Residential R8 Bonus Zone (R8-4*H15*/B-( )). The base zone of R8-4 would permit apartments at a maximum height of 13.0 metres and a maximum density of 75 units per hectare. Additional permitted uses could include: handicapped persons apartment buildings; lodging house class 2; stacked townhousing; senior citizen apartment buildings; emergency care establishments; and continuum-of-care facilities. The applicant’s request for a Bonus (B-( )) Zone would permit additional density above and beyond the permitted 75 units per hectare. The applicants are seeking additional density above 75 units per hectare, based on high quality urban design.

Is the requested Official Plan amendment appropriate?

a) Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)
The PPS contains goals and objectives for land use planning in the Province. Generally, the promotion of intensification, the provision of a broad range of housing types and the use of existing infrastructure are fundamental policy directives in the PPS. Intensification is accepted as an important part of good land use planning in the province since it promotes the previously mentioned objectives, and encourages compact urban forms, transit ridership, and walkable communities. Intensification is encouraged where it is considered appropriate.

b) Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation
Preferred locations for Medium Density residential development include lands in close proximity to Shopping Areas, Commercial Districts, designated Open Space areas or Regional Facilities; lands adjacent to a Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation; and, lands abutting an arterial, primary collector or secondary collector street. Applications are generally evaluated on the basis of compatibility, availability of municipal services, traffic, adequate buffering, scale of development, height, and density.

The site is located on an arterial road, and is in close proximity to several shopping areas (Oxford/Adelaide; Adelaide/Cheapside), and regional facilities (such as Carling Arena and Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre). The site is also easily accessible by transit.

Any proposals for changes in land use are evaluated on the basis of criteria relevant to the proposed change. The proposed development will be evaluated on the basis of Section 3.7, Planning Impact Analysis. Where an Official Plan amendment and/or zone change is for a specific development proposal, or where more site specific and detailed information on the type and nature of future development is given, the following criteria may be considered:

Compatibility - The proposed building type (low-rise apartment) is compatible with existing development in the area. There are several low-rise apartment buildings in the vicinity, including a four-storey building directly adjacent to the proposed development at 871 Adelaide Street North. Although these buildings pre-date the current Official Plan and zoning by-law, they are an established use within the neighbourhood and do set the context for building form. The proposed townhouse block, located on the westerly portion of the subject site, is not a form typically seen within the adjacent neighbourhood. However, a townhouse block at this location has the ability to act as a transition and buffer for the lower density uses to the south and west towards apartment uses to the north.

The Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation may serve as a suitable transition between Low Density Residential areas and more intense forms of land use. It will also provide for greater variety and choice in housing at locations that have desirable attributes but may not be appropriate for higher density, high-rise forms of housing. Residential uses that typically comprise medium density development include row houses, cluster houses, and low-rise apartment buildings.

Availability of services - A key tenet of intensification is the availability of services. By increasing densities within existing areas, new development can draw on existing services and not require the costly extension of services. Confirmation of sanitary services will be required, therefore, a holding provision will be applied to ensure that a sanitary sewer capacity analysis and a water capacity analysis are completed prior to any development occurring.
Figure 1 - Site Plan (submitted by the applicant)
ADELAIDE STREET NORTH
Traffic - Adelaide Street is a busy arterial road with an estimated average daily traffic volume of 28,500 vehicles. A traffic impact study was completed by the applicant to review the effect of traffic, specifically cut-through traffic, on the area. Concerns from the neighbourhood were expressed regarding the volume of traffic generated by this site that may use surrounding local streets. As estimated in the report, the development will generate 32 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 50 trips during the p.m. peak hour. There is the potential for some of this traffic to use surrounding local streets, but as the data shows, the amount of traffic this site will generate during the peak traffic time periods is minimal and will have limited impact on traffic volume on these local streets.

Adelaide Street is a mixed use corridor with varying land uses, intersected by many streets, and is a main arterial into the City and the downtown. The addition of 52 units onto Adelaide Street and the associated impact is negligible, particularly compared to the traffic generated by significant residential developments along Adelaide Street north of Fanshawe Park Road.

Other traffic issues including the need for a left turn lane on Adelaide St and the number of accesses to serve this site will be discussed in greater detail during site plan review. This requirement will ensure an acceptable level of service is maintained on Adelaide Street.

Buffering - As it currently exists, the site is heavily vegetated and contains many trees and shrubs. To ensure that the majority of this is retained and incorporated into the new site design, as part of the site plan for the bonus zone, a landscape plan was submitted to show retained vegetation, as well as new vegetation for the site. The retained and new vegetation will act as a buffer between adjacent sites and the development, to screen buildings as well as parking. A board on board fence with stone columns is also proposed. An outdoor amenity area is proposed at the southwest corner of the site, which pushes the townhouse building farther away from the property line - approximately 9.0 metres. Many provisions have been added to the site design to ensure buffering is achieved.

Scale of development - The proposed development is of a height (three storeys) and form (apartments) that is currently present in the neighbourhood. The apartment is also located on the property adjacent to existing apartment buildings. Although the building mass is larger than existing apartments in the area, the overall effect on adjacent properties is minimized as design features, and changes in building materials will help to reduce the appearance of scale. The townhouse form, however, is a new housing form that is not currently present within the immediate neighbourhood. However, the townhouse has a lower profile (two stories) and is smaller in scale and more compatible with existing single detached dwellings in the adjacent area. Additional setbacks (9.0 metres from the southerly property line, and 4.5 metres from the westerly property line) will also help to lessen the visual mass of the project.

Height - This development overall will not exceed three stories in height, or 10.0 metres overall. This is the proposed height for the apartment building. The proposed stacked townhouse will not exceed two stories in height, or a maximum of 8.0 metres. The current zone permits a maximum height of 10.5 metres. Both of these proposed heights are in existence within the adjacent neighbourhood through existing development, in the form of single detached dwellings and low-rise apartment buildings.

Density - The typical density range for development within the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation is 30 to 75 units per hectare. The predominant density in the existing surrounding area is low density, as is the designation. However, the densities for the two apartment buildings within the area are varied. There are approximately 18 units at 871 Adelaide Street, which translates into a density of 55 units per hectare, and there are approximately 40 units located at 872 William Street, which translates into a density of 121 units per hectare. On the east side of Adelaide Street there are several low-rise apartments of varying densities. The location of apartment buildings within the area is shown in Figure 11 of the urban design report (Appendix "A", page 11).

The Official Plan allows for increases to the height and density limits applicable to a proposed development where the development incorporates design features that achieve design
objectives outlined in Chapter 11 (Urban Design Principles) of the Official Plan. The Planning Act allows a municipality to include in its Zoning By-law regulations that permit increases to the height and density limits applicable to a proposed development in return for the provision of such facilities, services, or matters as are set out in the By-law. Bonus zoning is provided to encourage development features which result in a public benefit which cannot be obtained through the normal development process.

This applicant is proposing 52 units on the site overall, which translates into 87 units per hectare. This does not exceed the requirements for bonusing under the policies for Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential, which limits any increase in density to 100 units per hectare. The net increase above what is typically permitted with the MDR designation is approximately 12%.

c) Infill Policies
The policies that are currently within the Official Plan for infill development do not apply for this application as they relate to lands within the Low Density Residential designation. Although this development could be considered "infill", in general terms, the application is for a Medium Density residential designation and is not considered infill within the context of the Official Plan policies.

d) Policy for North London/Broughdale
The North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood is generally bounded by the Thames River on the north and west, Oxford Street on the south and Adelaide Street on the east. Policy 3.5.9. details the existing character of the area, and the appropriate locations for development, infill and intensification, while maintaining the current character. North London/Broughdale is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density residential, institutional and office uses located along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street corridors.

The intent of the special policy was considered. The policy states that the preferred areas for new residential and intensification and infill development are those areas that are designated Multi-Family Medium Density and Multi-Family High Density Residential along Adelaide Street, Oxford Street and Richmond Street. There are no areas designated for Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential along Adelaide Street, and lands that are designated for Multi-Family, High Density Residential along Adelaide Street are currently built out. The Adelaide Street North corridor is a mixed use corridor with many land uses including apartments, commercial uses, office, and single detached residential dwellings. Opportunities for intensification within this corridor should be oriented towards Adelaide Street, which is distinctly different in character from other areas within the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood. The proposed development has no direct vehicular or pedestrian connection to the interior of the existing neighbourhood.

By designating these lands as Multi Family, Medium Density Residential, the potential for intensification and development on these lands is recognized.

Are the requested zoning by-law amendment and bonusing provisions appropriate?

a) Requested zoning
The applicant has requested a Residential R8 (R8-4) Zone. This base would permit apartment buildings at a maximum height of 13.0 metres and a maximum density of 75 units per hectare.

b) Proposed zoning
Although it is recognized that intensification is possible for this site, and that a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential development is appropriate at this location, it is recommended that the base zone of a Residential R2 (R2-2) Zone be maintained, with a bonusing provision to permit the development as specifically proposed with this application. The bonus zone will ensure that the development as shown today is entrenched within an agreement with the City so that all of the elements are agreed upon. Any changes to this would require an amendment to the bonus zone and therefore would go through a public process (zoning by-law amendment) and re-evaluation of whether the new proposal is appropriate.
By keeping the base zoning at R2-2 it ensures that any development proposed on the site is subject to, at minimum, a zoning by-law amendment which would again require public involvement, comment and ensure that issues such as urban design, site layout, retention of vegetation, etc. are worked through on a collaborative basis. It is crucial that the linkage between intensification and good urban design is made.

This is an established neighbourhood and any application for intensification and infill needs to ensure that the development brings elements of the neighbourhood into the design, that the scale and form are amendable to the neighbourhood, and that appropriate mitigation and buffering is incorporated into the overall design.

c) Bonusing
Under the provisions of the Planning Act, a municipality may include in its Zoning By-law, regulations that permit increases to the height and density limits applicable to a proposed development in return for the provision of such facilities, services, or matters, as are set out in the By-law. This practice, commonly referred to as bonus zoning, is considered to be an appropriate means of assisting in the implementation of the Official Plan.

The main principle for bonusing is that the facilities, services or matters that would be provided in consideration of a height or density bonus should be reasonable "and must result in a benefit to the general public and/or an enhancement of the design or amenities of a development to the extent that a greater density or height is warranted." The policy further states that the height and density bonuses received should not result in a scale of development that is incompatible with adjacent uses or exceeds the capacity of available municipal services.

Bonus Zoning can be used to encourage a number of development features, including: support of the City's urban design principles, as contained in Chapter 11; the provision of affordable housing as provided for by 12.2.2.; aesthetically attractive residential developments through the enhanced provision of landscaped open space; and support innovative and environmentally sensitive development which incorporates notable design features, promotes energy conservation, waste and water recycling and use of public transit. As a condition to the application of bonus zoning provisions to a proposed development, the owner of the subject land will be required to enter into an agreement with the City, to be registered against the title of the land.

Review of design
As part of the bonusing agreement, the applicant has provided the following: site plan (Figure 1), landscaped plan (Figure 2), building elevations (Figures 3 and 4), site rendering (Figure 5), and plan impact analysis with design review and guidelines for development. These have been used to develop the elements within the bonus zone; the drawings will be attached to the development agreement, and the design guidelines are attached to this report and will be used to finish the evaluation of the design through the site plan process.

As part of the design review, the original application was reviewed by architect John Nicholson (MNSA). Based on the original assessment of the design, a critique of the development and commentary was provided on areas where improvements could be made to the development proposal. Based on this design review, the applicant submitted the new development proposal, which resulted in a change to the overall development (from 60 units to 52 units, within a three-storey apartment building and a two-storey stacked townhouse), changes in the design and building materials, and the subsequent development of the site plan, landscape plan, elevations, an urban design report, which includes design principles to be used in the evaluation of the design.

The following design principles were created by the applicant's agent, Michael Hannay, and were followed by the applicant to create the design of the proposed building.

Design Character Statement
The guidelines were prepared based on an analysis of the existing streetscape, current best practices for urban design and a review of the relevant sections of the City of London's Official Plan.
Figure 3 - Building Elevations - Low-rise Apartment (submitted by the applicant)
Figure 4 - Building Elevations - Stacked Townhouse (submitted by the applicant)
Figure 5 - Site Rendering (submitted by the applicant)
These guidelines have been used to direct the design of the proposal to visually support the:

- Compatibility of the proposed buildings with the existing adjacent buildings;
- Character of the neighbourhood; and
- Pedestrian scale of the Adelaide Street North streetscape.

The guidelines are attached under Appendix “A”.

A review of the development as per the main headings within the design guidelines is as follows:

**Architectural Style**
The style of both buildings draws on architectural elements and designs that are present within the single detached dwellings in the adjacent neighbourhood. Both buildings are meant to mimic the style of adjacent developments, by incorporating design elements such as peaked roofs, front porches, window overhangs, brick building materials, and window shutters. For instance, the segmental arch over the street facing windows and the “tower” structure of the windows for the low-rise apartment is reminiscent of the Italianate style. The rhythm of the main apartment echoes the Georgian Revival style with the symmetrical placement of doors and fenestration. The use of gables and quoins (decorated end pieces) at the ends of the townhouse and in the porch feature reflect a Classical style of architecture, all present within the adjacent neighbourhood.

**The Adelaide Street North Streetscape**
The low-rise apartment building will continue the established building line of the street. This is an important feature to ensure that an uninterrupted street line is created. As well, much design has been put into the front façade which projects out onto Adelaide Street, including incorporating windows which are meant to mimic the appearance of a front door, landscaping and bricked walkways.

**Massing and Siting**
The proposed building provides cornice lines and angled balconies to minimize the visual impacts of the mass and scale of the building. The reduction in overall height to three stories for the low-rise apartment also minimizes the scale of the development. The change to a two-story stacked townhouse form has also significantly reduced the scale and mass of the development.

**Cladding Materials and Colour**
Both buildings are proposed to be a brick to match the existing brick of the other buildings along the street. It is important to use a consistent material that is already present in the area to ensure continuity and compatibility. The yellow brick is a very common brick in London; however, there are several other brick colours in the adjacent neighbourhood that could also be used, such as beige/brown or salmon.

**Window Scale and Placement**
The orientation of the windows are vertical rather than horizontal to match the windows on the adjacent buildings. As well, the window openings are emphasized with headers, balconies and shutters to enhance the design. The presence of dormers is a common feature in older homes in this neighbourhood – this has been echoed in the dormer style windows which are included in the low-rise apartment.

**Pedestrian Access and Main Building Entrance**
A well-designed building should emphasize entranceways. The apartment development is proposing individual entrances at grade to each of the units on the first floor. This will have the effect of creating individual outdoor "spaces" for each of these entrances, similar to the entrances of the single family homes. The main entrances into the building, located in the centre of the development, will need to include many of the design elements that are apparent in the individual entrances proposed, such as overhangs, headers, extra fenestration and pillars. The main entrances for the townhouse building are located within porches, and include details such as pillars, peaked roofs, and quoins.

**Rooflines**
The low-rise apartment is proposing a “mansard” style roof which is stylistically very different than existing rooflines in the adjacent area. However, with the addition of dormers and accent gables, the overall effect is stylistically interesting and ties in with adjacent architecture. The
stacked townhouse has a more typical gabled roof which is represented in many of the adjacent homes.

*Landscaping and Site Design*

Although not a specific category within the urban design guidelines, there are several design elements that should be mentioned. Firstly, the applicant is proposing to maintain a substantial amount of vegetation and trees that are currently on the site, to act as a buffer and to maintain some of the natural vegetation of the site. As well, new trees will be added to offset any trees that may be lost through the development of the site. It is also proposed that the pathways and sidewalks on the site will be done in either a stamped concrete or brick/interlocking stone to add to the aesthetic value. The fencing proposed will be seven feet high overall - the first five feet will be a solid wood board fence, and the top two feet will be a closed lattice. It is also proposed that there will be stone posts within the fence. An outdoor amenity area with play structures will also be incorporated into this development.

The applicant has worked diligently to achieve a very positive outcome with respect to design. All the design elements that are noted in the urban design guidelines appear to have been incorporated into the final design of the building.

*Chapter 11 - Urban Design Principles*

The proposed development will retain many trees and as much natural vegetation as is possible through the development process, and as demonstrated on the landscape plan. A high design standard has been applied, which incorporates architectural continuity with the adjacent neighbourhood, and introduces new design elements that are interesting and attractive. The design and positioning of new buildings has regard for the impact of the proposed development on year-round sunlight conditions on adjacent properties and streets. The proposed landscaping and retention of trees will enhance the appearance of building setback and yard areas, and will help to mitigate and buffer parking, loading, garbage and service facilities from adjacent properties and streets. The buildings are positioned such that usable and secure open space areas are defined on the site and will afford a reasonable measure of privacy to adjacent dwelling units. The development includes low-rise apartments with individual accesses off the driveway, which will facilitate access and use by handicapped persons and senior citizens. The parking and loading on the site is designed such that the building will buffer any noise and lights that are associated with the buildings. Every effort has been made to design and position the new buildings to minimize the loss of privacy for adjacent residential properties. This development will include an appropriately sized outdoor children's play area that is accessible for all units in the development.

*Issues raised through the application*

The following were issues raised by the public through the circulation process. Please note that some of these issues were raised through the original application circulation.

a) **Housing tenure and affordable housing, decreased property values**

Some members of the public expressed concerns that this proposal would support rental or low income rental housing. The applicant is proposing the development of affordable housing. Official Plan housing policies support the creation of new affordable housing. Zoning does not differentiate between ownership and rental forms of tenure and planning staff do not regard tenure as a land use issue. Conclusive information of the impact on property values associated with higher density forms of housing on existing lower density residential uses is difficult to ascertain. Very often the impact on property values is related to such matters as the design of the higher density development, property upkeep and maintenance, property management, and the quality of construction. These issues relate more to the design and management of the proposed use than the actual use itself. Planning staff do not plan based on property values, but rather assess issues such as planning impact, appropriate land use, scale, density, massing, and design.

b) **Amount of parking**

Through the site plan review process and the zoning by-law regulations, parking will be required. The current proposal shows 53 parking spaces on the site. The Zoning By-law requires one parking space for every one unit. There is no variation in the parking standard with respect to the number of bedrooms within a unit.
c) Servicing
Engineering comments suggest that the applicant will be required to evaluate whether there is adequate capacity for sewer and water available in the system for this development. Until this is determined, a holding provision will be placed on the property to ensure that no development occurs. Several area residents commented on the potential for stormwater runoff on the site, due to snow runoff, or due to the increased impermeable surface on the site. Stormwater management will need to be addressed in greater detail at the site plan approval stage.

d) Height
The elevations show a 2 storey townhouse development with a peaked roof, and a 3 storey apartment building with a mansard roof. The maximum height for this development is 10 metres. The current zoning on the site permits a development of 10 metres, which is approximately 3 stories. The surrounding single detached residential uses range from 1-2 stories in height. The adjacent apartment building at 871 Adelaide Street North is three stories in height. The proposal is in keeping with existing two and three storey development already present in the adjacent neighbourhood.

e) Invasion of privacy/nuisance
By separating new structures from existing structures and ensuring existing mature vegetation is retained, by providing new landscaping to augment existing vegetation and by providing appropriate fencing, privacy issues will be addressed. Nevertheless, infill development at this location will have some impact on the adjacent properties' privacy relative to the status quo.

f) Precedent
The public raised issues with respect to the precedent that this type of development may set within the area. Each application is considered on its merits and given the proposed buildings location, the setback from existing single detached dwellings, and the recommended retention of existing trees and vegetation the proposed low-rise apartment building is compatible with existing development. The Planning Department recommends a Multi-Family Medium Density residential designation for the various reasons stated previously. However, to ensure sensitivity and compatibility issues are addressed and the form and type and scale of the developments are appropriate in the context of the neighbourhood, and to ensure the neighbourhood benefits from increased urban design and landscaping, the base zone for R2-2 will apply, and the bonus zone will be tied to the specific development proposal.

g) Design
Neighbourhood concerns were also raised about the overall design of the development, and how it will positively contribute to the neighbourhood. As was demonstrated earlier in the report, much has been done to ensure the design of the buildings is compatible, attractive, non-obstructive, and provides amenities and features which will enhance the urban environment.

