TO: CHAIR AND MEMBERS - PLANNING COMMITTEE
FROM: R. W. PANZER
   GENERAL MANAGER OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
SUBJECT: APPLICATION BY: IVAN & ANN KOVAC, AND LOUISA GOLF
   168 MEADOWLILY ROAD SOUTH
   PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING ON
   TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2008 AT 5:00 PM

RECOMMENDATION

That, on the recommendation of the General Manager of Planning and Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of Ivan & Ann Kovac, and Louisa Golf relating to the property located at 168 Meadowlily Road South, the request to amend the Official Plan to change the designation of the subject property from an "Urban Reserve, Community Growth" designation which permits a limited range of uses based on the nature of their existing use to an "Associated Shopping Area Commercial"; and the request to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1 to change the zoning of the subject property from a Holding Urban Reserve (h-2*UR) Zone which permits existing dwellings to an Associated Shopping Area Commercial Special Provision (ASA8( )) Zone BE REFERRED back to staff to work with the applicant on a concept plan and guideline document for the entire Urban Reserve Area with the intent of bringing these documents and the subject application back to a public meeting of Planning Committee for consideration in January of 2009.

IT BEING NOTED that Staff and the applicant agree that this is the best course of action to allow for a more appropriate review of the application within the context of the entire Urban Reserve area, consistent with Official Plan policy;

IT BEING ALSO NOTED that a terms of reference for the Community Plan and Guidelines for the remainder of the Urban Reserve area are attached as Appendix 1 and include consideration of the following items:

- Goals, objectives and a vision for the Urban Reserve Area, recognizing the context for the site and its relationship to surrounding land uses and the adjacent community to the south
- Alternative land use concepts, including the exploration of opportunities for the mixing of land uses
- An urban design concept, incorporating a community vision, design goals, sustainability objectives, and associated design guidelines
- Natural heritage review, including the completion of an acceptable Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the lands that are the subject of the application and appropriate considerations of natural heritage for the remainder of the lands within the Urban Reserve Designation
- Interface with the natural heritage and cultural heritage resources in the Meadowlily area
- Opportunities for incorporating innovative green development techniques

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER

None.
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PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information report to provide background information on the information received to date, and to recommend deferral at this time.

BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Application Accepted: September 18, 2007</th>
<th>Agent: Peter Nikolakakos, Commissioners Centres Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

REQUESTED ACTION: Official Plan and zoning by-law amendment to permit the development of 25,500 square metres (275,000 square feet) of retail commercial floor space, comprised of an anchor retail store of approximately 20,000 square metres (215,000 square feet) and five smaller buildings with a total of 5,500 square metres (60,000 square feet) of retail and service commercial space.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:
- Current Land Use – vacant
- Frontage – 228 metres
- Depth – 430 metres
- Area -9.12 hectares
- Shape - rectangular

SURROUNDING LAND USES:
- North – Meadowlily Woods ESA
- South - commercial
- East – City Wide Sports Park
- West - single family detached

OFFICIAL PLAN DESIGNATION: (refer to map on page 4)
- Urban Reserve, Community Growth

EXISTING ZONING: (refer to map on page 5)
- Holding Urban Reserve (h-2*UR)

PLANNING HISTORY

The site has been a farm parcel for many years. It previously contained several farm outbuildings (constructed in or around 1940), and still has a farm home on it.

SIGNIFICANT DEPARTMENT/AGENCY COMMENTS

Environmental and Engineering Services Department

"The City of London’s Environmental and Engineering Services Department (EESD) recommends that holding provisions be applied to ensure that appropriate municipal services are available to serve these lands. Major road works adjacent to this site have only recently been completed. Alterations to recently installed infrastructure are not eligible for claims from the Urban Works Reserve Fund (UWRF). EESD provides the following comments:
COUNCIL APPROVED ZONING FOR THE SUBJECT SITE: h-2*UR