Additional considerations

a) Holding provisions and requirement for public site plan
Planning staff have recommended that a public site plan meeting be held. As well, with the strict bonus zone, any changes to the design concept, even with such minor things as changes in building material of window placement or roof line will require an amendment to the bonus zone. This sets an expectation both from the neighbourhood and from the developer and the City that the development as seen before you will be built.

Bibliography
The following documents were used in the review of this development proposal:
  o Provincial Policy Statement, 2005
  o City of London Official Plan
  o Zoning By-law Z-1
  o Traffic Impact Report – FR Berry & Associates
  o Urban Design Report – Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Schwanz 866 Adelaide Street North</td>
<td>Heidi Peever-Bain and Kyle Bain 570 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Peterson Carlyle Peterson 700 Richmond Street</td>
<td>Gail &amp; Rick Robertson 560 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Longworth 859 Adelaide Street North</td>
<td>Joanne Buchanan &amp; Clayton Downs 582 St. James Street/787 Adelaide Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Diament 206 - 871 Adelaide Street North</td>
<td>Margaret &amp; John DeWit 564 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Diapidikis 586 Oxford Street East</td>
<td>Kay &amp; Josh Dubitsky 558 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Podrucki 875 William Street</td>
<td>Mary Gegeny 857 Adelaide Street North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starlee &amp; Kevin Carew 946 William Street</td>
<td>Elizabeth Pattison 561 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dow 85 Thornton Avenue</td>
<td>Isabel Zerebecki 583 Grosvenor Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Byswater 50 Thornton Avenue</td>
<td>Gerry &amp; Allison Vanderburgh 868 William Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Garrett 447 St. James Street</td>
<td>Barbara &amp; Gary Doerr 572 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Mundie 455 St. James Street</td>
<td>Susan Murdoch 574 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Ruddell 944 William Street</td>
<td>Joanna Line-Jolymore &amp; Rob Jolymore 558 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Favaloro 25 Partridge Street</td>
<td>Carolyn Woolford 576 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron MacDonald 495 St. James Street</td>
<td>Vicki &amp; Robin Samuels 856 William Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Yeats 640 St. James Street</td>
<td>David &amp; Denise King 568 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Davis 121 Baseline Road East</td>
<td>Susan Birnie-Marino 550 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Blay 6-8 Wallace Street</td>
<td>Jen Tansey &amp; Michael Tomazinico 578 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gregory &amp; Lara Naregatsian 375 Cheapside Street</td>
<td>Alexandra &amp; Zenon Szczukowski 864 William Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanom Naregatsian 940 Colborne Street</td>
<td>Irene &amp; David McGeoch 551 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Nagus 512 St. James Street</td>
<td>Mary &amp; Tom Richardson 552 St. James Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # OZ – 7098 Chai – El Holdings Inc

March 27, 2006

We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name
Print Address
Signature

[Signatures and addresses listed]
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – EI Holdings Inc
March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also, opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfuly affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name          Print Address          Signature
MARYLEE MAHNS       499 ST. JAMES ST.          
LYNN SMITH          324 MARLAP ST.          
MARY CAROL HARLEY   685 STEATH AVE.          
JOHN SMITH          824 MAINLAND ST.          
ANA GARCIA ALLEN    810 MAILOD ST. UNIT #31  
HAAN BERTHA 20-810 MAILOD ST. DI BELLETON  
GERALD BISHOP       810 HEADLAND           
KATHLEEN MURPHY     844 MAILOD ST.          
ELIZABETH COLBERT   840 MAILOD ST.          
GEORGE COLBERT      19 PARK ST.             
LINDA REED          19 PARK ST.             
MAYO MCCONNELL      2-3 SADDLE ST.          
SCOTT MAHNS         4995 ST. JAMES ST.         
MARY RICHARDS       4104 ST. JAMES ST.        
WILLIAM HADDOW      8TH AVENUE WAY 7         
JEANNI GARRET       410 ST. JAMES ST.         
LYNN BARKETT        455 ST. JAMES ST.         
BETTY MUNN          455 ST. JAMES ST.         

Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4J9

Re: File # OZ – 7098 Chai – EI Holdings Inc
March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name
Print Address
Signature

[Signature]
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – EI Holdings Inc

March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name
Coleman (Glady)

Print Address
454 St. James St.

Signature
Gladys Coleman
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – EI Holdings Inc March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name  Print Address  Signature

Isabel Zerbecki  563 Grosvenor  [Signature]
Alex Zerbecki  565 Grosvenor  [Signature]
Sandra Chynler  569 Grosvenor St  [Signature]
Deanna Zerbecki  563 Grosvenor St  [Signature]
Wally Burns  872 William St  [Signature]
Beverly Gill  567 Grosvenor St  [Signature]
Kathy Fisher  896 William St  [Signature]
Vicky Simmonds  898 William St  [Signature]
John Guigone  52 St James St  [Signature]
Gayle Hirsch  15 Credit Ave  [Signature]
Chas Wilks  701 William St  [Signature]
Pete Warz  27 Carlton Ave  [Signature]
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning Bi-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – EI Holdings Inc March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totaling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name	Print Address	Signature

L. C. Hines	1518 Western Rd
John Daved	296 Williams St
Kwan K. Poon	796 William St
Gary Lewis	798 William St
David Baker	28 Cameron Ave
D. S. R. Smith	25 Cameron Ave
F. B. Arnold	788 William St
Kelly Leonard	789 William St
D. J. Cooper	791 William St
Art Louden	797 William St
D. M. B. Anderson	799 William St
Regina McDonald	551 St James St
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Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning Bi-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – EI Holdings Inc

March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name          Print Address          Signature
PAT DAVIS  511 ST. JAMES     
JENNIFER SEDLAK  513 ST. JAMES     
ANDREW ARCHER  503 ST. JAMES     
SEAN B. GARA  489 ST. JAMES     
JOHN FORDONI  824 MARLBOROUGH ST.     
ALAN & ALICIA NASQUIS  572 ST. JAMES     
SUSAN T. SUDI  507 ST. JAMES     
DON JACkSON  557 ST. JAMES     
MONICA FERRY  585 ST. JAMES
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee  
Corporation of the City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue  
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – EL Holdings Inc  
March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name  Print Address  Signature

Nancy Bol  200 Victoria Street, London ON  Nancy Bol
Liz Etherington  1971 Lambeth Ave, London  
Lisa Pankert  10 Park Lane, London  
Lanae Cunningham  68 Meridene Cr, Ldn  
Aida Nasegatia  940 College St, Ldn  
Lena M. Henshaw  375 Chehardie Ln  
Adam Kellermans  783 William Ave  
Susan Nasser  71 Loker Ave, Ldn  
Carol M. Herbst  574 tudor Rd  
Elizabeth Taglieri  190 Victoria St, Ldn  
Andraide Hrv  20 557 St. James St, Ldn  
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Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z - 7098 Chai - EI Holdings Inc
March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name          Print Address          Signature
Mary Macdonald       500 Saint James          Mary Macdonald
Dee Beuerman         498 St. James St.       Holly Beuerman
Holly Beuerman        580 Ross St.           Holly Beuerman
Lori Beuerman         498 St. James St.       Jack Beuerman
Jim Hopkins           580 Ross St.           Jack Beuerman
Bill Hughes           495 St. James St.       Jack Beuerman
Gail MacKay           9 Partridge St.         Jack Beuerman
Sandy Mackay          9 Partridge St.         Sandy Mackay
Norm & Burridge       8 Partridge St.         Norm Burridge
Claude Merid         5 Partridge St.          Claude Merid
Rita Favalaro        25 Partridge            Rita Favalaro
J. D. Laid            26 Partridge            J. D. Laid
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning Bi-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4L9

Re: File # 0Z – 7098 Chai – El Holdings Inc
March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name
Print Address
Signature

Melanie Kilty Firth 549 St. James St.
Floyd Kilty 549 St. James St.
Donald Firth 549 St. James St.
Foncewa Cettia 871 William St.
Wamnna Rush 540 Chesapeake Ave.
Judy Miller
Steve Miles 338 Victoria St.
Jane McGeech 351 St. James St.
Jim Fraser 546 St. James
F. Sara 339 Cadence Ave.
Petition Opposed to Amending the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law

To: Planning Committee
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, On N6A 4J 9

Re: File # OZ - 7098 Chai - El Holdings Inc March 27, 2006


We, the undersigned strongly object to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

We are also opposed to the proposed Zoning changes from Residential R2 Zone to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings, totalling 100 units.

Allowing these Official Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the Old North community, as well as setting a precedent for further developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

Print Name Print Address Signature

ALISON VANDEWEGHE 868 William St. A. Vanderweghe
Pasato, Nancy

From: Joshua Hurwitz
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 5:11 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: 859-871 Adelaide St N
Attachments: adelaidenorth.doc; Card for Joshua Hurwitz

adoriedenorth.doc jhurwit.vcf (137 B)
(18 KB)

02-536 Dufferin Av
London N6A 4L9

Nancy Pasato
300 Dufferin Av
London N6A 4L9

Ms. Pasato:

I would like to take this opportunity to express strong support for the infill proposal at 859-871 Adelaide St N.

This development is an excellent example of urban design and of central city redevelopment. Unfortunately, developers, neighbours and city planners in London have generally shunned medium density development (as opposed to cluster townhouses, which do not achieve true urban medium density), such as stacked street townhouses and small apartment buildings. This urban form is predominant in many of the world’s great cities, and many of the most beloved neighbourhoods in Canada and North America (Toronto’s Annex, Montreal’s Plateau, Boston’s Back Bay, San Francisco’s Russian Hill). Medium density development is land-efficient, and it supports transit and walking, and convenient retail. It also avoids many of the issues of high-rise, high density developments such as shadowing, excess traffic and massive conflicts of scale.

We need to turn our opposition to this form of medium-density development into full-fledged encouragement, for it has the potential to solve many of our planning problems. So too do we need to reverse our “all-or-nothing” attitude towards development in the central city. The City, through various incentive programs, aggressively attracts new residential growth to the identified “Downtown” area. This is a great step forward, but it is not enough. Especially before it is fully revitalized, many do not want to live right downtown, but would still like to take advantage of its many services and attractions, as well as the attractions of other central city neighbourhoods. The causes of the decay of the downtown were not limited to the arbitrary borders of the Downtown official plan designation; neither will its solutions be. The blight that now affects portions of the downtown will continue to spread if our focus on suburban expansion is left unchecked. The holes in “don ut cities” are not stable entities, but contract with pro-urban policy and expand with suburban sprawl policy. The reasons to support downtown intensification, then, are the same as those to support intensification in the central city: curbing urban sprawl, supporting transit, allowing neighbourhoods to improve in acceptable ways rather than face the only alternative, slow stagnation.

This development is appropriate in scale, density and form for this site. There are already three such low-rise apartment buildings in the immediate vicinity: at 866 and 871 Adelaide St N and 872 William St. The latter building, with 71 units, single-handedly exceeds the size of the proposed development. The proposal is therefore in “character” with the neighbourhood. Further strengthening neighbourhood character is the preservation
of three houses along Adelaide St shown in the plan. The elevations of this project promise attractive and compatible architecture.

The site is along a major arterial road, a locational criterion identified as being a strong priority for intensification; it is not only in the Adelaide transit corridor, but is also within walking distance to buses on Cheapside St and Oxford St E. Also within walking distance are several grocery stores, a pharmacy, personal services, entertainment and restaurants. The proposed development will benefit from the proximity of uses, and reciprocally support the businesses.

This development will be a strong beginning to revitalization and new growth in the Adelaide/Oxford area. This intersection has the potential to become a major midtown "retail village" or "focus of activity"—the type of place that people go to people-watch, dine, or shop for novel items. The development of such an area will require developments of just the type proposed, as well as new retail merchants and pedestrian and aesthetic improvements.

There are but two minor changes which would improve this proposal. While the proposed official plan designation is appropriate, a change to the Arterial Mixed-Used district designation which exists to the south would be superior. This designation allows for medium-density development such as that proposed, but would also allow for future redevelopment or conversion of the houses facing Adelaide St to retail uses. The change of designation on this site will create a positive precedent to change the designation along the street from Cheapside St to Oxford St. Adelaide St, from as far south as Trafalgar St all the way to Huron St, with proper use of planning and incentives, could become like Richmond Row or Wortley Village, a midtown retail village. Retail villages are true neighbourhood assets and attractions.

The second change would be to create a new public street between the existing apartment building (871 Adelaide St) and the proposed buildings just to the south. This street, Partridge Pl would, through redevelopment of lands to the west, eventually connect to the existing Partridge St. Though a redline amendment would be necessary, it would be comparatively minor. The two buildings at the northern end of the plan would be moved slightly southward, and flipped so that the side shown as north elevation in the plan would face south. The main automobile entryway would be relocated to between the two northern buildings, allowing the preservation of the house at 863 Adelaide St. The westernmost building could be moved northward so that it faced Partridge Pl.

The reasons that such a street would be valuable (even as a dead-end) are numerous. The new buildings would be more inviting if entered primarily from a street, and this orientation would create a more obvious distinction between the public space of Adelaide St and Partridge Pl and the private space of the parking lot. This new street could replace the driveways onto Adelaide St, wisely channeling traffic and increasing safety. The City should encourage the creation of new streets and smaller blocks for more general reasons as well. Small blocks increase access, promote walking and also create exciting new spaces in a neighbourhood. No less a figure than Jane Jacobs devoted an entire book chapter to the benefits of small blocks.

In conclusion, this development will be in character with its neighbourhood and appropriate for its site. It will serve as a model for the type of development that will make London what we want it to be: not a city of massive skyscrapers, nor a city of boring, banal suburbs surrounding an ever-growing centre of blight and decay, but a city of vibrant neighbourhoods consisting of a mix of single-family houses, townhouses and small apartments. This is the model that is constantly pointed at by our city planners as desirable but somehow unachievable; we must put our money where our mouth is, as it were, and start supporting this type of development.

Respectfully submitted.

J Morris Hurwitz

PS Please include this letter in any relevant reports to committees.
Pasato, Nancy

From: Larry Carroll
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 12:59 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: Fw: File #02-7098 - Planning - City of London

Hi Nancy,

This is our position on the above application, which has been sent to the elected officials. Thank you for your forthright dealings with this file. Teny will attend tomorrow night’s Public Meeting.

Cheers!

Larry & Terry Carroll
897 William St.
London

--- Original Message ---

To: Larry Carroll
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 12:16 PM
Subject: RE: File #02-7098 - Planning - City of London

We wish to express our firm opposition to this Application.

02-7098 is an application which would amend the Official Plan of the City and increase density through a zoning change from R2-2 to R8-4B, including bonusing to increase density further.

This proposal for intensification is offensive to the neighborhood and the community in the following ways:

1. Traffic - Since the City of London is not served by any expressway, all traffic must be sent along residential streets. Adelaide Street is now a main north south corridor and bears more traffic than any part of the city core. Information provided by the city shows that there are 29,500 vehicles per day passing this location. That is 20.5 vehicles per minute for the whole 24 hours.

By observation, I believe that in the night hours - 11:00 pm to 7:00 am this rate drops to about half, or about 4,920 for that period.

Then, the rate for the remaining 16 hours would be 25.6 vehicles per minute.

Hourly this means 1536 vehicles, every hour for 16 hours.

Heading north on Adelaide Street from Oxford means climbing an incline. The crest of this hill is at the intersection of Adelaide & Grosvenor, such that oncoming traffic cannot be seen until they are about half a block away. The Trikon apartment building located at the northern end of the Applicant’s property has a very dangerous driveway to its rear parking lot, for the reason just described.

Adding upwards of 60 units to an apartment complex at the rear of 859-871 Adelaide will have a number of negative effects, including:
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northbound left turns will always be problematic, because oncoming traffic cannot be seen until half a block away.

rush hour traffic, morning and evening, is of particular concern, northbound left turns will cause one or more lanes to a stop.

Safety is a serious issue.

The pressure from this Application on the rest of the neighbourhood is significant. If these apartment buildings are built and occupied, and then there are problems with traffic on Adelaide Street, the next step is to find an exit to William Street and funnel the traffic from the Applicant's properties.

This is a complete Non-Starter.

Any rationale for approving this Application has to do with its' connection to Adelaide Street, for entrance/egress, utility services, bus service etc and it must be supported by Adelaide's ability to handle this development.

2. Character of the Neighbourhood - This Application will change the character of the whole block. What is now a family oriented single family block on Grosvenor, William and St James will be devalued and denigrated by this encroachment of high density use. Intensification as an objective to forestall urban sprawl should not be used as a license to eliminate long standing communities especially in an area like Old North which has been recognized as having valuable and unique character. In addition we believed that the City had a principle of protecting the priceless character of its' older areas.

3. Zoning - present zoning on the properties in this area including the Applicant's lands, is R2-2. This proposal will take the zoning to R-8-4B, a terrific jump in density.

We would expect that in an area like Old North which has in the past been a protected area that some tiering of density would occur such that apartment buildings with paved parking lots would not be placed adjacent to single family homes.

We question the City of London considering "bonusing" the density based on improved design considerations. How far can we carry density beyond existing standards?

4. Impact on the neighbourhood - We understand the Province of Ontario has set some broad principles for development such that intensification has been identified as preferable to urban sprawl, they have also indicated that such "intensification" should be appropriate.

It is not appropriate to increase density to such an extent, particularly when these homes are in an area which the City has traditionally protected from dramatic change.

Snow plowing and snow removal will be a challenge, this work is typically done at night so that residents can get out in the morning, will be a hardship for existing residents.

Run-off of rain & snow will carry water onto the neighbours properties instead of having the water absorbed into the soil.

This Application will, if approved, bring about a change in the character of the block, and a corresponding reduction in the property values of adjacent homeowners.

5. Sewer Services - It is a well known fact that London's sewers in the older parts of the City are in need of considerable investment in the coming years. The addition of 60 new units to the sewer system, causes us some questions as to the available capacity and dependability of those facilities.

In Summary:

This application if Approved would de-value the surrounding properties, without question, and cause hardship to residents in the area.

It stretches credibility in applying city policies and flies in the face of previous policies for protecting the character of Old North.
North.

The only winner in this matter would be the developer who has assembled the property by acquiring a few back lots for a small investment.

We recommend that the Application be declined. full stop.

Larry Carroll and Terry Carroll

897 William Street, London, Ontario

2006-04-10
Dear Controllers and Councilors

Re Proposed 3 four story walk up at St. James Street/Adelaide/Grosvenor.

File Number: File #OZ-7098

My name is Susan Reid Spindler and I live at 800 William Street with my two children. I am very concerned about the proposed 3 four story Walk Up development (File #OZ-7098). I believe this development is not going to enhance our neighbourhood. In fact I think the compromise it will require will alter the area most unfavourably. In the words of Joni Beachler (she was kind enough to attend a
neighbourhood meeting with Rob Alder...they both oppose this development)

"BACK YARDS ARE SACRED": this is the only private outdoor space families
have to enjoy special time with their children. To think we might have to
share this sacred space with three four story buildings looming over our
property and all its tenants is unconscionable.

This high density development is so contrary to the city's Official Plan
that I am confused as to why it has come this far. The area known as Old
North has special Official Plan policies to protect the unique character of
this area. I don't see how 75 to 100 rental units in my backyard protects
the unique character of Old North.

Others on our street will challenge that the proposed development and its
zoning is not compatible with the Official Plan. We agree whole heartedly
with this argument. What I want to convey is this development will forever
change the culture in our neighbourhood.

It is generally thought that home and property owners take care of their
dwellings and contribute to their communities. I would invite you to visit
the apartment building set in from William street (between St. James and
grosvener) and the Walk Up on Adelaide Street (between the same streets).
They are run down and are a constant source of trouble for the police and
fire rescue units. Fighting, yelling, loud music and firecrackers are
consistently heard in the neighbourhood...drunk tenants are caught walking
through backyards. Some previous council in their perceived wisdom thought
these developments would be a good thing for the neighbourhood. I beg to
differ. Either immediately or after a period of time I can guarantee the
same effect will happen with the proposed dwellings within a stones throw
of our home.

Areas of concern:

-Divergence from Official Plan for Old North; low density to high is not
compatible with the majority of the surrounding neighbourhood. The height,
bulk and placement of the buildings is not compatible. One must acknowledge
that the apartments on William and Adelaide (build in the 50's and 60's)
mentioned above are a huge anomaly to the consistency of the make up of Old
North.

-Loss in property value...this is already a fact...564 Saint James Street
was listed just prior to the City notice, the homeowners have had to drop
their asking price by $20,000 (thus far) and have had no interest since the
notice. The city will experience a barrage of home owners who will
consistently fight their tax assessment due to this development.

-Basement damage due to run off. Removing the green space behind our homes
and replacing it with pavement will increase the already rampant cases of
basement flooding in our neighbourhood due to run off. The majority of us
live down slope from the development.

-Current services will not be able to accommodate a huge increase in usage.
Parking needs will not be able to be accommodated by the proposed parking
lot. This will either result in overflow parking on the street or will
attract tenants who do not own cars which leads to an increased probability
of more low income/at risk person's in our community.

-Traffic is already an issue on Adelaide. Increased entrance and egress
from
the property will considerably hold up traffic on Adelaide and increase the
occurrence of high speed traffic down residential streets such as Saint
James etc. This is already a safety issue for families.

- Noise and light pollution produced by buildings, tenants and cars.

- Concern of increased break-ins due to open parking lot behind our homes.

Increased break-ins are currently experienced due to the parking lot at
Goodlife/Palisad on Adelaide and Oxford.

- Noise and light pollution produced by buildings, tenants and cars.

- Concern of increased break-ins due to open parking lot behind our homes.

We recognise the province and the city support intensification. We also
recognise that the space behind our home might be developed one day. What
we respectfully request is the city put themselves in our shoes and follow the
path that will truly maintain the character of Old North. Council has
supported and protected North London/Broughdale in the past from this type
of incompatible development, most recently at Audrey & Huron. Council's
support should be consistent throughout all North London Broughdale.

Our preference would be to have no new development behind our homes, but
any development must include a berm with significant plantings and a tall noise
reducing/security fence. Single family homes with front and back yards, or
tasteful condos with green space, which can be privately owned, would
increase the probability that new families who care about their property
and pay taxes will become a contributing part of the fabric of our community.
Zoning and development errors have been made before let's not let this
happen again.

Note: PLEASE ENSURE THIS LETTER IS INCLUDED IN THE ZONING CHANGE
APPLICATION. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan R. Spindler
800 William Street
London, Ontario
April 9, 2006

Dear Sir or Madam: (Controllers, Councilors and Planning Board Members).

Re: Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment

File #OZ-7098 Chai-El Holdings Inc Attention Nancy Pasato

We would like to add our voices to the multitude opposing the zoning change from Residential R2 to Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit apartment buildings totaling a possible 100 units to be built in our area.

Notwithstanding the fact that many family back yards will be sacrificed along with green space that is so valued in this area, what happened to the "Official plan"-a policy set in place to protect the unique character of "Old North"?

The logic in adding additional traffic from a possible 100 new units to an area already recognized as being congested and stressed by traffic should certainly trump any Provincial wish for Intensification without criteria. It should be of great concern that this project will allow a High Density multi-family project to be inserted into an already established unique landscape.

There are numerous other concerns that I am sure are being addressed by our neighbors and we concur. We love our streetscape and its uniqueness and will work heartily to ensure its safety.

Thank you for your ongoing work in making London a wonderful "Forest City." Looking forward to your support in this matter.

Sincerely,

Larry Beuerman
Dee Beuerman

Please attach this letter to the report that goes to Council.
10 April, 2006

509 St. James Street,
London, Ontario
NSY 3P4

Dear Sir,

Letter to the Planning Committee and Planning Council, City of London,
Ontario
Please circulate this letter to all concerned

Re: OZ-7098-Chai-EI Holdings Inc.

It has come to my attention that a proposal is afoot to amend the official plan and zoning by-law affecting 859-871 Adelaide Street North. I understand that three 4-storey apartment buildings and zoning changes for portions of 859,861 and 865 Adelaide Street North and 863,867 and 869 Adelaide Street North are under consideration.

I must strongly protest these contemplated changes. I have resided at 509 St. James Street since 1985 and selected this area for its tranquility and its single family residential atmosphere. I am urging Planning Committee and Council members to vote against the proposed changes and enable us to live in comfort and without aggravation in this area. Your help is greatly appreciated.

Here are some of the plausible reasons to oppose the proposed changes:

- Intensification does not make any sense if it affects the quality of life of the existing residents.
- The proposed plans will inevitably lead to increased traffic along William St, St. James St and Cheapside. It will also affect other street arteries and hence lead to an uncomfortable situation for all concerned.
- Back-lotting is not a practice which is to be encouraged.
- Changes to the by-law would set a dangerous precedent for the building of other apartment complexes.
- The value of the existing single family residences will obviously fall. This will adversely affect all the residents and especially those of us in retirement. This
will represent a significant dilution of our major investment. How will we be compensated for this?

- The environmental impact—because of heightened traffic—will be sizeable and could represent a health hazard.
- There are other important issues as well e.g. loss of natural amenity space, loss of sunlight, noise from cars and people, excess artificial lighting, loss of privacy, parking concerns and increased garbage.
- The stability of the residential neighborhood is threatened. It will irreversibly alter the unique residential character of Old North.

There are many other issues but the above should suffice to convince you to Vote Against the proposals.

I trust that I can count on your concurrence with the issues I have raised.

Yours Truly,

Surinder Kumar Suri
Owner.
March 26, 2006

This is in response to the proposed change of the Official Plan use designation from a Low Density Residential to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation at 859-871 Adelaide Street in London Ontario.

FILE # OZ-7098-Chai-El Holdings Ins.

As a member/resident of the immediate neighborhood I am opposed to this construction, for the following reasons.

1) We will loose a valuable asset of the Prime old North, in the atmosphere of open green space that has been a history and attraction of the community.

2) Our present property values will decrease due to the influx of population, a population that has a social economic status below the present.

3) The increase of Pedestrian and Automobile traffic will increase taking away the quietness of the neighborhood.

4) The additional stress to storm sewer, roads, spring runoff, will only serve to destroy the natural setting of the community bringing about a decrease in all ecological activities.

5) Old North is just that, old. Problems in the infrastructure will only be compounded in the future. Additional repairs, Added construction will increase taxes, in an already high tax bracket community.

6) We will lose our present privacy. That is why the majority of residents live in this area.

7) On point # 2, an increase in crime with the increase of population will only follow. The rate of attempted Home and Automobile break ins has been on the rise since 1996.

8) The additional lighting will be a loss of atmosphere.

9) I do not see any mention of compensation to the neighborhood.

   a) Protection of our property.
   b) Monies to residents to offset depreciated property values.
   c) Fences for privacy.
   d) Mention of tree replacement, we are after all the Forest City.
10) Additional Units of residence will add increased stress in Noise, Air, Garbage, and Water pollution.

11) If this proposed plan is adopted, a mass exodus of present residences will occur, and with decreased property values, a lower income based population will arrive creating a pocket of a less attractive nature which will spread into the heart of Old North. I give you the downtown core as a prime example. I wish to preserve Old North.

12) All residents of this area have spent much time and money upgrading and beautifying their properties. We will lose all our hard work and investment.

13) There is no mention of construction starting date if this project goes forth. In short you will create a neighborhood of stress, economically, socially, and ecologically. You begin a destruction of Old North and its family atmosphere. Some of this letter may not be politically correct but I am beyond caring. Any correspondence can be directed to the below.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter of protest

Norman Howes
580 St. James Street
London, Ontario
NSY-3P6

[Signature]

I remain

Norman Howes
Dear Nancy:

Please ensure this is in the file, in opposition of this application. I have copied controllers and councilors. See below.

Thank you.

April 06, 2006

Dear Planning Committee,

Re Proposed 3 four story walk up at St. James Street/Adelaide/Grosvenor.

File Number: File #OZ-7098

My name is Heidi Peever Bain, my husband’s name is Kyle Bain, we reside at 570 Saint James Street with our two young boys. We are very concerned about the proposed 3 four story Walk Up development (File #OZ-7098) which will essentially face our backyard. In fact according to the documents the city sent to our home, one of the buildings will sit not 25 feet from our back fence. In the words of Joni Beachler (she was kind enough to attend a neighbourhood meeting with Rob Alder... they both oppose this development) “BACK YARDS ARE SACRED”, this is the only private outdoor space families have to enjoy special time with their children. To think we might have to share this sacred space with three four story buildings looming over our property and all its tenants is unconscionable.

This high density development is so contrary to the city’s Official Plan that I am confused as to why it has come this far. The area known as Old North has special Official Plan policies to protect the unique character of this area. I don’t see how 75 to 100 rental units in my backyard protects the unique character of Old North.

Others on our street will challenge that the proposed development and its zoning is not compatible with the Official Plan. We agree whole heartedly with this argument. What I want to convey is this development will forever change the culture in our neighbourhood.

It is generally thought that home and property owners take care of their dwellings and contribute to their communities. I would invite you to visit the apartment building set in from William street (between St. James and Grosvenor) and the Walk Up on Adelaide Street (between the same streets). They are run down and are a constant source of trouble for the police and fire rescue units. Fighting, yelling, loud music and firecrackers are consistently heard in the neighbourhood... drunk tenants are caught walking through backyards. Some previous council in their perceived wisdom thought these developments would be a good thing for the neighbourhood. I beg to differ. Either immediately or after a period of time I can guarantee the same effect will happen with the proposed dwellings within a stones throw of our home.

Areas of concern:
- Divergence from Official Plan for Old North; low density to high is not compatible with the majority of the surrounding neighbourhood. The height, bulk and placement of the buildings is not compatible. One must acknowledge that the apartments on William and Adelaide (build in the 50’s and 60’s) mentioned above are a huge anomaly to the consistency of the make up of Old North.
- Loss in property value... this is already a fact... 560 Saint James Street was listed just prior to the City notice, the homeowners have had to drop their asking price by $20,000 (thus far) and have had no interest since the notice. The city will experience a barrage of home owners who will consistently fight their tax assessment due to this development.
- Basement damage due to run off. Removing the green space behind our homes and replacing it with pavement will increase the already rampant cases of basement flooding in our neighbourhood due to run off. The majority of us live down slope from the development.
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Current services will not be able to accommodate a huge increase in usage. Parking needs will not be able to be accommodated by the proposed parking lot. This will either result in overflow parking on the street or will attract tenants who do not own cars which leads to an increased probability of more low income at risk persons in our community.

Traffic is already an issue on Adelaide. Increased entrance and egress from the property will considerably hold up traffic on Adelaide and increase the occurrence of high speed traffic down residential streets such as Saint James etc. This is already a safety issue for families.

Noise and light pollution produced by buildings, tenants and cars.

Concern of increased break-ins due to open parking lot behind our homes. Increased break-ins are currently experienced due to the parking lot at Goodlife/Palisad on Adelaide and Oxford.

We recognise the province and the city support intensification. We also recognise that the space behind our home might be developed one day. What we respectfully request is the city put themselves in our shoes and follow the path that will truly maintain the character of Old North. Council has supported and protected North London/Broughdale in the past from this type of incompatible development, most recently at Audrey & Huron. Council's support should be consistent throughout all North London Broughdale.

Our preference would be to have no new development behind our homes, but any development must include a berm with significant plantings and a tall noise reducing/security fence. Single family homes with front and back yards, or tasteful condos with green space, which can be privately owned, would increase the probability that new families who care about their property and pay taxes will become a contributing part of the fabric of our community. Zoning and development errors have been made before let's not let this happen again.

Note: PLEASE ENSURE THIS LETTER IS INCLUDED IN THE ZONING CHANGE APPLICATION. Thank you.

Warmest regards,
Heidi Peever Bain & Kyle Bain

Heidi Peever Bain
570 Saint James Street
London, ON

This communication (and any attachments) is directed in confidence to the addressee(s) listed above and is intended solely for their use. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you must not disseminate it, copy it or take any action in respect to any information contained in it. If you have received this communication in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by telephone and destroy the communication and any accompanying attachments.
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Pasato, Nancy

From: Heidi Peever Bain  
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 3:33 PM  
To: Pasato, Nancy  
Cc:  

Subject: RE: Letter re File # OZ - 7098

Nancy,

Thank you for the meeting last night. I am the person who sat at the back of the room. As you can imagine this is a very emotional and stressful time for us. Raising a young family in a community we love and facing the prospect of having our privacy virtually erased by this development is unacceptable. I apologize if my comments were a little pointed last night ... as you can see we are very concerned and we feel our communities' collective voice needs to be heard.

One point I would like to stress is the development's proximity to our home (570 Saint James) ... Mr. Henney measures the development from the edge of the closest apartment building to the edge of our home. We should be looking at this from the perspective of how close the apartment building will be to our back fence. We do not have the luxury of owning a long lot ... we have a small back yard and one of the apartment buildings in particular will tower over the space where we play outside with our children. In fact if you look at the drawings it appears to be approx. 25 ft. from our fence. Many of the homes on Saint James Street face this situation. Currently the brush, mature and young "scrub" trees camouflage the view of other dwellings ... when this is removed we will have a much to clear view of a 60 car parking lot and three apartment buildings. Again we find this unacceptable and do not understand how this development is in keeping with Old North. The argument might be that there are some examples of existing apartment buildings on Adelaide. For the record the other two building are zoned Low density (not sure how or why they were allowed to be developed in the 50/60s). Two buildings of this proposed development do not even face Adelaide, the third is hidden from Adelaide. The only reference to Adelaide is the entrance and egress of cars to the parking lot. The development if right in the centre of our residential block of Old North (Saint James/William/Grovenor/Adelaide).

I invite you to come to our home at any time to see for yourself how devastating this development will be to our family home. Due to traffic diverting from Adelaide, our front yard on Saint James Street is not safe area to play with our children who are both under 3 years old. The back yard is the only safe, private sanctuary for us.

I would appreciate if you would include these points in your file.

Warmest regards,
Heidi

Heidi Peever Bain
V. P. Development

This communication (and any attachments) is directed in confidence to the addressee(s) listed above and is intended solely for their use. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you must not disseminate it, copy it or take any action in respect to any information contained in it. If you have received this communication in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by telephone and destroy the communication and any accompanying attachments.
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Dear Nancy Pasato,

We recently received a notice of meeting regarding the proposed development behind our home at 570 Saint James Street. I am very concerned that we were not sent renderings of what the proposed changes are and that we are blindly going into a second round of meetings. Is there any chance you can email this information to the group cc'd on this email. This list does not represent the whole community who are concerned with this development but at least it is a start.

One point I would like to stress is the development’s proximity to our home (570 Saint James)... Mr. Henney measures the development from the edge of the closest apartment building to the edge of our home. We should be looking at this from the perspective of how close the apartment building will be to our back fence. We do not have the luxury of owning a long lot... we have a small back yard and one of the buildings in particular will tower over the space where we play outside with our children. In fact if you look at the drawings it appears to be approx. 25 ft. from our fence. Many of the homes on Saint James Street face this situation. Currently the brush, mature and young "scrub" trees camouflage the view of other dwellings... when this is removed we will have a much to clear a view of a 60 car parking lot and buildings. We obviously prefer NO development behind our home... but any development MUST be in keeping and maintain the character of Old North. The argument might be that there are some examples of existing apartment buildings on Adelaide. For the record the other two building are zoned Low density (not sure how or why they were allowed to be developed in the 50/60s). Also the existing buildings either on Adelaide or off of William are eye sores and are a perfect example of poor planning. Two buildings of this proposed development do not even face Adelaide, the third is hidden from Adelaide. The only reference to Adelaide is the entrance and egress of cars to the parking lot. The development is right in the centre of our residential block of Old North (Saint James/William/Grosvenor/Adelaide).

I invite you to come to our home at any time to see for yourself how devastating this development will be to our family home. Due to traffic already diverting from Adelaide, our front yard on Saint James Street is not a safe area to play with our young children. The back yard is the only safe, private sanctuary for us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Heidi Peever Bain & Kyle Bain

This communication (and any attachments) is directed in confidence to the addressee(s) listed above and is intended solely for their use. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you must not disseminate it, copy it or take any action in respect to any information contained in it. If you have received this communication in error please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephone and destroy the communication and any accompanying attachments.
Pasato, Nancy

From: Heidi Peever Bain

Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 2:41 PM

To: Pasato, Nancy

Subject: RE: Chai El holdings/Old North community

Attachments: Map of St James and Adelaide.jpg

Thank you Nancy, We appreciate the information.

Whether it is a four story apartment or a three story "stacked townhouse development" ...the issue is still housing style, density, proximity to other existing homes and height. This does not address the issue of the complete erosion of backyard privacy, road safety, increased Adelaide traffic, noise and light pollution from the parking lot, not to mention break-ins (often properties/parking lots shielded from view of main streets are preferred exit routes for thieves). I think our neighbors on the south side of Saint James (near Adelaide) can testify to the challenges that living behind the Palasad parking lot have presented. In fact I am sure the police can tell you the number of occurrences they have been called to related to that parking lot, and 872 William in particular.

If development is inevitable, we are still requesting housing that resembles and suits the old north London style. These proposed amendments may change the appearance of the development somewhat, but we are still dealing with large/obtrusive structures that do not fit with the desired make up of the neighbourhood.

One simple question. If this development were proposed for an infill site behind homes one block West of us (ie no Adelaide Street entrance or address) I suspect we would not be having these discussions. We need to treat old north properties and tax payers equitably and maintain a plan that will appreciate the flavour of the neighbourhood and not stick out like a sore thumb, now, or in years to come. Please maintain the character and integrity of our community. What happens today will have a profound effect on the success of inappropriate development in years to come....just look at 871 Adelaide and 872 William...need I say more.