1) LEGEND FOR ZONING BY-LAW Z-1

- R1 - SINGLE DETACHED DWELLINGS
- R2 - SINGLE AND TWO UNIT DWELLINGS
- R3 - SINGLE TO FOUR UNIT DWELLINGS
- R4 - STREET TOWNHOUSE
- R5 - CLUSTER TOWNHOUSE
- R6 - CLUSTER HOUSING ALL FORMS
- R7 - SENIORS' HOUSING
- R8 - MEDIUM DENSITY/LOW RISE APTS.
- R9 - MEDIUM TO HIGH DENSITY APTS.
- R10 - HIGH DENSITY APARTMENTS
- R11 - LODGING HOUSE

- DA - DOWNTOWN AREA
- RSA - REGIONAL SHOPPING AREA
- CSA - COMMUNITY SHOPPING AREA
- NSA - NEIGHBOURHOOD SHOPPING AREA
- BDC - BUSINESS DISTRICT COMMERCIAL
- AC - ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL
- HS - HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL
- RSC - RESTRICTED SERVICE COMMERCIAL
- CC - CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL
- SS - AUTOMOBILE SERVICE STATION
- ASA - ASSOCIATED SHOPPING AREA COMMERCIAL

2) ANNEXED AREA APPEALED AREAS

CITY OF LONDON
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ZONING
BY-LAW NO. Z-1

SCHEDULE A

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

**A** preliminary Traffic Impact Study submitted with this application identified the need to reconfigure turning lanes on Commissioners Road between Highbury Avenue and Meadowlily Road to accommodate traffic volumes anticipated with the development of this site. This study proposes the construction of a new westbound to northbound on-ramp to Highbury Avenue from Commissioners Road. The study also identified the need to construct an additional westbound through lane on Commissioners Road from Meadowgate Boulevard to Meadowlily Road. It should be noted that a final study has yet to be submitted and the findings have not been accepted by EESD.

The proposed new ramp has not been identified as a system wide need through the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and is not included in the capital works budget. Nor has it been included in the Transportation Development Charges Schedules. As such the ramp is not eligible for funding through the UWRF. In accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process, a Schedule "A" or "B" Study will be required for the ramp. The classification and extent of the EA will be determined by the cost of the ramp.

As part of a Subdivision Agreement for the Summerside subdivision, a section of Commissioners Road was widened between Highbury Avenue and Meadowgate Boulevard. Due to the lack of sufficient right-of-way on the north side of Commissioners Road and this applicant's reluctance at the time to provide a right-of-way widening, only one westbound through lane was constructed in 2006. Based on the TMP, it is anticipated that once the Summerside Area builds-out and growth of background traffic from other developments to the east increases, the additional through lane would be required sometime beyond 2018. This development substantially changes this schedule, such that the extra lane is needed with this development. Changes to the relatively new road will not be eligible for claim from the UWRF as this would be a double up on claims which is not the intended use of the fund. Other transportation issues, including access will be discussed during the site plan review processes.

It is recommended a holding provision be applied to these lands until the Traffic Impact study is accepted, the Transportation Master Plan is amended, the EA is completed and the infrastructure is in place to accommodate development.

NOTE: Additional Transportation comments were provided on August 14, 2008 in response to the iTrans revised report, submitted in July, 2008:

"The impact of this development was assessed with a full signalized access to Commissioners Rd approximately mid-way between Meadowlily Rd and Meadowgate Blvd. This access arrangement would also require full access to be permitted to the commercial and church lands to the south. We indicated previously that a restricted access at this location that includes right in, left in and right out movements would only be supported. This restricted access would permit full inbound movements while precluding the necessity of another traffic signal along Commissioners Rd. The restricted access arrangement also matches the approved access for the commercial and church property on the south side of Commissioners Rd opposite this proposed development. This change in access type has a major impact in the analysis particularly in determining the extent, timing and type of infrastructure required to accommodate development. For example the study indicates that due to the growth in background traffic an additional westbound through lane on Commissioners Rd will be required by 2017. Based on traffic data shown in the report this lane appears to be required due to exiting traffic from the commercial development on the south side of Commissioners Rd. If the site was analyzed with the restricted access approved for this site (no outbound left turns), then this lane would not be required by the growth in background traffic.