Warm regards,
Heidi and Kyle

2007-02-26
To: Planning Department, City Hall, London Ontario
    Planning Committee members
    London City Councillors
    City of London Board of Control
    City of London Mayor Anne Marie deCicco


This letter is in followup to the conversation Gail had with Nancy Pasato on March 27, 2006 when Gail voiced our objections to the proposed development noted above. Please include this letter in the planning committee report package.

While we understand and support the province and city as they work towards implementing urban intensification, the proposal noted above is one we oppose for the following reasons:

The City of London’s Official Plan policies note that “The North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood …..is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density …..along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide St. corridors.” The Official Plan also notes that “it is anticipated that there will be demand for residential intensification and infill development……..area specific guidelines are required which will direct future residential development to suitable locations, and protect the character of the existing low-rise, low-density residential community.” It also states that “In Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide St. N. corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock, provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale which is compatible with surrounding land uses”

The proposal by Chai-El Holdings currently under consideration (File #OZ-7098) does not meet the conditions of the Official Plan for the following reasons:

- A development of this nature should have been directed to areas currently designated as Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family Medium Density Residential – this proposal is for an area designated Low Density Residential.
- While the artist’s drawings of the proposed development shows conservation and rehabilitation of existing housing stock, it should be noted that Chai-El Holdings intends to demolish three houses to make an entrance/exit driveway and intensify through new construction. Should rehabilitation of the existing houses be a requirement, it should also be noted that since Chai-El
Holdings has owned the houses fronting on Adelaide Street, the condition of these houses has deteriorated significantly from the outside, leaving one to question whether rehabilitation or conservation of any of these buildings will in fact be possible. The artist's rendering also shows the four story apartment building to be roughly the same height as the two story houses, which gives a misleading view of the development.

- Replacing houses with an entry/exit way is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.
- The proposed development does not protect the character of the existing low-rise, low-density residential area.....we believe it threatens significant deterioration of this quiet, well-kept, family-oriented community, given that one of the four story apartment buildings is proposed to be situated at the far western end of the property, very close to the low-density family homes and the parking lot will be close to the property line of numerous family homes on St. James St.
- Gord Hume chaired the Creative Cities Task Force recently in which the character of Old North was addressed. This proposal is in direct opposition to recommendations in this report.
- The proposed development is for 60 units with 60 parking places, presumably to accommodate both residents and visitors i.e. not even one parking place per unit. Should the parking not be sufficient for residents and guests, it is likely that they will be searching out street parking on Grosvenor and St. James streets. St. James St. already accommodates overflow parking from the Palasad Bar at Oxford and Adelaide on the weekends; any increase to this will make parking for St. James St. residents and guests challenging to say the least.
- The green space proposed on this site is minimal; in fact, most if not all of the large existing trees are proposed to be removed with some new plantings added; even if the new trees were to be large, mature trees, the green space would not be in the character of green space in adjacent low-density dwellings.
- The proposed zoning change to medium density with a 33% bonusing (beyond what we understand is a more common 25% bonus ceiling) to give 100 units per hectare rather than the R8-4 zoning maximum density of 75 units per hectare, would, in effect, make this proposed development a high density development next to low density residential neighbours.
- For historical reasons that escape us, a back-lot anomaly apartment building threatening the character of the neighbourhood, located at 872 William St., was approved by the City decades ago. It is not reasonable, given the Official Plan, to approve a development that would become an even greater anomaly in the neighbourhood.

Other reasons for not allowing this development to go forward are:

- This proposed development is in effect high-density - high density intensification should be confined to nodes such as the Fanshawe Richmond area where roads, etc are designed to accommodate the traffic resulting from such developments.
- Traffic on Adelaide Street is especially busy at rush hours (this is further magnified when trains go through south of Oxford St.) Traffic on Adelaide Street continues to increase as development to the north of Fanshawe and Adelaide continues. Having up to 60 additional cars exiting and entering an Adelaide St. driveway at a point where traffic is already backed up well beyond that driveway will prove challenging; currently when traffic backs up on Adelaide St., drivers turn onto St. James St. where they speed to William St. to rejoin a southbound route. There are many mornings where we have to wait in our driveway for ten or more cars to pass before we can turn out of a "quiet" residential street. The speeds at which these frustrated drivers are traveling already makes exiting our driveways a safety
concern. Adding more cars to the immediate area will only increase this problem beyond what is being caused by the North London/ Sunningdale developments.

- Adding more vehicle traffic to the residential Old North neighbourhoods is a safety issue for our children walking to school or playing outside. When traffic calming measures were installed at William and Cheapside residents of St. James St. were asked if we wanted traffic calming measures added to St. James St. At that time, the neighbourhood preferred to let traffic take its natural course and see whether the calming measures at William and Cheapside would be enough. We find it concerning that the city is considering a development that would increase traffic significantly in this area given they were already concerned about the level of traffic. Recently, safe school walking route signs have been posted on St. James. Cognizant of adding more traffic to the mix seems counterproductive. We also understand that the City is currently studying traffic in Old North. One would hope that the results of that study to date would influence this process.

- We are concerned about the impact on infrastructure. How will the sewers and water lines accommodate 60 additional housing units when we are told that the infrastructure in this part of the city is already overtaxed? It is our understanding that the apartment units in the proposed development could be three bedroom units, meaning up to an additional 180+ people living in this development.

- Locating the apartment buildings at the side and rear of the property (north and western limits) means that especially the third and fourth level apartments will be overlooking backyards on St. James and William Streets. The character of the neighbourhood will undoubtedly change as yards that currently back onto green space will be looking into apartments and vice versa.

- Lights from the apartments, outside building security lighting, parking lot lighting and lights from vehicle headlights will be a disturbance to bedrooms and yards backing onto this development.

- In the winter, snow removal is likely to be a serious concern. Should snow removal occur at night or early in the morning, there will be significant noise disturbance in the neighbourhood. As well, we are very concerned about the effect of piled snow melting in the spring. As the Adelaide St. properties slope down towards William St., it is highly likely that the concentrated runoff will cause basement flooding in homes on St. James St.

- Given the large amount of building and paved space in the proposed development in lieu of the porous earth currently in place to absorb rain/water runoff, it is likely that rains will also result in large water runoff to St. James St. yards and basements.

- The proposed development is certain to cause a decline in the property values of low density residential homes in the area. Our home at 560 St. James St. is located two lots west of the property line of the proposed development. Our house had gone up for sale one week prior to the notice of the proposed development being received. Prior to listing our home, we had a few real estate agents price our home for the market. We chose to go with a price that would sell our house quickly rather than try for a higher price, as we did not wish to endure a prolonged selling period. During the first week, there was much interest and activity around our house. When we received the notice of this proposed development, we disclosed it to our real estate agent as we were legally required to do, at which time we were advised to re-list our home at a lower price; we were told that we would be lucky if all we lost was $20,000 and that we could expect that the number of people who would be willing to move into our house given the ‘worst-case scenario’ proposal before the City would likely decline.
significantly. Since that time, only a few real estate agents have shown our house to prospective buyers. We have been told that we must hope for a buyer who will believe that the City would never approve such a development and that the worst that could happen is infilling with condos such as those in The Old North Condos development on Maitland St. between St. James and Oxford. The rear apartment building would overlook our back yard. If this is the impact on our home, we have to wonder how the houses to the east of us directly backing onto the proposed development would be affected.

- It is common knowledge, backed by data, that property owners typically maintain their dwellings in a better manner than renters in apartment dwellings. While there are exceptions, it is unlikely that over time the proposed development will be maintained inside and out in a manner compatible with maintenance practices in the surrounding neighbourhood. This has certainly been the case at the existing anomaly apartment building at 872 William St. In addition, as the condition of the dwellings declines, so does the behaviour of the renters; this behaviour impacts all living in the neighbourhood subjected to noise and criminal activity.

- The fact that the developer has not himself initiated any sort of meeting with the neighbourhood prior to submitting this proposal to the City, coupled with the manner in which he has neglected his properties on Adelaide St. to date, leads us to believe that he has no concern for maintaining or contributing to the character of the neighbourhood. It is our understanding that should a zoning change be approved by planning committee and City Council, that the developer does not have to adhere to any site plan guidelines, only to adhere the new zoning requirements. We find this very concerning and fear that the development could be even worse than what has been proposed as part of the submission, providing an even greater threat to this neighbourhood.

While we have concerns for our personal stake in this matter, our greater concern is for the good of the neighbourhood and our city over the long term. We firmly believe that this proposed development is not good for London. We ask that all members of the planning committee visit the proposed site prior to attending the planning committee meeting to address this matter and that as many members of City Council as possible do the same. Once you have seen the area, we are confident that you will vote against this proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Darroch (Rick) and Gail Robertson
March 31, 2006

Notice of Application to Amend the Official Plan & Zoning By-Law

RE: File OZ-7098—Chai-El Holdings Inc.

I dispute this application in its entirety and have listed my reasons, sources and questions below.

Sources:

Some of the relevant issues of Official Plan policies, which are relevant to our area, are listed below. These policies are intended to guide the physical development in North London. The area known as Old North has special Official Plan policies to protect the unique character of this area. Those policies are as follows:

3.5.9 - North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood

The North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood is generally bounded by the Thames River on the north and west, Oxford Street on the south and Adelaide Street on the east, but does not include the St. George/Grosvener Neighbourhood, which is defined separately in policy 3.5.3 of the Plan. North London/Broughdale is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density residential, institutional and office uses located along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street corridors.

It is anticipated that there will be demand for residential intensification and infill development within portions of the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood during the planning period. Area-specific guidelines are required which will direct future residential development to suitable locations, and protect the character of the existing low-rise, low-density residential community.

Multiple unit residential development is directed to those areas within the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family/Medium Density Residential. Except for lands identified in Policy 3.5.9(b), in Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock, provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale which is compatible with surrounding land uses.

The following objectives will guide the implementation of Low Density Residential policies for the Old North/Broughdale neighbourhood:

i. the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with that of existing development in the surrounding area;

ii. all required parking will be accommodated on site and limited in area;

iii. development will be sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing residential streetscape; and

iv. any new lots created through consent will be in conformity with the minimum zoning requirement, and in keeping with the established lot pattern (in terms of frontage, depth and overall size) in the surrounding area.

There seems to be a little confusion as to what the current zoning and Official Plan designations are for the properties between 659-859 Adelaide Street and what is being proposed. The
properties are currently designated in the Official Plan as Low Density Residential and are zoned as R2-2. What this means is that the policies from 3.5.9. (listed above) which speak to Low Density Residential apply to these properties. And the R2-2 zone only permits a) Single detached dwellings, b) semi-detached dwellings, c) duplex dwellings, and d) converted dwellings. Because the applicant wishes to build 3 structures that do not conform to the Official Plan or the zoning by-law, the applicant is proposing to amend the Official Plan designation from a Low Density Designation to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential and amend the zoning by-law from an R2-2 to an R8-4 to permit apartment buildings at a maximum density of 75 units per hectare. The applicant is also applying for a bonusing provision that would increase the maximum density from 75 units per hectare to 100 units per hectare.

Question: What is a bonusing provision and why would this applicant qualify for one?

Reasons:

Given this information here are my reasons as to why this application is inconsistent with the policies of the Official Plan:

- The policies of the Official Plan have anticipated that an application such as this may be submitted and they direct this type of development to areas that are currently designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family Medium Density Residential. Given that the Adelaide Street properties are currently designated Low Density Residential this development has obviously not been directed to areas designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family Medium Density Residential.

- Residential intensification is permitted along Adelaide Street through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock. This proposal intends to demolish 3 houses and intensify through new construction. This hardly seems to be the intent of the Official Plan.

- The intensification should be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. I don’t believe that this application is sensitive to the surrounding built form at all.

- The Plan states that the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with the existing development. I’m sure that this applicant will point to the two existing apartment buildings in this block to argue that his application is in “keeping with the existing development”. However, in my opinion, those two buildings themselves are an anomaly within this neighbourhood (given that they were built in the 1950s and 1960s whereas the rest of the neighbourhood was built in the late 1800s and early 1900s) and by comparing his development to an anomaly is not a true representation of the character of the existing neighbourhood.

- The development must be able to support on-site parking and to be honest I don’t know if this application can or cannot support the parking. Five stories (counting the ones below ground) in total for 3 buildings with potentially 100 units and the developer have plans for 50 spaces. I was forced to put in 8 spaces for my tiny dwelling at 797 Adelaide St. That includes one unit for each residential apartment (and I have two) and 6 for my Massage Therapy Clinic of three rooms.

Question: How is this developer getting away with a minimum of 50 spaces? Does he not have to provide one per unit and take into account visitor parking? If so, it is inconceivable to construct this unless he forfeits one entire building of his plan. If he cannot accommodate the parking onsite, as required, I guess that implies that the guests and residents will be parking on our residential streets? What parking enforcement measures are going to be implemented to deal with this should this plan move forward?

- The Plan says that the development will be sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the residential streetscape. First of all the adjacent
dwellings all front onto Adelaide whereas this development proposes to side onto Adelaide and front onto an internal parking lot instead. And additional buildings are proposed for the rear area of the lots, which will front onto an internal parking lot as well. How is this sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings when no one else in the neighbourhood has a house at the rear of their lot (with the exception of the two existing anomaly apartment buildings, that is)? Secondly, when the application states that they propose to demolish 3 houses along Adelaide Street and replace them with driveways how can that be interpreted as being sensitive to the continuity of the residential streetscape?

This type of development affects each of us differently depending on where we live. Each person’s concern may be unique because of where they live or how their bedroom faces the proposed development, etc.

Here are a few more reasons that I am opposed to this development:

- Loss of natural amenity space
- Loss of sunlight being blocked by development
- Noise from cars parking in the parking lot
- Noise from people
- Excess lighting where none existed before
- Headlights shining into our yards from parking cars
- Loss of privacy due to height of buildings
- Garbage concerns
- Rodent control
- Traffic concerns
- Pedestrian paths
- School zones recently designated and posted along St. James and inner corridor streets
- Parking concerns
- This irrevocably alters the character of the neighbourhood and sets a precedent for future development on William Street as well as North London/Broughdale in general
- Council has supported North London/Broughdale in the past from this type of incompatible development, most recently at Audrey & Huron, and Council’s support should be consistent throughout all North London/Broughdale
- This is a stable residential neighbourhood with mostly owner occupied homes. Several owners have lived in the neighbourhood for more than 20 years. This development threatens the neighbourhood stability by compelling residents to move.
- This development is certain to attract students and lower-income dwellers by nature of its design and location. This will cause the owners to become absentee landlords and/or force them from the neighbourhood.
- This neighbourhood has had to defend itself from incompatible development several times in the recent past. How many times can one neighbourhood be expected to continue to fight such applications with their time, energy and money? The constant barrage of applications also compels the residents to move away.
- I was forced to enter into a ‘future development agreement’ with the city at my costs and legal expenses. This is due to a property I purchased to house my business and residential tenants at 797 Adelaide Street. The agreement stipulates that, should the city deem the traffic flow from two adjacent driveways to be a hazard or concern, they would force me to forfeit my driveway and business access and build a mutual drive between myself and the property to the south (currently GoodLife and Palasad plaza)
- I was forced to design, secure permits for, and construct a drywell on my property at 797 Adelaide St. N. Prior to purchase, at meetings with all of the relevant department heads
and planners at City Hall, I was told that I could build a driveway using gravel and recycled asphalt. After purchasing said property, I was informed that a 'by-law' change now required me to put asphalt and curbs, substantially adding to my project costs. Also, I was told that I would have to put in a cash basin, storm drain and tie into the city sewer system. After returning with these paid designs, I was informed that the sewer systems are aged, being replaced through a gradual tax and that I would NOT be allowed to tie into this system. From there I was told that water management on my property was my concern and that any ponding, well or drainage systems need a permit from the Ministry of the Environment, another substantial cost and waiting period. It is inconceivable that this developer can get around these issues either given the depths of the back of the lots for infill.

**Question:** What does this developer and/or the city intend to do about water management and run-off from the massive proposed parking lot? There undoubtedly will be snow, salt, auto/oil runoff, melting agents etc. leaching into our yards and water system. What soil testing has been done and how will this be monitored if the development moves forward?

**Question:** What future provisions is this developer made to adhere to regarding the traffic flow onto Adelaide, since he is in the same position of emptying far more traffic than I onto an already congested Adelaide St.?

**Question:** Does the city intend to allow all developers to seek out older neighbourhoods with larger backyards and allow infill development?

**Question:** Why did you waste tax payer/property owners money on erecting and designating at safe 'foot traffic' and school zone and then allow this type of development to move forward? This developer intends to funnel his traffic onto William Street.

**Question:** After years of wrangling with the city, the residents bounding the intersection at Cheapside and William Streets, finally got more than a few posts to divert the traffic flow off of their residential streets. Drivers use Cheapside as main east-west corridor to avoid the heavy flow of traffic Fanshawe Park Rd to the north and Oxford St. to the south. I was one of the accident victims at that intersection and am still recovering from my injuries nearly 6 years later. I was involved in that battle at city hall to make that intersection safer for residents, pedestrians and traffic. This developer intends to funnel his traffic to that intersection. What do you propose to tell the residents this time?

**Question:** The residents have already done battle over the patio issues at Palasad's. Again, this application should have never been allowed to move forward because, again, it was fraught with obvious objections to most of the existing laws. They were given exemptions at every avenue and allowed to construct their patio. The 'provisions' (i.e.: no exterior music, roof or lighting) have all been ignored to date. This patio disrupts the neighbourhood. We were all in objection to it. It moved forward anyway with many parking and building 'exceptions' and total disregard for the tax paying property owners. What makes this developer's application any different? Can we expect the same treatment and disregard for rules and by-laws put in place to protect us as property owners? Is this battle fruitless and the application an already 'done deal'?

This application is not even borderline acceptable. What concerns me is that this application is so contrary to the policies of the Official Plan that one can basically go sentence by sentence and come up with an argument for every single policy.

**Question:** How did this application make it past any site planning department approval and Ministry of the Environment approvals to be proposed to the property-owning public?
I very much would appreciate you adding my name to the list of opposed. I would also request that my name be added to the speakers list at any and all City Hall meeting. I believe that I was treated unfairly in trying to 'reconstruct' an old abandoned property and convert it into an office, thus keeping my business and residence in this neighbourhood. I have specific knowledge of By-laws and building codes/practices that I believe are being flouted and all but ignored in this application.

Sincerely,

Joanne Buchanan
Owner of 582 St. James Street
Owner of 797 Adelaide St. N.
Notice of Application to Amend the Official Plan & Zoning By-Law

RE: File OZ-7098—Chai-El Holdings Inc.

I dispute this application in its entirety and have listed my reasons, sources and questions below.

Some of the relevant issues of Official Plan policies, which are relevant to our area, are listed below. These policies are intended to guide the physical development in North London. The area known as Old North has special Official Plan policies to protect the unique character of this area. Those policies are listed below:

3.5.9 – North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood

The North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood is generally bounded by the Thames River on the north and west, Oxford Street on the south and Adelaide Street on the east, but does not include the St. George/Grosvenor Neighbourhood, which is defined separately in policy 3.5.3 of the Plan. North London/Broughdale is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density residential, institutional and office uses located along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street corridors.

It is anticipated that there will be demand for residential intensification and infill development within portions of the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood during the planning period. Area-specific guidelines are required which will direct future residential development to suitable locations, and protect the character of the existing low-rise, low-density residential community.