The study indicates that side by side left turn lanes along Commissioners Rd between Meadowlily Rd and the easterly ramp to Highbury Ave can be constructed to accommodate left turning traffic for the Highbury Ave ramp and traffic desine to the development at Meadowlily Rd. This would be in place of constructing a new ramp onto Highbury Ave and reconfiguring existing lane designations on Commissioners Rd as recommended in the previous TIS. We indicated that we would be willing to explore parallel left turn lanes (back to back left turn lanes) provided it could be shown that this lane configuration could be accommodated due to physical
restrictions created by the overpass bridge structure for Highbury Ave. The concept plan and traffic distribution analysis provided in the report is insufficient for us to support this recommendation. Additional information regarding justification for the distribution of left turning traffic between the Meadowlilly Rd access and the first access to the east must be provided. The conceptual design shown in the report must meet our design standards for road construction. Sufficient detail was not provided for either. A new ramp onto Highbury Ave with a reconfiguration of turn lanes on Commissioners Rd will provide for better long term service of motorists travelling through this area and is our preferred option.

The report recommends traffic signals be installed on Commissioners Rd but does not includes a traffic signal warrant analysis to justify installation. The report further indicates that a minimal band width of progression (vehicles travelling without stopping) could be achieved for motorists travelling between Highbury Ave and Meadowgate Blvd with this new signal and spacing between signals is within minimum recommended by the Ontario Traffic Manual. There are other costs regarding the installation of traffic signals including maintenance, pollution from idling vehicles, potential for certain types of collisions and energy consumption that were not discussed. However, as indicated above we do not support full access at this location and therefore traffic signals will not be required for restricted access.

Based on the above, we are requesting that a holding provision for access and a holding provision for transportation infrastructure be applied to any zoning by-law amendment for this site. These holding provisions should remain until appropriate agreements have been reached to accommodate our concerns regarding access and infrastructure. The remaining comments are technical issues related with the study.

A volume to capacity ratio of 0.9 or higher (per individual movement) should be used to determine operational deficiency not 0.95. Furthermore, it should be noted early in the report that the threshold for infrastructure requirements/modifications is a LOS “E” or worse and v/c more than 0.9.

Please include results of queue analysis (95th percentile queue) per movement in any tables that identify calculated v/c and LOS data.

The conceptual design shown in Exhibit 11 does not provide sufficient detail to determine adequacy of design. It would appear that it will be difficult to accommodate an acceptable design for side by side left turn lanes between the bridge and Meadowlilly Rd. We will not support the design for westbound through lanes shown on the concept. A new ramp and reconfigured turn lanes on Commissioners Rd is our preferred option.

Please provide more detail regarding the progression analysis undertaken in support of the new traffic signal. The report shows that a minimal band width of progression can be provided but additional explanation regarding the work sheets shown in Appendix F should be provided. There are other costs regarding the installation of traffic signals including maintenance, pollution from idling vehicles, potential for certain types of collisions and energy consumption that were not discussed. Results should be included for the eastbound direction as well.

The distance between public streets and driveways shown in Exhibit 2 should be proportional to scale.

The site concept plan (Exhibit 4) shows the proposed 3 driveways. The design of Driveway 2 is inadequate. It is too short, and even if this access is restricted, movement in and out from development will be problematic.”

SANITARY:

- The Functional Servicing Report for this site submitted by Dillon Engineering and dated November 9, 2007 generally addresses the effluent discharge rates from the site. However, detailed information in the form of a complete sewer analysis will be required for the sewer from the discharge point at Meadowlilly Boulevard/Commissioners Road downstream to Evans Boulevard. It is recommended a holding provision be placed on the subject lands until the sanitary sewer analysis is completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
STORM WATER:

- It is recommended a holding provision be placed on the subject property until the Owner's Consulting Engineer submits a hydrogeotechnical report which addresses the affects of the proposed land use on the adjacent environmental areas, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

- The subject lands are located in the Thames River Central Area Watershed. The Owner's professional engineer must ensure that the post development storm water runoff does not exceed the stormwater runoff under pre-development conditions.

- Due to the amount of paved surface area (parking spots) the Owner is required to have a consulting Professional Engineer design and install an oil/grit Separator for stormwater quality control to the standards of the Ministry of the Environment and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The oil/grit separator is to be located on private lands and be maintained by the Owner.

WATER:

- High pressure water is required for this development.

- Engineering analysis, satisfactory to the City Engineer, may be required by the Owner's professional engineer to determine the extent of external waterworks that may be required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

EESD recommends that appropriate holding provisions be applied to the subject lands. The holding provisions may be removed once all concerns have been addressed. The servicing concerns may be addressed through future development processes such as consent to sever, site plan and subdivision approvals.

London Hydro

"London Hydro has adequate 27.6kV aerial distribution in place along Commissioners Road for this development. Transformation lead times are minimum 30 weeks. London Hydro recommends you contact their engineering department to confirm transformer requirements and availability. The applicant will be responsible for the cost associated with the relocation of any existing infrastructure as a result of this development. Depending upon the power requirements of the applicant, aerial or padmount transformation or a customer owned substation are all options for servicing this development. London Hydro will require a blanket easement over the entire property. London Hydro has no objection to the zoning or official plan amendment."

Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC)

- a) Prior to the consideration of the application, a larger Area Plan and a Master Plan for the Environmentally Significant Area to the north should be completed;
- b) an Environmental Impact Study should be completed for this site given its proximity to the Environmentally Significant Area
- c) consideration should be given to the amount of commercial vacancies already existing in this general area.

NOTE: Additional comments provided on August 28th, 2008, in response to revised EIS:

- "...No Need for Additional Commercial Designated Lands

1) Even assuming absolutely no use of currently vacant commercial space, there is enough vacant land already designated for commercial use to fill demand for the next 13 years (City of London Commercial Policy Review – Phase II Market and Supply Analysis). There is no need to increase the amount of land designated for commercial use as requested by this application.

Infill and Intensification

2) In addition to already designated lands, there is also highly visible vacant commercial space very near to the proposed development. On Commissioners Road, from Highbury Ave to Pond Mills Road, there are multiple vacant commercial lands that could be redeveloped instead
of developing the proposed Greenfield. Further, the PPS clearly aims to accomplish 60% of all new development via infill and intensification. London’s Official Plan s.2.4.1 also specifies that infill and intensification be the primary means for new retail development. Directing the applicant to currently vacant commercial lands along Commissioners Road would be of higher economic and environmental benefit to the City as well as moving toward the PPS objective and adhering to the City’s own Official Plan.

Incompatible Development along Thames Valley Corridor

3) As per Official Plan s. 2.9.3 "The City recognizes the Thames Valley Corridor as its most important natural, cultural, recreational and aesthetic resource." The TVC must be protected not only within the strict confines of the traditional corridor but also be protected by ensuring all adjacent and proximity development is compatible with the river corridor, values the river corridor and enhances the river corridor. Any development with its back turned to the river corridor fails to value and enhance it. A commercial development especially, by its very nature of operations, fails to value and enhance the river corridor.

Other cities, such as Guelph, as early as 1993, are far ahead of London in recognizing that all development along the river corridor has a significant impact on the cultural values expressed for the river system. In turn, development along the corridor has an impact on the entire city as it relates to and defines the City’s most important natural, cultural, recreational and aesthetic resource.

Urban Design – Land Use and Building Design

4) As per Official Plan section 11.1.1 Design Principles, “new development shall complement and protect any significant natural features.” Placing a high use commercial development directly adjacent to one of the City’s Environmentally Sensitive Areas is inappropriate and does not complement nor protect the ESA. It devalues the ESA both ecologically and culturally.

5) Official Plan s.2.3.1 Planning Principles states “Land use planning should promote attractive, functional and accessible site and building design, which is sensitive to the scale and character of the surrounding area.” Use of the subject property for a commercial development does not adhere to this land use planning policy.