Multiple unit residential development is directed to those areas within the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential. Except for lands identified in Policy 3.5.9(a), in Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock, provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale which is compatible with surrounding land uses.

The following objectives will guide the implementation of Low Density Residential policies for the Old North/Broughdale neighbourhood:

i. the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with that of existing development in the surrounding area;
ii. all required parking will be accommodated on site and limited in area;
iii. development will be sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing residential streetscape; and
iv. any new lots created through consent will be in conformity with the minimum zoning requirement, and in keeping with the established lot pattern (in terms of frontage, depth and overall size) in the surrounding area.

There seems to be a little confusion as to what the current zoning and Official Plan designations are for the properties between 859-869 Adelaide Street and what is being proposed. The properties are currently designated in the Official Plan as Low Density Residential and are zoned as R2-2. What this means is that the policies from 3.5.9. (listed above) which speak to Low Density Residential applies to these properties. And the R2-2 zone only permits a) Single...
detached dwellings, b) semi-detached dwellings, c) duplex dwellings, and d) converted dwellings. Because the applicant wishes to build 3 structures that do not conform to the Official Plan or the zoning by-law, the applicant is proposing to amend the Official Plan designation from a Low Density Designation to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential and amend the zoning by-law from an R2-2 to an R3-4 to permit apartment buildings at a maximum density of 75 units per hectare. The applicant is also applying for a bonusing provision that would increase the maximum density from 75 units per hectare to 100 units per hectare.

Question: What is a bonusing provision and why would this applicant qualify for one?

Reasons:

Given this information here are my reasons as to why this application is inconsistent with the policies of the Official Plan:

- The policies of the Official Plan have anticipated that an application such as this may be submitted and they direct this type of development to areas that are currently designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family Medium Density Residential. Given that the Adelaide Street properties are currently designated Low Density Residential this development has obviously not been directed to areas designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family Medium Density Residential.
- Residential intensification is permitted along Adelaide Street through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock. This proposal intends to demolish 3 houses and intensify through new construction. This hardly seems to be the intent of the Official Plan.
- The intensification should be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. I don't believe that this application is sensitive to the surrounding built form at all.
- The Plan states that the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with the existing development. I'm sure that this applicant will point to the two existing apartment buildings in this block to argue that his application is in "keeping with the existing development". However, in my opinion, those two buildings themselves are an anomaly within this neighbourhood (given that they were built in the 1950s and 1960s whereas the rest of the neighbourhood was built in the late 1800s and early 1900s) and by comparing his development to an anomaly is not a true representation of the character of the existing neighbourhood.
- The development must be able to support on-site parking and to be honest I don't know if this application can or cannot support the parking. Five stories (counting the ones below ground) in total for 3 buildings with potentially 100 units and the developer have plans for 50 spaces.

- Question: How is this developer getting away with a minimum of 50 spaces? Does he not have to provide one per unit and take into account visitor parking? If so, it is inconceivable to construct this unless he forfeits one entire building of his plan. If he cannot accommodate the parking onsite, as required, I guess that implies that the guests and residents will be parking on our residential streets? What parking enforcement measures are going to be implemented to deal with this should this plan move forward?
- The Plan says that the development will be sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the residential streetscape. First of all the adjacent dwellings all front onto Adelaide whereas this development proposes to side onto Adelaide and front onto an internal parking lot instead. And additional buildings are proposed for the rear area of the lots, which will front onto an internal parking lot as well. How is this sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings when no one else in the neighbourhood has a house at the rear of their lot (with the exception of the two existing
anomaly apartment buildings, that is). Secondly, when the application states that they propose to demolish 3 houses along Adelaide Street and replace them with driveways how can that be interpreted as being sensitive to the continuity of the residential streetscape?

This type of development affects each of us differently depending on where we live and or work. Each person's concern may be unique because of where they live or how their bedroom faces the proposed development and how when they exit onto Adelaide St. and the adjacent arteries, etc.

Here are a few more reasons that I am opposed to this development:

- Loss of natural amenity space
- Loss of sunlight being blocked by development
- Noise from cars parking in the parking lot
- Noise from people
- Excess lighting where none existed before
- Headlights shining into our yards from parking cars
- Loss of privacy due to height of buildings
- Garbage concerns
- Rodent control
- Traffic concerns
- Pedestrian paths
- School zones recently designated and posted along St. James and inner corridor streets
- Parking concerns
- This irrevocably alters the character of the neighbourhood and sets a precedent for future development on William Street as well as North London/Broughdale in general
- Council has supported North London/Broughdale in the past from this type of incompatible development, most recently at Audrey & Huron, and Council's support should be consistent throughout all North London/Broughdale
- This is a stable residential neighbourhood with mostly owner occupied homes. Several owners have lived in the neighbourhood for more than 20 years. This development threatens the neighbourhood stability by compelling residents to move.
- This development is certain to attract students and lower-income dwellers by nature of its design and location. This will cause the owners to become absentee landlords and/or force them from the neighbourhood.
- This neighbourhood has had to defend itself from incompatible development several times in the recent past. How many times can one neighbourhood be expected to continue to fight such applications with their time, energy and money? The constant barrage of applications also compels the residents to move away.

Question: What do the developer and/or the city intend to do about water management and run-off from the massive proposed parking lot? There undoubtedly will be snow, salt, auto/oil runoff, melting agents etc. leaching into our yards and water system. What soil testing has been done and how will this be monitored if the development moves forward?

Question: What future provisions is this developer made to adhere to regarding the traffic flow onto an already congested Adelaide St?

Question: Why is Palasad/Goodlife allowed to have Sysco, The Beer Store and a variety of other delivery trucks parked on Adelaide St. blocking the intersection at Oxford? There are no stopping and no parking signs posted. Several times daily, their deliveries impede the rush hour traffic flow on Adelaide St. This development will further add to this problem by dumping
100 plus vehicles (potentially) into this artery daily and nightly. Is there a traffic flow study in place and if not, why not?

**Question:** Does the city intend to allow all developers to seek out older neighbourhoods with larger backyards and allow infill development and intensification there as well?

**Question:** Why did you waste tax payer/property owners money on erecting and designating at safe ‘foot traffic’ and school zone and then allow this type of development to move forward? This developer intends to funnel his traffic onto William Street.

**Question:** After years of wrangling with the city, the residents bounding the intersection at Cheapside and William Streets, finally got more than a few posts to divert the traffic flow off of their residential streets. Drivers use Cheapside as main east-west corridor to avoid the heavy flow of traffic Fanshawe Park Rd to the north and Oxford St. to the south. This developer intends to funnel his traffic to that intersection. What do you propose to tell the residents this time?

**Fact:** The residents have already done battle over the patio issues with Palasad. That application should have never been allowed to move forward because, again, it was fraught with obvious objections to most of the existing laws. They (Palasad) were given exemptions at every avenue and allowed to construct their patio. The ‘provisions’ (i.e.: no exterior music, roof or lighting) have all been ignored to date. This patio disrupts the neighbourhood. We were all in objection to it. It moved forward anyway with many parking and building ‘exceptions’ and total disregard for the tax paying property owners.

**Question:** What makes this developer’s application any different? Can we expect the same treatment and disregard for rules and by-laws put in place to protect us as property owners?

This application is not even borderline acceptable. What concerns me is that this application is so contrary to the policies of the Official Plan that one can basically go sentence by sentence and come up with an argument for every single policy.

**Question:** How did this application make it past any site planning department approval and Ministry of the Environment approvals to be proposed to the property-owning public?

I very much would appreciate you adding my name to the list of opposed. I would also request that my name be added to any and all mailing lists regarding this application

Sincerely,

Clayton Downs

582 St. James Street
Notice of Application to Amend the Official Plan & Zoning By-Law

RE: File OZ-7098—Chai-El Holdings Inc.

Following a meeting at City Hall on April 11, 2006, with Nancy Pasato, the developer, planners and owner of the above mentioned properties, I would like to add the following to my letters of March 31, 2006.

**Bylaw Sources:**

There is an existing bylaw for the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood of which these properties are enveloped in.

There is an existing bylaw for preservation of the Woodfield Heritage Area, which is immediately south of this proposed area and, again is protected.

As recent as last week, City Hall fast-tracked another designation for Old East Heritage Conservation District. This is a neighbourhood of 1,000 homes extending east of Adelaide Street to the west side of Quebec Street, south of the CP Rail allowance and north of Dundas Street. This area is immediately to the south and east of this proposed application.

To quote Peter Geigen-Miller of the London Free Press in his article that appeared in the London Free Press on April 17, 2006 on the front page: "in the words of the city’s official plan, conservation policies ‘protect, where possible and feasible, those heritage resources which contribute in a significant way to the identity and character of the city’.

Similar architecture, which also needs to be protected, exists in Old North on both east and west sides of Adelaide St., St. James, Grosvenor, Victoria, William and Maitland Streets. There are existing heritage properties on Grosvenor and Victoria Streets.

**QUESTION:** How many protected area bylaws the City of London, passed and then developers draw up are allowed to apply to change designations protected by the bylaw?

This development project does not meet the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood bylaw. That should be sufficient to turn down this application unless it is rewritten to conform to the existing bylaw.

Why were these developers not pointed out this bylaw and the simple fact that their proposal doesn't meet existing criteria that the neighbourhoods, and more importantly, the City of London fought to protect?

**Affordable Housing Issue:**

I understand the city’s need for infrastructure and affordable housing. However, this particular developer and property owner has a history of applications for affordable housing grants and financing. The quality and calibre of his properties and their maintenance is abysmal. I can appreciate the city cannot, legally, discriminate an applicant based on history. But based on fact, history repeats itself. We also have evidence of property maintenance with absentee landlords.

This owner outwardly said, at this aforementioned meeting, that he intends to construct 100 units with a minimum of 3 bedrooms per unit in a geared to income project/development. He also openly stated that he has no intention of living there. It was insulting that he jokingly asked how many other property owners
would be willing to sell (out) to him. I suppose that if one buys up all the surrounding properties, then there is no neighbourhood left to oppose the development either.

I'm not opposed to developing these properties. I would like to see townhouses or condominiums that are purchased and owner occupied verses rental units. When one has a financial investment in properties, they are apt to maintain and preserve it.

**Litigation Issues**

Has the city considered future litigation issues should they proceed with this application is it currently appears?

There is definitely going to be backlash from the community organizations that have invested their time and money into forcing City Hall to establish these bylaws to protect the neighbourhoods. Other developers in the past have surely been turned down based on these protection bylaws. I would expect that news of this development, should it pass, would bring prior denied applicants forward and potential lawsuits.

As a property owner at 582 St. James Street, I ran a home occupation business from that location from 1991 until 2002. I was subject to stringent bylaws and adhered to each of them. These ranged from the square footage useable inside, the fence I erected, a house number on the property, parking issues and boulevard maintenance.

As a property owner at 797 Adelaide St. N, I currently operate London Massage Therapy Centre and two residential apartments from this location.

I spend over 6 months of fact-finding at City Hall prior to my purchase. I had meeting with the Site Plan Department (Tom Karidas), Building Division (Jay Zendrowski), Planning (Allister McLean) and others. Several key points I would like to bring forward are that I was

1) prohibited from my initial parking design based on the hydro pole and its proximity to the mouth of the entrance/driveway. Less than six months after we altered the plan to accommodate this pole, the city removed and replaced all of the hydro poles from Oxford to Cheapside Streets and moved them each 6 feet north of the existing holes. This would have accommodated my initial parking plan yet this move was not disclosed to me as a developer.

2) I was told I could fill the rear yard and put gravel or recycled asphalt for a driveway. After firmly purchasing the property, I was told by the City that all new driveways would need to be paved with curbs. This added over $30,000 to the cost of my project, a fee I could not afford.

3) I was told to build a paved parking lot with curbs and a storm drain.

4) Once we proceed with this plan, the City again changed their mind and said that the sewer system in old north London, in particular Adelaide St. N. was aged and overtaxed and being replaced by the City in their long term plan.

5) I was prohibited from tying our storm drain into the existing sewer lines and storm water management/drainage on Adelaide St.

6) I was also prohibited from tying in via the property directly west of 797 Adelaide St. N., that being the properties I back onto on Carling Avenue.

7) I was more specifically told that 'water management on my property was my problem'.

8) We were then forced to do a soil and water management study and secure a certificate from the Ministry of the Environment.

All of these caused great financial hardship and delays in my project and business relocation. **Should City Hall allow this developer to tie into the existing storm and water systems on Adelaide St. N., I fully intend to seek legal council and recourse, as he would be shown preferential treatment.**
Traffic Concern: We (the property and business owners) have all voiced our concerns about the traffic issues.

I was forced to enter into a Future Development Agreement (at my costs) with the City of London regarding the entrance to my property and business. Should the city decide that traffic flow exiting Palasad/Good Life and our adjacent driveway become an issue, I would be forced to alter our entrance and, at my costs, build a mutual drive with the neighbours to the south.

I would suggest strongly that this developer be subjected to the same rulings. His proposal is adjacent to an existing apartment building already causing traffic problems on Adelaide St. N.

Should this developer be allowed to subvert this ruling, again, I would consider legal council and litigation to show preferential treatment to this developer. It is insignificant to me what type of structures he plans; he would have to adhere to the same regulations.

If the existing zoning on several of these old houses (including those he wishes to maintain and/or demolish) were renovated, he would be subject to stringent building codes, as I was. These include, but are not limited to staircases, secondary fire exits, fire codes, entrance and exit doors, and height restrictions for basement and/or attic units, etc.

Once again, should this owner or developer be allowed to subvert these laws, I would exercise my rights to council and bring these against City Hall.

This application is not even borderline acceptable. What concerns me is that this application is so contrary to the policies of the Official Plan that one can basically go sentence by sentence and come up with an argument for every single policy.

Question: How did this application make it past any site planning department approval and Ministry of the Environment approvals to be proposed to the property-owning public?

Question: Is there a Traffic Study of the flow on Adelaide and the adjacent streets sure to be affected? (In particular the created 'ring road' bounded by Adelaide, St. James, William and Cheapside Streets.)

Question: Is there access to the Public Site Plan prior to completion of the development?

Question: Would you be willing to come and tour the proposed site and surrounding neighbourhood?

I would respectfully request written replies to my questions and concerns and welcome your feedback on the above issues.

I would also request to be keep on any/all mailing lists regarding this file.

Sincerely,

Joanne E. M. Buchanan

Owner of 582 St. James Street and 797 Adelaide St. N.
Dear Ms Pasato:

I am writing to you to strenuously object to the proposed zoning and land use change, File 02-7098 – Chai-El Holdings Inc., for 859-871 Adelaide St. North. This proposal is totally incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood, and would have a huge negative impact on the area.

There are so many reasons to reject this proposal that I don’t know where to start! The most obvious one is the major change from the Official Plan necessary for this development. The designation would officially go from Low Density Residential to a Multi-Family Medium Density designation. That would be bad enough, but with the bonusing provision, the designation would really be High Density, right adjacent to Low Density. Almost all the surrounding houses are single-family, owner occupied homes. This proposal just doesn’t fit with the Official Plan, which tries to keep similar developments together. What is the point of having an Official Plan if it is always being ignored?

If this is approved, it will be used as a precedent, and residential areas will be under attack all over the Old North. As I understand it, the Old North is designated as a special area in order to stop just such developments as this one – preserving the Old North character of a “low-rise, low-density residential community” is supposed to be a priority, and this development of apartment buildings stuck in the middle of a residential block would surely go against the policy. If you read the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood policy (3.5.9 of the Official Plan), this proposal contradicts nearly every part of it. While the city understandably wants to infill, rather than to expand outwards, the infill has to be appropriate. There are logical areas where intensification can take place without changing the character of the area. This location is not in a “node”, rather it is between “nodes”, and will increase the intensity of land use in mid-block – not good planning. Approval of this proposal will lead to a domino effect, with other established residential blocks being gutted. It is not an appropriate place to infill.

This development will have a very negative impact on the neighbourhood. We are an established community of homeowners who care about their properties and their neighbours (our block on St. James St. does not have a single rental property in it!).
have lived in my home for 25 years and my neighbour has been here over 40 years. Many of us have raised our families here and we were hoping to stay for years to come. Others have moved in within the last year and are hoping to raise their families here as well. This development would have a huge negative impact on our neighbourhood. The character would be irrevocably changed with the inappropriate and intrusive buildings and the huge increase in population of a transient nature. Other concerns that would impact on our rights to **peace, quiet and the enjoyment of our properties** are:

- **Noise pollution** — from cars, from people
- **Light pollution** — lighting for the parking lot where there has only been darkness
- **Loss of privacy in back yards** — the buildings loom over the surrounding houses, two stories taller than them, and the apartment buildings are on land that is higher than the surrounding houses
- **Loss of sunlight** — the apartments will block sunlight due to their excessive height
- **Loss of natural green space** — instead of back yards with trees and grass, there will be paving and a parking lot — surely London wants to keep any greenery that they can
- **Pollution** — cars in the parking lots, delivery trucks, garbage trucks and plowing trucks will all sent fumes and pollution into our back yards, spoiling our pleasure in our properties
- **Huge increase in population** — the density is incompatible and would not fit with the existing neighbourhood
- **Placement of the apartment buildings** — by placing the apartments at the back of the lots, they have a greater impact on the neighbourhood than if they faced onto Adelaide St. — essentially they gut the block.

The character of the neighbourhood will be irrevocably changed. This development will make it a less appealing place to live (would you want to have an apartment building looming over your back yard?) causing the area to deteriorate. Families will move out and absentee landlords with student housing will move in. What a pity if this is allowed to happen!

Another problem, that is so large that it needs to be dealt with separately, is the traffic situation. The entrance and exit for this development is onto Adelaide Street. This is a very busy arterial road (over 29,000 cars per day according to the City of London website). Already there are problems with back-ups at rush hour due to trains and trucks unloading at Adelaide and Oxford, and blockages due to cars turning left into the Palasad/Goodlife parking lot. Adding the cars from the apartments will make the section of Adelaide a nightmare, both as they turn left into the development, and as they try to turn north out of the development (a nearly impossible feat). The fact that Adelaide St. is
not level at that point will only make the situation worse – cars coming south on Adelaide are hidden by the hill until they are very close. Safety is definitely a concern.

What will probably happen is that apartment dwellers wanting to go north on Adelaide will turn right out of the development, then turn down St. James, turn north on William and then turn right onto Cheapside. This will hugely increase the traffic on residential streets that already have many cars using it as a by-pass of the Oxford-Adelaide intersection. St. James St. has been designated as a “walk to school” street, and the increase in traffic will put the children in danger. These interior streets do not have the servicing capacity for all the extra vehicles.

In addition to these concerns there are some questions about the development itself that need answers:

- parking for residents – there are only 60 parking spots allowed for 60 apartments. Surely 3-bedroom apartments will have more than one car? Where will the extra cars park? Where will their visitors park? St. James St. is the likely spot. We already have overflow parking from the Palasad bar on the street. The extra cars from the apartment development will make the street impossible and unsafe.

- storm water management – the local storm sewers are old and can’t handle the existing run-off from St. James St. during a downpour. Where will all the run-off from the apartments parking lot go? The vegetation will no longer absorb the rain. Houses in the neighbourhood already have wet-basement problems, and paving the area in the centre of the block will only compound the problem.

- sewers – the sanitary sewers in the area are also very old and would not be able to handle the sewage from another 60 apartments. It would not be able to go to Adelaide Street as it is uphill! The sewers on St. James St., William St. and Grosvenor St. would not be able to handle the extra load.

- snow removal – the parking lot and walkways of the new development will have to be cleared. The question is where the snow will be put. If it is put against the perimeter fences, it will flood the adjoining backyards. Also, the plowing will probably take place in the middle of the night, causing intrusive noise that will wake the neighbours.

- garbage collection – where would the garbage bins be located? Would the garbage collection be in the middle of the night, disturbing the peace and rest of the neighbours. As this is a residential area, and not a “node”, commercial or downtown area, the garbage trucks would be very disturbing to those living in the surrounding houses.

- buffering fencing – there is no indication on the plans that there is to be any buffering fences. They would be essential to provide some privacy and security for the neighbourhood back gardens.
For all the above reasons, and more, this proposal must be rejected. This development is blatantly against the Official Plan, would cause serious traffic problems, and would have an extremely negative impact on the surrounding residents. It would irrevocably change the area and destroy the Old North character of the neighbourhood, denying us our right to peace, quiet and the enjoyment of our properties.

Sincerely

Elizabeth Pattison

Please include this letter in the planning department report that will submitted to the Planning Committee.

Please notify me if this proposal is going to be forwarded to the Ontario Municipal Board.
April 8, 2006

Planning Department
City Hall
London, Ontario

Attention: Nancy Pasato

Re: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment - File #OZ-7098

As a homeowner and resident of the neighbourhood affected by the Official Plan and zoning by-law amendment requested by Chai-El Holdings Inc. I am writing to voice my objection to this application.

In respect of the affected area, the Official Plan states:

"North London/Broughdale is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density residential, institutional and office uses located along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street corridors.

It is anticipated that there will be demand for residential intensification and infill development within portions of the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood during the planning period. Area-specific guidelines are required which will direct future residential development to suitable locations, and protect the character of the existing low-rise, low density residential community.

The preferred locations for new residential intensifications and infill development are those areas within the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-family, High and Multi-family, Medium Density Residential. In Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock, provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale that is compatible with surrounding land uses."

The proposed amendment to the Official Plan, zoning changes and residential intensification proposed by Chai-El Holdings does not protect the character of the existing community, does not provide adequate space for parking or landscaped open space and is not compatible with the surrounding land uses.

The character of the existing community, and the current zoning, is low density residential. The proposed amendment, with the bonus provision, is high density. This is contrary to the Official Plan provisions.

The proposed development would see the destruction, rather than the conservation and rehabilitation of existing buildings. This is contrary to the Official Plan.

There is inadequate space to accommodate the on-site parking for the proposed 60 unit buildings. On-site parking of only 60 spaces will result in over-flow parking on the surrounding streets during day-time hours. The prohibition against parking on city streets between 3:00 a.m.
and 6:00 a.m. appears not to have been taken into account and when it is considered, it is clear that 60 spaces for parking is insufficient. This is also contrary to the Official Plan provisions.

The proposed landscaping of 33% of the developed area is not in keeping with the percentage of landscaped area of the surrounding properties. This is contrary to the existing character of the neighbourhood and is contrary to the Official Plan.

The proposed development will effectively destroy the existing character of the homes that circle the area and back on to the subject area. Peaceful backyards will be disrupted by the arrival and departure of vehicles at all times of the day and night, with headlights shining into homes and backyards, by lighting of the parking lots and walkways, and by four-storey buildings with balconies and windows allowing residents of the proposed development clear view of what are currently private areas.

Homes that do not back onto the subject lands will, nevertheless, be directly affected by the development. There will be increased traffic and parking over-flow on Grosvenor, St. James and William Streets. It is already the case that there is over-flow parking of patrons of The Palasad on St. James Street. Furthermore, there will be substantial increase of traffic on Adelaide Street as residents of the proposed development enter and depart from the property. In particular, vehicles travelling north on Adelaide and turning left into the property will create further traffic congestion in an area that is already a high accident zone.

At present, the homeowners affected by this development take pride in their property and have well-maintained homes and surrounding property. The proposed development will devalue the adjacent properties and if the amendments to the Official Plan and zoning by-law are permitted, this will change. Residents who have lived in this neighbourhood for many years or who have recently moved into the neighbourhood due to its existing character will very likely leave. If approved, the proposed amendments will change the nature of the block and will, unnecessarily, begin the erosion of the North London character and community.

The proposed development is of a level of intensification that clearly contravenes the Official Plan.

I have reviewed some of the correspondence from other concerned property owners and have not repeated their comments and observations here. I agree with their comments and share their concerns.

Please include this letter in the report to the Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

Susan Murdoch
Notice of Application to Amend Plan & Zoning By-Law

Dear Nancy,

My husband and I would like to make note to you that we are very opposed to the zoning change and bylaw amendment OZ-7098 859-871 Adelaide Street North. We have not only noted that we do not agree with the zoning of the area described residential, but we also do not agree with medium density either.

Our main concerns are:

i) The flow of traffic on Adelaide and William is currently too slow and difficult to turn left or right on to Adelaide from St James and visa versa into St James.

ii) There is too much traffic turning down St James and into William from Adelaide. We will be having young children in the house soon and am worried about the speed and volume of the traffic. This is a residential area as indicated by the School Sign on St James.

iii) We have been advised that the vendor has bought a property on William. Currently it has been mentioned that he wishes to use this as construction access to build the said property. We have also been advised that he wishes to...
use this property to create an access for the many units to peer into William as opposed to Adelaide.

My concerns here are that this is a natural beautification area. It is a very natural 'green space' in the middle of the city. There are 3 properties on William that run long strips that go right back to Adelaide properties. This area has cardinals, lice doves, abundant bats, squirrels, skunks and racoons that live here. It is a sanctuary. With the noise of construction and the buzz of traffic plan actually breaking through this area, it will disturb such an important area.

iv) A traffic study shall be done on the current strain on Adelaide.

v) A traffic study on St. James and William to see the speed and volume of traffic.

vi) We are also concerned about the flow of human traffic through the back area. Currently, there is a block of apartments with low income clientele. Often we have heard shouting and police are called. We have had lots of break-ins from the back and would be concerned that this could be increased with interconnection.

These are just a few of our concerns. We have seen areas drastically change in London because of 'interconnection' and housing/zoning changes.

I have placed in perimeter signs and would like my input built into the report.

Again we are against any change of zoning that promotes low or medium density buildings.

Sincerely,

Joanna Hickey

[Signature]

From: Joanna Hickey
April 8, 2006

Planning Department
City Hall
London, Ontario

Attention: Nancy Pasato

Re: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment - File #OZ-7098

As a homeowner and resident of the neighbourhood affected by the Official Plan and zoning by-law amendment requested by Chai-El Holdings Inc., I am writing to voice my objection to this application.

In respect of the affected area, the Official Plan states:

"North London/Broughdale is characterized by predominantly low rise, low density residential development, with some higher density residential, institutional and office uses located along the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street corridors.

It is anticipated that there will be demand for residential intensification and infill development within portions of the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood during the planning period. Area-specific guidelines are required which will direct future residential development to suitable locations, and protect the character of the existing low-rise, low density residential community.

The preferred locations for new residential intensifications and infill development are those areas within the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-family, High and Multi-family, Medium Density Residential. In Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock, provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale that is compatible with surrounding land uses."

The proposed amendment to the Official Plan, zoning changes and residential intensification proposed by Chai-El Holdings does not protect the character of the existing community, does not provide adequate space for parking or landscaped open space and is not compatible with the surrounding land uses.

The character of the existing community, and the current zoning, is low density residential. The proposed amendment, with the bonus provision, is high density. This is contrary to the Official Plan provisions.

The proposed development would see the destruction, rather than the conservation and rehabilitation of existing buildings. This is contrary to the Official Plan.

There is inadequate space to accommodate the on-site parking for the proposed 60 unit buildings. On-site parking of only 60 spaces will result in over-flow parking on the surrounding streets during day-time hours. The prohibition against parking on city streets between 3:00 a.m.
and 6:00 a.m. appears not to have been taken into account and when it is considered, it is clear that 60 spaces for parking is insufficient. This is also contrary to the Official Plan provisions.

The proposed landscaping of 33% of the developed area is not in keeping with the percentage of landscaped area of the surrounding properties. This is contrary to the existing character of the neighbourhood and is contrary to the Official Plan.

The proposed development will effectively destroy the existing character of the homes that circle the area and back on to the subject area. Peaceful backyards will be disrupted by the arrival and departure of vehicles at all times of the day and night, with headlights shining into homes and backyards, by lighting of the parking lots and walkways, and by four-storey buildings with balconies and windows allowing residents of the proposed development clear view of what are currently private areas.

Homes that do not back onto the subject lands will, nevertheless, be directly affected by the development. There will be increased traffic and parking over-flow on Grosvenor, St. James and William Streets. It is already the case that there is over-flow parking of patrons of The Palasad on St. James Street. Furthermore, there will be substantial increase of traffic on Adelaide Street as residents of the proposed development enter and depart from the property. In particular, vehicles travelling north on Adelaide and turning left into the property will create further traffic congestion in an area that is already a high accident zone.

At present, the homeowners affected by this development take pride in their property and have well-maintained homes and surrounding property. The proposed development will devalue the adjacent properties and if the amendments to the Official Plan and zoning by-law are permitted, this will change. Residents who have lived in this neighbourhood for many years or who have recently moved into the neighbourhood due to its existing character will very likely leave. If approved, the proposed amendments will change the nature of the block and will, unnecessarily, begin the erosion of the North London character and community.

The proposed development is of a level of intensification that clearly contravenes the Official Plan.

Please include this letter in the report to the Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Woolford
Robin and Vicky Samuels  
856 William Street  
London, Ontario  
N5Y 2S3

Nancy Pasato  
300 Dufferin Ave, P.O. Box 5035  
London, Ontario  
N6A 4L9  
By Fax (519) 661-5397

File #0Z-0798-Chai-El Holdings Inc.  
859-871 Adelaide Street North

Dear Ms. Pasato,

We are writing with respect to the above-mentioned application. We are opposed to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential to a Multi-Family Medium Density and we strongly object to the Residential R8 Bonus Zone to permit the apartment buildings.

Our property currently backs onto the aforementioned Adelaide Street properties. We purchased this property 8 years ago for the land. The house needed many repairs however, we were looking to the future, and the enjoyment our family would have in the back yard. Over the past eight years we have done extensive renovations on our home and we have spent a significant amount of money in landscaping our back yard. We have planted three new blue spruce trees, two birch trees and have created several new gardens. The reason that this information pertains to the above mentioned property is that we have made a substantial investment in our property over the past several years and allowing the proposed amendments would seriously impact both the value of our property, and definitely conflicts with our attempts to maintain a safe and private space for our three children to play. (Ages 9, 7 and 4)

I have several concerns about the proposed changes, specifically;

- Loss of sunlight due to the height of the development
- Noise levels in the center of the block, from people, and vehicles
- Loss of green space
- Loss of privacy due to the height of the proposed development
- A significant increase in population, in a relatively small area

Chai El Holdings also owns the property on the north side of our property. It has been rumored that this property could serve as an access during construction and thereafter.
We are strongly against any such use, as this would have a significant impact on our daily lives. We purchased the property so that our children would have a safe place to play. Allowing the use of any portion of the property to be used as access for any vehicle (including short term construction vehicles) would put our children at risk. Currently our property is not fenced as in the past there was no need for such. Our children are accustomed to playing amongst the wildlife, and will not be conditioned to watching for vehicles of any sort. Property values, and general inconvenience aside, this is about safety. I strongly suggest if this proposal is approved in any form, that a full privacy/noise fence be constructed around the perimeter of the properties.

A fence of substantial weight and size will also reduce the temptation of any children to pass through neighboring yards to travel to and from school.

Any traffic flowing from the Adelaide St. properties to William St. will affect many neighboring properties, many of which may not have received notice of this initial application.

I would appreciate this letter being included in the report that goes to council.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Robin and Vicky Samuels
To: Nancy Pasato, Planning Department  
London City Councillors  
London Board of Control  
Mayor Anne Marie deCicco  

Re: File OZ-7098 – Chai-El Holdings Inc.

My family and I moved to our home at 568 St. James Street six years ago. The main reasons for moving to the Old North community were because of its unique and individual characteristics, and having an expansive green space abutting our back yard was an added bonus. Changing the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential to a Multi-family Medium Density designation would greatly affect these unique and individual characteristics. We are not apposed to the province’s and city’s need for appropriate intensification; however, we can not see this proposal falling under the term appropriate. The Official Plan for Old North also anticipates the need for residential intensification and infill developments; however, it also details specific guidelines which direct these types of developments to suitable or pre existing locations so as to; I assume, protect the existing integrity of predominantly low rise, low density communities.

The Official Plan states:

- the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with that of existing development in the surrounding area;
- all required parking will be accommodated on site and limited in area;
- development will be sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing residential streetscape; and
- Any new lots created through consent will be in conformity with the minimum zoning requirement, and in keeping with the established lot pattern of the surrounding area.
All original buildings in this area, dating from the early 1900's are one or two storey, single family homes, fronting on an adjacent street, with the only exception being the two existing apartment buildings within this block, which I suspect came about before the existing Official Plan policies. This new development proposes to construct 3 four storey apartment buildings which are obviously greater in height and bulk than the original single family homes, and do not conform to the exiting build form of the adjacent lots.

The proposed site plan shows 60 parking spaces, making no allowance for handicapped or visitor parking, and does not seem to be limited in area, taking up maybe 1/3 of the total site area.

The site plan also depicts the removal; rather than, the rehabilitation of three homes along Adelaide Street to permit access to the proposed site. It also shows the buildings oriented along the side and rear of the combined lots while ignoring the continuity of the existing streetscape. Even the existing apartment building at 871 Adelaide Street seems to be fronting onto Adelaide Street.

This development also proposes to combine the existing 6 parcels of land into one large property, which is not only non-conforming in size with the surrounding single family lots, but is even larger in size than the two existing apartment complexes.

Allowing a change to the Official Plan for this type of development will set a precedent for future developments of this kind in Old North, resulting in a loss of character and integrity for not only the surrounding homes but for the entire community. Accepting the Official Plan and Zoning changes would mean all other applications; of a similar type, would have to be accepted in the future. This is not what the guidelines of the Official Plan were set out to do.

Another concern we have with regard to the possible amendments deal with traffic and traffic safety. Many streets in Old North tend to be used as bypass roads to avoid surrounding major streets and intersections. St. James Street and William Street are already treated as a main arterial road instead of a quiet residential street. A lot of vehicles turn off Adelaide Street, and speed down St. James Street to William Street running north and south, to avoid the Oxford/Adelaide intersection, or having to attempt a left turn heading north onto Adelaide. With the increase in development along the Adelaide Sunningdale corridor, the traffic volume moving along Adelaide Street fronting the subject properties has grown to ten's of thousands of vehicles a day; close to other major roads such as Wonderland Road, which has more lanes and design features to accommodate the traffic load. Adding two more driveways, with the addition of 60+ cars attempting to exit onto Adelaide will cause extra congestion and danger to an already problem area, as well as, potentially causing more vehicles to travel down St. James Street; a posted school route. Along with the increase in traffic congestion there is the possibility of overflow parking on surrounding streets, as there seems to be no spaces allotted for visitor parking, or taking into account multi car families. These two factors combined with the already congested surrounding roads are just going to increase the chances for vehicle and pedestrian accidents.

Another issue which needs to be addressed is the sanitary and storm water management for this site. Adding 180+ people to an already highly populated area will potentially overload an already failing system. Numerous homes in the immediate area have had numerous sewer problems, resulting in backups and eventual replacement. Replacing existing trees and grass with buildings and asphalt parking will substantially increase traffic and storm water management problems.
increase the surface runoff from this property; either into the storm water system or to adjacent properties. Many of these properties are currently prone to damp basements and ponding water during spring thaw and heavy downpours. I don’t see how the developer plans to direct storm and sanitary leads from the rear of the property to an uphill Adelaide Street, as well as diverting surface runoff away from surrounding properties, which for the most part, are down hill from this site.

Another area of concern is that of increased pollution, be it from noise, light or from surface runoff. A complex of this size and density will produce a large amount of garbage, as well as noise from cars, people, and snow removal equipment (at night), which will be directed to the rear of the adjacent homes. Along with noise will be the increased amount of light from car head lights and overhead security lighting which will undoubtedly shine into rear yards and bedroom windows of nearby homes. Overland flow of rain water and melting snow piles will carry contaminants, such as oil and salt into surrounding areas, killing grass and other vegetation.

The size and bulk of a new four storey building looming over numerous backyards (see included photos) will result in loss of privacy, diminish our standard of living, decrease property values and eventually compel people to move away.

Any changes to the present Official Plan and Zoning would be detrimental to an already vibrant and diverse community, which already has an appropriate amount of intensification.

Thank-you for your consideration in this matter and please have this letter appended to the staff report.

David and Denise King
PHOTO # 1

Photo number 1 depicts the ultimate height of the proposed building siding on the rear of 568 St. James Street, taken from ground level at the rear of the house. The orange stake in the middle of the picture is 1.0 metre.

PHOTO # 2

Photo number 2 depicts the side profile of the proposed building siding on the rear of 568 St. James Street, taken from a second floor bedroom window. The orange stake near the middle of the picture is 1.0 metre.
Ms. Nancy Pasato  
Planning Division, City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue  
London, ON N6A 4L9  

Re: File OZ -7098 – Chai-El Holdings Inc  

Dear Ms. Pasato,

Thank you for your taking the time to speak with me by phone earlier this week. As I advised you then, I am strongly opposed to the above proposed development in my immediate neighbourhood. The reasons for my opposition are as follows:

The developer’s proposal to build three apartment buildings, 4 stories high is totally inconsistent with the Official Plan designating this area as Low Density Residential which committed to protect the unique character of this area of our city.

I am nearing retirement and I recently bought on this city block. I had hoped to invest in a stable neighbourhood and live on my property with a lifestyle which would leave this space more ecologically healthy than when I moved here. I am dismayed to even contemplate that the city would approve a development plan which would not support preserving the environment and residential stability of this part of London.

This city block houses several children whose young parents or parents-to-be have bought here believing it to be a neighbourhood which would be family- and child-friendly. This future is threatened by the proposed development, which would increase traffic congestion and parking problems, and compromise safety on Adelaide and the surrounding block, where the area is designated as a safe “Walk to School” district, and is part of the city’s special project to encourage our children among others to be more active outdoors. Notwithstanding the aforementioned are problems to the environment, to city water and road resources, traffic and safety, and great personal losses of privacy as well as the contamination of noise, light, and car exhaust that those of us who live on this city block will experience. It is the issue of backyard privacy which I consider to be paramount, to myself and my neighbours. Our backyards are sacred spaces and need to be preserved as such. In addition, I have not even mentioned the issue of diminished property values.

I cannot imagine that you are not aware of the several ways in which the developer’s proposal is contrary to the Official Plan. It is not even borderline acceptable. We are aware of other developments in our area of the city where in-fill endeavours were designed and built successfully to honour the intention of the Official Plan and the
neighbourhood. For example, the area on the east side of Maitland Street between Oxford and St. James Street, and the development on the west side of Colborne St. below Oxford Street are both attractive and fit in much better with their adjacent neighbourhoods.

I am requesting that the city not approve this re-zoning application, and suggest that future proposals to develop this part of Adelaide Street be considered only if they attempt to be consistent with the Official Plan both in spirit and in reality.

Thank you for requesting community input to the above proposal. I look forward to your reply. Could you please include this letter as part of your staff report and proposal to City Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

Susan Bimie-Marino
550 St. James Street
Dear Ms. Pasato,

We have reviewed the Notice of Application relating to file OZ-7098 and we would like to express our concerns regarding the proposed amendments. We believe this application is inconsistent with the intent of the Official Plan, it requests a density that is akin to Multi-Family, High Density Residential, the form and design are incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood, it places undue strain onto the existing neighbourhood with traffic and parking issues, it is inconsistent with past Council decisions, it is premature given the spotty lot fabric, it irrevocably alters the character of the neighbourhood and it sets precedence for future intensification along the William Street corridor as well as within North London/Broughdale in general.

As it relates to Municipal Policy the proposed amendments are contrary to the statements and recommendations of The Creative City Task Force Report. As you are aware, the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood is under constant pressure to accommodate infill and intensification to the point that a special policy has been adopted for the area bounded by the Thames River, Oxford Street and Adelaide Street to protect the predominantly low rise, low density residential neighbourhood. Not only have these policies been adopted in the Official Plan they have also been celebrated in The Creative City Task Force Report adopted by Council on June 27th, 2005. For example, Chapter 6 – London Heritage, Heritage and Planning states:

Planning Staff has worked with residents of the Old North heritage neighbourhood to develop policies which limit the size and intensity of residential conversions in this historic area. The area is seeing significant development pressures from activities relating to the University of Western Ontario, St. Joseph's Health Care London, and the Downtown.

While we recognize the fact that the above paragraph has no policy status per se, it is noteworthy that Old North was singled out by the Creative City Task Force as a neighbourhood worthy of preservation and that these policies were selected as an example of Council's commitment to the neighbourhood. In addition, several of the recommendations in The Creative City Task Force Report adopted by Council address the need to develop policies that support existing urban neighbourhoods and their unique characteristics (Recommendation 50.c) as well as deal with urban design (Recommendation 50.a, 57 and 58).

Although The Creative City Task Force Report provides little policy basis to refuse the proposed amendments, we included those excerpts from The Report in our letter to emphasize Council's clear intent to preserve unique neighbourhoods such as Old North.
The Official Plan, however, does have policy basis to refuse the proposed amendments. We believe that these Official Plan policies, which are intended to protect the low rise, low density character of Old North, are so apparent that this proposed amendment lacks any policy merit. For example, the Official Plan anticipates that Old North will be subject to the very form of intensification that is proposed in this application and in response Council has adopted policies which restrict this type of development. Specifically, Section 3.5.9. of the Official Plan outlines the following policies:

- Multiple unit residential development is directed to those areas within the Oxford, Richmond, and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential.
- In Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock provided there is adequate space to accommodate required on-site parking and landscaped open space and that intensification is of a scale which is compatible with surrounding land uses.

It would appear that the proposed application intends to evade these policies by simply redesignating the lands to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation. However, even by redesignating the lands to Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential this application is still not consistent with the intent of the Official Plan.

For example, the Official Plan states that multiple unit residential development is directed to Medium and High Density Residential lands, it does not state that multiple unit residential development be redesignated to accommodate Medium and High Density development. To further expand upon this point it is noteworthy to address the textual change made in the North London/Broughdale policies from the January 2003 consolidation of the Official Plan which stated that:

The preferred locations for new residential intensification and infill development are those areas within the Oxford, Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential.

Whereas the January 2005 consolidation now states that:

Multiple unit residential development is directed to those areas within the Oxford, Richmond, and Adelaide Street North corridors that are designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential.

This textual change in the policy indicates the strengthening of the intent of the Official Plan to conserve the existing low rise, low-density residential character of North London by directing intensification to lands that are already designated Multi-Family Residential. Had the intent of the Official Plan been maintained, this application would have been directed to those lands along the Oxford Street Corridor and portions of the Richmond Street Corridor that are currently designated for Multi-Family development. Given that there is no Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation along the Adelaide Street corridor, this application could not have possibly been directed to the appropriate area and therefore does not comply with the intent of the Official Plan. The intent of the
North London/Broughdale policies does not contemplate a simple redesignation of land use to higher density, but instead steers it to appropriate locations. This is in contrast to other areas of London where it is implicitly understood that Council may redesignate lands to accommodate intensification. In North London, however, the Official Plan policies explicitly instruct Council to direct intensification to existing designated areas.

And where the intent of the Official Plan explicitly states that intensification may occur through the preservation of the existing housing stock, this proposed application intends to demolish the housing stock and intensify through new construction. Therefore, even with a change in land use designation to Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential as sought by the applicant, this application is still not consistent with the intent to preserve the existing dwellings.

Furthermore the Official Plan outlines the objectives that will guide the implementation of Low Density Residential policies for Old North. This includes:

- Height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with that of existing development in the surrounding area;
- Development will be sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing residential streetscape.

We fail to see how this proposed application is "in keeping with that of the existing development of the surrounding area". While there is an existing 3 storey walk-up building north of this site, this application is not "in keeping" with all the other adjacent properties nor is it "in keeping" with the built form of the general surrounding area which is characterized by low rise, low-density dwellings. In addition, the proposed application is not at all sensitive to the orientation of adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing residential streetscape. In fact, we believe that the streetscape is made worse off through the demolition of several buildings and replaced with a side façade and two points of ingress and egress where those buildings once stood. Once again we reiterate that the proposed application simply attempts to evade the above objectives by redesignating the lands to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation which we maintain is inconsistent with the intent of the Official Plan.

Lastly, an application such as this is better suited as a submission under the "Infill Housing" Policy (Section 3.2.3), which governs new residential development within an established neighbourhood, instead of the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential Policy. This is because the current designation of the lands is Low Density Residential to which the Infill Housing policy applies and because this policy is much more sympathetic to the character of the existing neighbourhood than is the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential policy. For example, the Infill Housing policy recognizes the scale of adjacent land uses, it requires that projects be sensitive to the height, scale and architectural design of surrounding buildings, it requires that the project be sensitive to the continuity of the streetscape, that parking areas be buffered and the policy limits any bonus density to a maximum 75 units per hectare. In essence, the Infill Housing policy ensures that a new residential development built within an existing neighbourhood is intended to enhance the existing neighbourhood, not detract from it. On the other hand, the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential policy, which the applicant is seeking as a designation, is not as sensitive to the existing residential neighbourhood and is more forgiving to a poorly designed development by not requiring, among other things, attention to streetscape, architectural compatibility and lower density. In essence, the
Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential policies do not strive to achieve a higher standard for new development in an existing neighbourhood and the end result can be development that is contrary, not complementary, to an existing community.

Moving away from the policy argument, the design of the proposed application leaves much to be desired. As previously mentioned the orientation of the buildings is not sensitive to the streetscape and, in fact, makes it worse through the demolition of the existing built form. In effect, the proposed application seeks to "punch out the teeth of the Adelaide Street smile" and replace it with gaps that will function as automobile ingress and egress points of access. And as frequent pedestrians of this corridor, if this proposed application is approved, we would be subjected to traffic from a site with 60 units where only 3 once stood.

It is already difficult to cross Adelaide Street given the flow of traffic and because the nearest cross-walks are south at Oxford or north at Cheapside. This is also particularly troubling because residents from the proposed application may use the Saint James/William/Cheapside route when they are unable to turn directly north onto Adelaide Street. While this may seem like a stretch of the imagination we can assure you that it is not. These local streets are used very frequently by northbound travelers who cannot penetrate the Adelaide Street traffic while turning and also by southbound traffic who wish to avoid the intersection of Oxford and Adelaide. This point is underscored by Council's recent decision to implement traffic calming measures at the intersection of William and Cheapside to discourage through-traffic from using the internal street network. To complicate matters, many of the interior intersections within this block are not four-way stops which encourages increased speeds.

On-street parking continues to be a problem in this neighbourhood. Some of the homes in this neighbourhood have limited driveway space given their age and many residents and guests are therefore required to park on the street. The commercial plaza on the northwest corner of Adelaide Street and Oxford Street constantly experiences a shortage of parking and Saint James Street becomes the default overflow parking for the plaza. With a 60-unit, 60-parking space development being proposed, the parking woes of the existing neighbourhood must be taken into consideration. Given the density of the proposal and its limited amount of parking, it is reasonable to assume that guest parking, in addition to the existing overflow parking, will end up being absorbed by Saint James Street and Grosvenor Street.

Also from a design point of view, the built form, density and mass of this proposal are inconsistent with the surrounding neighbourhood. Undoubtedly the justification of this built form and massing is that it demonstrates the continuation of the built form at 871 Adelaide Street North, located just north of this site. However, we would argue that the building at 871 Adelaide Street itself is an anomaly within the neighbourhood (given that it was built in the 1950s whereas the rest of the neighbourhood was built in the late 1800s and early 1900s). By justifying the compatibility of the proposed development on the basis of an anomaly does not depict a true representation of the character of the surrounding neighbourhood. And to perpetuate the design and built form of an anomaly would have the effect of irreversibly altering the character of the neighbourhood (please refer to map below).
This illustration highlights the fact that this city block consists of single detached dwellings with the exception at 871 Adelaide Street North and 872 William Street. By demolishing 3 existing single detached dwellings at 869, 867 and 863 Adelaide Street and replacing them with 3 medium density apartment buildings changes the character of this neighbourhood as depicted below.
Given that the properties between 854 to 868 William Street are a mirror image of the Adelaide Street properties it may set precedence for future Medium Density Residential applications along that corridor. The only difference between the Adelaide Street properties in this application and the William Street properties is the classification of the street. While some may argue that a Medium Density Residential application could never be approved for William Street because it is not an arterial road, we do not believe this would be a sufficient enough reason in-and-of-itself to prevent further intensification. An application along the William Street corridor could be justified on the basis that it demonstrates the continuation of the built form that currently exists north of this site. The application would be further strengthened with the existence of adjacent Medium Density Residential dwellings such as those proposed on Adelaide Street. If the proposed application is approved, what justification would Council have to prevent a similar application from being approved on William Street or Grosvenor Street given that the abutting residential uses are Medium Density Residential?

To further this argument, it is noteworthy to point out that the applicant has already purchased the property at 858 William Street. It would be helpful for the applicant to disclose his intentions for the William Street corridor for the public record.

Additionally, the proposed application creates a remnant parcel at 865 Adelaide Street. This parcel essentially creates an isolated island of R2 zoning. This site could quickly lose its residential amenity and become an Office Conversion thereby further altering the
character of the neighbourhood. Until such time as 865, 861 and 859 Adelaide Street can be properly integrated into a comprehensive development proposal for this site, this application is premature.

The Bonus Special Provision requested in the proposed application is above and beyond that which is commonly permitted. Ordinarily, density bonusing does not exceed 25% of the density otherwise permitted and even then the maximum 25% is not always granted. In this case the applicant is requesting a 33% increase of the permitted density. There is no justification for such a departure from the 25% maximum especially when the design of the proposal does not warrant any bonusing. In terms of density, at 100 units per hectare this application is well beyond the upper limits of Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential development and is in fact consistent with the density of development in many High Density designated areas. In effect, the abutting property owners would be subjected to living adjacent to a High Density development, without a reasonable buffer, where Low Density Residential existed for almost a century. It is noteworthy that the italicized introduction of Section 3.3 states that the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation does not permit densities intended for the Multi-Family, High Density Residential designation. Although we do recognize that the italicized sections of the Official Plan have no policy basis, it is provided to assist in the understanding of the policies.

Council has been supportive of the Old North/Broughdale policies in the past. Recently, Council denied an application for intensification at the intersection of Audrey Avenue and Huron Street because it was inconsistent with the Official Plan special policies pertaining to Old North. Furthermore, a recent Interim Control By-law sought to amend the Zoning By-law along the Richmond Street corridor north of Oxford Street to lower the permitted density. Given that the Official Plan policies that govern development on Richmond Street are the same policies that apply to Adelaide Street, we believe that it would be inconsistent for Council to attempt to reduce the permitted density of Richmond Street while at the same time dramatically increasing the allowable density along Adelaide Street. How can Council on the one hand actively pursue the preservation of the Low Density Residential character of Richmond Street while approving the intensification and demolition of the Low Density Residential character of Adelaide Street when the Official Plan policies are identical to both corridors?

We recognize that there are Provincial policies which endorse infill development in existing neighbourhoods. However, the regulations which limit the size, shape, density, height, design and form are left to the discretion of local policy. The Provincial Policy Statement is not intended to be used carte blanche as an excuse to build at the highest conceivable densities. In fact, Section 2.6.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement does speak about mitigating measures to conserve heritage attributes affected by adjacent development. The following local properties are listed in the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources:

- 870 William Street
- 559 Grosvenor Street
- 585 Grosvenor Street
- 866 Adelaide Street North
- 857 Adelaide Street North
In summary, we believe this application is inconsistent with the intent of the Official Plan, it requests a density that is akin to Multi-Family, High Density Residential, the form and design are incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood, it places undue strain onto the existing neighbourhood with traffic and parking issues, it is inconsistent with past Council decisions, it is premature given the spotty lot fabric, it irrevocably alters the character of the neighbourhood and it sets precedence for future intensification along the William Street corridor as well as within North London/Broughdale in general.

Please include this letter in all reports to Planning Committee and Municipal Council relating to this matter.

Respectfully,

Michael Tomazincic
578 Saint James Street
London, ON
N5Y 3P6

Jen Tansey
578 Saint James Street
London, ON
N5Y 3P6
TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 6, 2006

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON
300 DUFFERIN AV.
LONDON, ON N6A 4L9

To. Nancy Pasato.
File# 0Z-0798—Chai—El Holdings Inc.

WE, the undersigned STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed change to the Official Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential designation, to a Multi-Family Medium Density Residential designation.

WE< are oppose to the proposed Zoning changes as well. Allowing these Plan and Zoning amendments would seriously and harmfully affect the character and integrity of the OLD NORTH community, as well as setting a precedent for future developments of this nature in other areas of Old North.

We would like you to included this letter in the report that goes to ALL councils.

These are only few of our concerns----

--property values will decrease{ we might loose as much as 20-30 000$ }
-- complete loss of privacy on our back yard
--potentially could be 300-400 people residing at the complex
-- increase of crime in the area
--traffic increase on St. James and William St.
--problem with storm water
--snow removal from this complex and melting water will pour into our back yards.
--extensive noise from cars and people on our back yards
--parking concern visitors will park on the St. James and William St.
--with zoning changes being approved, builder could potentially build 100 units
--this development threatens the neighborhood stability compelling residents to move after 20-25 years
--council has supported North London/Broughdale in the past from this type of incompatible development, most recently at Audrey & Huron and Council's support should be consistent throughout all North London/Broughdale
--we will loose character of the existing neighborhood [houses build in late 1800—early 1900]
--definitely loss of 100 years old trees—black walnuts, maples, evergreens,
--loss of GREEN SPACE

Best regards,----- Alexandra and Zenon Szczukowski
864 William St.
London On N5Y 2S3

PLANNING DIVISION
SCANNED
April 9, 2006

City of London,
Nancy Pasato,
Re: File OZ-7098 – Chai-El Holdings Inc.

We oppose the above application to amend the existing zoning by-law & official plan.

The height, size, density, and placement of these proposed buildings are not in keeping with the existing neighbourhood. Four storey apartment buildings do not conform in height to two storey homes & one-floor cottages, prevalent in this area. The proposal does not conform to the existing streetscape. It should be apparent that this neighbourhood is made up of single/dual dwellings, not mid to large-scale apartments.

Can parking be accommodated?
The proposal is contrary to the City's Official Plan.

Please submit these concerns to The Planning Committee of City Council, and/or append these comments to the staff report.

Yours truly,

David & Irene McGeoch,
551 St. James St.
London, Ontario
Concerning Notice of Application  
File 02-7098 - Chai-EI Holdings Inc.

As a home owner at 552 St. James Street, I am very concerned about the application to amend the zoning by-law.

My concerns include increased noise, increased traffic in our area, increased exhaust fumes, decreased security, decreased privacy and thus decreased property value.

We have renovated our one hundred year old home in keeping with our neighbourhood.

We would like to maintain our quiet, well kept low density residential neighbourhood.

This proposed change of land use cannot be viewed as an improvement to our area!! Therefore we oppose this application.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

(552 St. James Street)
I own a business on Hamilton Rd near Egerton. Daily we witness or are involved as innocent victims of road rage. Whether you watch it or are involved it is not a pleasant experience to say the least. This road rage is from law abiding citizens who do to poor building and road planning find themselves in a position that is a set up for some very hot tempers. The consequences of this anger can cause horrific situations that could last years in personnel damage, vehicle damage, and legal fees. This amendment to the property on Adelaide St. is a sure recipe for years of road rage. I can vision the problems starting at the railroad tracks on Adelaide especially if there is a long train carrying on to Oxford St with very limited left turn signal on to St. James with no left turn light on to the new way over density apt complex that is proposed and past Cheapside which is already a huge problem. Now why would anyone on the city planning board want to put the population of London thru this nightmare. I strongly oppose this amendment and would suggest that the developer choose a less constricted area of London.

Douglas Manning
554 St James St.
April 11, 2006

577 Grosvenor Street
London, Ontario
N5Y 3T2

RE: File OZ-7098-Chai-El Holdings Inc.
Attention: Nancy Pasato, Planning and Development – Planning
300 Dufferin Avenue, P.O. Box 5035
London, Ontario
N6A 4L9

Dear Ms. Pasato:

I am writing to outline my opposition to the requested amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law for 859-871 Adelaide Street. My concerns centre around the high intensification of the proposed development being incompatible with the existing neighbourhood. More specifically, my concerns include:

- the size and intensity of the proposed development (three 4-storey apartment buildings) and direct adjacency to low density residential housing
- does not protect the integrity of the neighbourhood
- loss of green space and wildlife due to large scale development
- additional traffic on Adelaide Street and re-routing through residential streets
- privacy, noise and lighting which would detract from my ability to use my backyard for family enjoyment

I believe that the proposed development is not consistent with the Old North Official Plan of protecting the character of the existing low-rise, low-density residential community. When I moved to the area two years ago, I was aware of two apartment buildings in the neighbourhood (871 Adelaide St. and 872 William St.). However, I assumed that these buildings were constructed prior to the existing Official Plan and current zoning. I did not foresee further intensification to the degree described in the proposal. Perhaps this was an error on my part, as I am very committed to living in and raising my family in a stable low-density residential area where property values are maintained.

In closing, I am adamantly opposed to the proposed planning and zoning change. I do not believe such change will promote the type of 'infill' that is keeping with the character of the neighbourhood. Rather, I believe that constructing three 4-storey apartment buildings will have a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood, irreversibly decreasing the quality of life in this community. I also wish to have my comments appended to the staff report.

Sincerely,

Claude Olivier
Pasato, Nancy

From: Claude A Olivier
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2006 4:06 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: File OZ-7098-Chal-El Holdings Inc

Dear Ms. Pasato:
I'm writing to add something to my letter of April 11, 2006. When I attended the 'neighbourhood' meeting last Tuesday, the planner for the development, Michael Hannay, said that because there are already 2 existing apartment buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development, that this lent support for the the proposed development. I fail to see the logic in this argument. In fact, I would take a contrary position that the existence of 2 apartment buildings already creates a high density load. I believe that three more apartment buildings would tip the scale in favour of high density characterizing the neighbourhood. Eventually this would lead to fewer and fewer owner occupied homes and an irreversible loss of quality, low density residential housing.
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Claude Olivier

2006-04-20
CITY OF LONDON
PLANNING DIVISION

FILE NO. _______________________
REFERRED TO ___________________
SUBSEQUENT REFERRALS
☐ FOR ACTION
☐ FOR INFORMATION
☐ FOR REPORT
☐ FILE
☐ M.P.
☐ OTHER _______________________

APR - 6 2006

567 KEEWICO RD.
London, ON.
N5Y 3T2

Dear Nancy:

I wish to voice my opposition to this proposal -

The neighbourhood will be damaged by excessive traffic, noise, light pollution, loss of green space, much less security.

Any going south during rush on Adelaide St. we will go west on

15th for to avoid the congestion at Adelaide & Oxford St. Consequently, they will use Keele instead for the return trip.

How will rain & snow water be directed? Are our storm sewers sized to capacity now?

Still one parking space per apartment, residents will need parking on the surrounding streets.

Our home is directly north of 572 Tennis St. apartment building.

Over the years we have had to contend with, "fire trucks" - "police cars" - and garbage thrown into our garden.

More people living on the block will decrease the quality of life on our property, which has suffered enough.

Please include this letter in the report that goes to council.

Sincerely,

Sandra Hill
Pasato, Nancy

From: Janet Teare
Sent: Sunday, April 09, 2006 11:49 AM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Cc: Baechler, Joni; Aider, Rob; Tranquilli, Fred; MacDonald, Bernie; DeCicco, Anne Marie; Hume, Gord; Polhill, Bud; Monteith, Russ; Gosnell, Tom
Subject: Opposition to File OZ-7098 to amend the official plan & Zoning By-Law @ 859, 861, 865 Adelaide St N

RE: opposition to File OZ-7098 - Chai-El Holding for zoning amendment

Dear Ms Pasato:

As a homeowner in Old North I would like to register my opposition to any zone amendment at 859-871 Adelaide St North, file # OZ-7098.

I have received official application for this amendment and feel that 3 4-storey apartment buildings containing 60 units each is an overload to this area.

Traffic on Adelaide Street in this area is already heavy and I have witnessed a number of traffic accidents at the corner of Grosvenor and Adelaide. By adding such a heavy population base to that area it is only going to cause more accidents and more traffic backup. Furthermore there is no area to install traffic lights to alleviate that problem and I think residents of the proposed units trying to turn left into or out of the units with cause a hazard. Also, the railroad tracks at Central and Adelaide often has traffic backed up almost to Cheapside, this will also add to traffic confusion.

As well there is not enough green space in this area to allow for such a population growth. Any children living in these units will not have readily accessible play areas and may take the dangerous route of crossing Adelaide Street to reach Carling Heights Arena.

I can't even imagine the impact on our sewer and water system by adding 200-500 people onto an outdated and problematic sewer system. There is no way this neighborhood can accommodate that much more activity.

What about resident parking? It is pretty common for households to have a minimum of two cars and with 180 proposed units there is no way that even each unit will have one parking spot.

Our neighborhood offers diverse living accommodations and I for one am proud of that, however outbalancing rental units and owner occupied units goes against the plans of this area and will change the look and atmosphere of historic Old North, and not for the better.

Please file my official opposition to this plan,

Janet Teare
591 Grosvenor St
London, ON
N5Y 3T2

2006-04-10
Dear Councilors, Controllers and City Planner:

My name is Kevin Ross and my family and I reside at 579 St. James Street in the Old North. My wife and I are concerned with the application to amend the city’s official plan and zoning by-law to allow for a development of three, four story rental apartment buildings. Although we as supporters of policies of intensification to prevent urban sprawl we do have objections to this proposal. Our concerns are as follows:

- this application would leap frog from a low density residential to high density (with bonus provision) and it is very contrary to the official plan.
- the Old North has had provisions made in the official plan to help keep it’s character and fabric of it’s neighborhoods. This application is contrary to this.
- the drop in property values (as already seen by those selling their home on our street). This is regrettable as considerable and well above average maintenance dollars are spent by area owners due to the age of the neighborhood homes. Is another low income apartment development going to help compel owners to continue this as property values decrease?
- What is the purpose of the plan if it is not followed and continually under pressure from applications for amendments? The domino effect of constant moderate amendments to the plan adds up and renders the intent of the original vision mute.

I would invite you to review the city’s official plan and view the area to help with your decision making. I appreciate your interest and consideration.

Please have this letter noted for standing. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kevin & Stacey Ross
579 St. James Street
London, Ontario N5Y 3P5

NOTE: THIS ELECTRONIC MAIL TRANSMISSION CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED FOR THE PERSON(S) NAMED. ANY USE, DISTRIBUTION, COPYING, OR DISCLOSURE OF THIS INFORMATION TO ANY OTHER PERSON OR ENTITY IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED.
Appendix "A"
Planning Justification report submitted by the applicant
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1.0 Introduction

This report has been prepared to provide a further level of detail regarding the characteristics of the 52 unit residential infill development proposed by Chai-El Holdings Inc., for the lands at 859, 861, 863, 865, 867 and 869 Adelaide Street North in the City of London. The report is intended to demonstrate that the plan for the subject lands represents good planning and effective urban design by responding appropriately the physical and policy context.

Figure 1 Location Map
2.0 Location and Physical Context

The subject lands are composed of six house lots (869 to 859 Adelaide Street North) located on the west side of Adelaide Street between St. James Street and Grosvenor Street, one and a half blocks north of Oxford Street. In terms of location and physical context the subject lands are ideally located to provide medium and high density residential uses. Within the City of London, Adelaide Street is a major arterial road providing an important north/south connection and transit route through the core of the City. In addition to the public transit opportunities provided by Adelaide Street, the subject lands are positioned at a convenient walking distance from public transit routes on both Cheapside Street and Oxford Street. Both of these east/west public transit routes provide connections to many of the City's major employers including: University Hospital, St Joseph's Hospital, the University of Western Ontario and Fanshawe College, as well as to other major employment areas in the south and east of the city. This section of Adelaide Street from Cheapside Street to Oxford Street provides a range of shopping opportunities, including two food stores within a convenient walking distance. As well as providing convenient access to transit and shopping opportunities, the subject lands are also within a comfortable walking distance of both the Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre with its community facilities and indoor swimming pool, as well as the Carling Arena with its ice pads.
3.0 Policy Context

3.1 Municipal Policy Context

The City of London's Official Plan (the Plan) contains a variety of polices in its Planning Framework and Land Use Polices that apply to issues affecting the proposed development. In various sections, the Plan encourages intensification with medium density residential infill development in existing low density areas, with the directions that it:

- be located to be transit supportive;
- provide a high quality of architectural and landscape design; and
- protect and enhance the character of existing neighbourhoods.

Policies are also provided that present the possibility of Bonus Zoning to support the Plan’s urban design principles and to provide public benefit through a higher quality of architectural and landscape design.

The Vision Statement (Section 2.2.) contained in the Planning Framework speaks to the desire to promote an urban form that locates more intensive forms of residential uses along major transit corridors to facilitate public transit, to blend infill and redevelopment projects with their surroundings and to support the City's transportation objectives.

The Planning Principles (Section 2.3.) represent the underlying concepts and values that influence the formulation of land use and development control policies, promoting compatibility among land uses in terms of scale and intensity of use, and direct that the character of existing residential areas should be enhanced while intensification activities are located where existing land uses are not adversely affected. Additionally, the Planning Principles direct that land use planning should promote attractive and functional site and building design which is sensitive to the scale and character of surrounding uses.

Figure 3  View Looking West Along Oxford Street
City Structure Policies (Section 2.4.) recognize that there may be redevelopment, infill and intensification in established neighbourhoods and directs intensification to locations where the character of the residential area is enhanced and existing land uses are not adversely affected (ix). Additionally these policies encourage a compact urban form and efficient use of serviced land (xvi) encouraging infill development and intensification of lands or buildings suitable for residential development (xvii).

Growth Management Principles (Section 2.6.2.) directs that the measures necessary to accommodate growth through land use intensification, having regard to the timely and efficient use of existing infrastructure, will be supported (i).

Transportation Strategies (Section 2.11.3.) promote transit friendly, compact forms of development that encourage and facilitate an efficient public transit system (v).

Housing and Community Development (Section 2.13.) identifies the importance of community character (Introduction), stating the goal that intensification within existing communities will maintain compatibility with streetscapes and other aspects of neighbourhood character (i).

Urban Design Goal (Section 2.14.3.) states that it is a goal of the Plan to promote a high quality of architectural and landscape design that is sensitive to the character of surrounding uses and streetscapes.

General Objectives For All Residential Designations (Section 3.1.1. (vi) encourages infill residential development in residential areas where existing land uses are not adversely affected and where development can effectively utilize existing municipal services and facilities.

Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential Objectives (Section 3.1.3. (i) support the development of residential uses at locations which enhance the character and amenity of a residential area and have convenient access to transit, shopping, public open space, recreational facilities and other urban amenities.

Figure 4 View Looking North Along Adelaide Street
Low Density Residential Permitted Uses (Section 3.2.1.) permits the development of medium density residential housing as infill housing in existing low density areas subject to section 3.2.3.

Infill Housing (Section 3.2.3.) describes infill housing as new residential development in existing neighbourhoods and provides examples of appropriate types of locations, including obsolete existing building sites and vacant remnant parcels of land (i). Additionally this section describes the range of housing forms appropriate for infill housing including single detached dwellings, semi-detached attached dwellings, attached dwellings and low rise apartments (ii). Infill housing may be allowed up to the maximum scale permitted under the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential Designation. As well, infill housing should be sensitive to the height, scale and architectural design of buildings in the existing neighbourhood. It is intended that infill housing projects recognize the scale of adjacent land uses, enhance the character of the area (iv) and be sensitive to the continuity of the existing residential streetscapes (v).

Scale of Development (Section 3.3.3.) identifies that height limitations should be sensitive to the surrounding neighbourhood and will not normally exceed four storeys (i). This section presents the possibility of qualifying for Bonus Zoning under Section 19.4.4. to increase density from 75 units per hectare to a maximum of 100 units per hectare.

Policies for Specific Residential Areas (Section 3.5.) locate the subject lands in the North London/Broughdale Neighbourhood (Section 3.5.9.). These policies identify that areas designated Multi-Family, High and Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential along the Oxford, Richmond, and Adelaide Street North corridors are the preferred locations for new residential intensification and infill development. Additionally these policies state that in Low Density Residential areas fronting onto the Richmond and Adelaide Street North corridors, residential intensification may be permitted through the conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock. Objectives to guide the implementation of Low Density Residential policies state: the height, bulk and placement of buildings will be in keeping with that of existing

Figure 5  View Looking South Along Adelaide Street
development in the surrounding area; all parking will be accommodated on site and limited in area; development will be sensitive to the orientation or adjacent dwellings and to the continuity of the existing streetscape; and any new lots created through consent will be in conformity with the minimum zoning requirements and in keeping with the established lot pattern (in terms of frontage, depth and overall size) in the surrounding area.

*Bonus Zoning* (Section 19.4.4.) provides the possibility to encourage development features which result in public benefit and which support the City's urban design principles (ii), as contained in Chapter 11 of the Plan.

### 3.2 Provincial Policy Context

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides direction on matters of provincial interest relating to land use planning, while the Planning Act requires that decisions affecting planning matters "shall be consistent with" policy statements issued under the Planning Act. The PPS promotes efficient use of existing infrastructure, opportunities for intensification, redevelopment and compact urban form.

![View Looking North from the Subject Lands](image)
4.0 Neighbourhood Character

The visual character of a neighbourhood is always a product of a combination of factors that commonly include the scale and architectural design of buildings, the orientation and siting of buildings, the location of parking, the width of streets and the quality of landscaping on public and private property.

4.1 Adelaide Street North Streetscape

Adelaide Street North running south from Cheapside Street to Oxford Street is composed of a mix of residential and commercial uses accommodated in a range of building types. The major commercial use at the northern end of this section of the streetscape is the A&P plaza at the intersection of Cheapside Street and Adelaide Street North, with a three in one gas bar/convenience store/car wash located directly on the northeast corner. From this point south the predominate land use is residential and the predominate building form is single detached houses. Commercial uses are located in some specifically designed small commercial buildings but are also located in specifically adapted houses. This pattern shifts once more to the intersection of Oxford street and Adelaide Street North, which is dominated by two plazas and a Seven Eleven gas bar.

For the most part, residential uses are accommodated in what were originally one and two storey single detached houses. Many of these houses still retain their front porches which appear to be in use despite their closeness to the street and the traffic volumes. Today many of these houses contain more than one residential unit.
There are a number of four storey low rise apartment buildings as well along the streetscape adjacent to the subject lands. One of these apartment buildings is located at 871 Adelaide Street North directly north of the subject lands and another is located directly across the Street at 856 Adelaide Street North. There are five more apartment buildings directly north of Cheapside Street on the west side of Adelaide Street North. Along the streetscape, houses have a variety of roof styles, orientations and pitches.

In general, the majority of buildings fronting onto Adelaide Street North are sited in very close proximity to the street line. The existing houses on the subject lands are amongst some of the closest to the street line. The existing apartment buildings are also consistently sited close to the current street line.

The most common cladding material used on buildings along this section of Adelaide Street North is brick. Brick is used in a variety of colours, shades and textures. Along this section of Adelaide Street North there appear to be few if any street trees, with the majority of visible landscaping occurring in the front yards of properties facing onto the street.

Figure 8  View South from the Intersection of Adelaide Street and St. James Street
4.2 Block Structure

The subject lands form part of a City block bounded on the east by Adelaide Street North on the south by St. James Street, on the west by William Street and on the north by Grosvenor Street. The streetscapes of Grosvenor, William and St. James are primarily composed of one, and two storey single detached houses. These streetscapes are dominated by their wide right-of-ways and high crowning street trees. Although there are a range of lot depths, the majority of lots addressing onto Grosvenor Street and William Street are deeper than those facing onto St. James Street. The exceptions to these lot and house types are 872 William Street and 871 Adelaide Street North, which are both apartment buildings and zoned R9-3, H18. The existing 8 storey apartment building at 872 William Street is located back from the street and takes the form of a high density interior block residential infill project. This building was sited in such away as to preserve the houses on the adjacent streetscapes. The existing four storey apartment building at 871 Adelaide Street North is sited with its front elevation in line with the existing houses on Adelaide Street North and forms part of the streetscape. Parking for this apartment building is located in the rear yard, sited in an interior block location.

Figure 9  871 Adelaide Street North

Figure 10  877 & 879 Adelaide Street North
Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office) 2007

By-law No. C.P.-1284—

A by-law to amend the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 relating to 859-871 Adelaide Street North.

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

1. Amendment No. (to be inserted by Clerk's Office) to the Official Plan for the City of London Planning Area — 1989, as contained in the text attached hereto and forming part of this by-law, is adopted.

2. This by-law shall come into effect in accordance with subsection 17(38) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13.


Anne Marie DeCicco-Best
Mayor

Kevin Bain
City Clerk

First Reading – June 11, 2007
Second Reading – June 11, 2007
Third Reading – June 11, 2007
A. PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT

The purpose of this Amendment is:

1. To change the designation of certain lands described herein from "Low Density Residential" to "Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential" on Schedule "A", Land Use, to the Official Plan for the City of London.

B. LOCATION OF THIS AMENDMENT

1. This Amendment applies to lands located at 859-871 Adelaide Street North in the City of London.

C. BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The Official Plan amendment to a Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation is appropriate because the proposed use is compatible with existing development in the area, has access to available services, will have minimal impact on the existing road network, and is of a scale and height that is in keeping with other development in the area. The site is located in close proximity to major commercial areas, transit, and public open space and recreational uses. The proposed development is oriented to and accessed from an arterial road and is compatible with the existing mix of housing forms along Adelaide Street. The proposed bonus zone will ensure a higher design standard for the development, will mitigate impacts on surrounding uses, will fit within the character of the residential neighbourhood, and will enhance the aesthetics of the proposed development. The recommended zoning will provide for a form of residential development compatible with the scale of development in the surrounding neighbourhood.

D. THE AMENDMENT

The Official Plan for the City of London is hereby amended as follows:

1. Schedule "A", Land Use, to the Official Plan for the City of London Planning Area is amended by designating those lands located at 859-871 Adelaide Street North in the City of London, as indicated on "Schedule 1" attached hereto from "Low Density Residential" to "Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential".

"NP/np"
FROM: LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
TO: MULTI-FAMILY, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

LEGEND
- OFFICE AREA
- OFFICE/RESIDENTIAL
- OFFICE BUSINESS PARK
- GENERAL INDUSTRIAL
- LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
- REGIONAL FACILITY
- COMMUNITY FACILITY
- OPEN SPACE
- URBAN RESERVE - COMMUNITY GROWTH
- URBAN RESERVE - INDUSTRIAL GROWTH
- RURAL SETTLEMENT
- ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
- AGRICULTURE
- URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

SCHEDULE 1
TO OFFICIAL PLAN
AMENDMENT NO.

FILE NO. OZ-7098
MAP PREPARED: May 11, 2007
PREPARED BY Graphics & Information Services
SCALE 1:30,000
WHEREAS Chai-El Holdings Ltd. has applied to rezone an area of land located at 863, 867 and 869 Adelaide Street North, and on a portion of 859, 861, and 865 Adelaide Street North, as shown on the map attached to this by-law, as set out below;

AND WHEREAS upon approval of Official Plan Amendment Number (number to be inserted by Clerk’s Office) this rezoning will conform 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 863, 867 and 869 Adelaide Street North, and on a portion of 859, 861, and 865 Adelaide Street North, as shown on the attached map comprising part of Key Map No. 53, from a Residential R2 (R2-2) Zone and a Holding Residential R2 (h*R2-2) Zone to a Holding Residential R2 Bonus (h*R2-2*B-( ) Zone.

1) Section 4 of the General Provisions to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by adding the following Special Provision:

4.3 4) B-( ) 863, 867 and 869 Adelaide Street North, and on a portion of 859, 861, and 865 Adelaide Street North

The subject site is being bonused for enhanced urban design. The building design is identified through the elevations, site plan, and landscaping plan included in the development agreement, which includes one apartment building, 42 units, 3 storeys in height (maximum 10.0 metres), located along the northern boundary of the site, and one stacked townhouse development, 10 units, 2 storeys in height (maximum 8.0 metres), located along the western boundary of the site.

A design character statement has also been included in the development agreement to provide guidance to any minor changes that are made as these plans are finalized through the site plan process.

The following regulations apply with the approved site plan:

Permitted Uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartments and Stacked Townhouses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (minimum): 6,000 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontage (minimum): 15.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (minimum): 7.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard – north (minimum): 3.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard – south (minimum): 9.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Depth (minimum): 4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped Open Space (%) (minimum): 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (%) (maximum): 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (maximum): 10.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density – units per hectare (maximum): 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking: 1 space per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cumulative impact of using this bonusing provision shall not result in a density greater than 87 units per hectare (215 units per acre) and a building height greater than 10 metres (32.8 feet).

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. P.13, either upon the date of the passage of this by-law or as otherwise provided by the said section.


Anne Marie DeCicco-Best
Mayor

Kevin Bain
City Clerk

First Reading - June 11, 2007
Second Reading - June 11, 2007
Third Reading - June 11, 2007