6) EEPAC recommends the completion of an Urban Design Report (as per OP Section 11.1.5) for this development application with the goal of analyzing the proposal within the context of the surrounding area and to provide guidance how the site should be developed.

Buffer to ESA

7) EIS contains no analysis of the necessary buffer width whatsoever. The proposed 10m buffer is simply the absolute minimum as per City guidelines. City guidelines clearly state that a woodland buffer should be a minimum of 10m and increased according to site and natural feature characteristics. Given the intensity of the proposed use and the sensitivity of the ESA, a wider buffer is required.

8) As per City guideline, EIS should start with a minimum 10m buffer and increase according to the Natural Feature Characteristics and Sensitivities listed in Table 2 of Guidelines for Determining Setbacks and Ecological Buffers. Characteristics listed in the Table and that are relevant to the subject site include, Aspect, Community Maturity, Height of Vegetation, Edge Type and Scale of Development. Each of these characteristics of the subject site determine that a buffer wider than the absolute minimum is required. The EIS should not be accepted by the City with only a 10m buffer to the ESA.

9) EEPAC does not accept a common EIS approach wherein the level of protection for the natural feature afforded by the current land use may be low and consequently the proposed land use assumes that they must provide only this same level of low protection. Current poor protection does not justify continued poor protection.

10) EIS states that in some locations the buffer will be from 15 to 25 m wide (p. 35). This statement is in clear conflict with Figure 4 where the buffer is clearly shown as 10m. One can only assume that the EIS is considering any turf area between the buffer and the building as part of the functional buffer. This consideration is flawed and reflects a poor level of respect for
the need and function of an ecological buffer. The EIS is incomplete while it contains directly conflicting statements and mapping as to the width of the buffer.

11) EIS proposes to screen the view of the commercial development from view of users of Park Farm and Meadowlily ESA via planting along the north boundary of the CCL site. The degree of proposed planting is insufficient to accomplish the goal of visual screening.

Buffer to Recreation Lands

12) The North/South hedgerow should be completely outside the proposed development envelope. The existing, and eventually enhanced, hedgerow is a highly desirable visual buffer between the outdoor recreation areas and the proposed commercial development.

Storm Water

13) EIS fails to explain, even at summary level, how storm water run-off will be controlled for quantity and quality (e.g. sediment loading). Although this may be more fully addressed in a separate report, it is within the scope of an EIS to provide assurance and description of how storm water impacts will be mitigated. The EIS is incomplete without this information and should not be accepted by the City.

Groundwater Infiltration

14) EIS admits there will be a change to groundwater flows but fails to provide any mitigating measures. EEPC is concerned that water infiltration in the existing agricultural field may be supplying the ESA with groundwater or seepage which will be destroyed by the proposed development.

Geotechnical Setback

15) EIS lacks any discussion of any necessary geotechnical setback in the northwest corner of the subject site where multiple drainage features exist and there is a water channel just inside the ESA.

Birds of Conservation Priority

16) EIS fails to identify which observed birds are of conservation priority, which level of priority and what type (i.e. forest, marsh, open country); without this the EIS should be considered incomplete.

Rarity of Reptiles and Butterflies

17) EIS fails to identify the rarity (G Rank and S Rank) of the observed reptiles and butterflies.

18) EIS fails to examine what impacts, if any, there will be on identified reptiles and butterflies.

Use of Heavy Equipment / Soil Compaction (Table 8)

19) EIS states a construction fence will be erected at the dripline. This is insufficient protection for the trees during construction. The fence must be posted at outer edge of buffer to prevent soil compaction within the buffer.

Lowering or Raising Soil Grade (Table 8)

20) EIS states that no grade alteration will occur within the staked tree dripline. This prohibition must be extended to the entire width of the proposed buffer. The very nature of the first 10m of a buffer is to fully protect the active and fine root system of existing trees. Any change in grade within the buffer will adversely affect the ESA.

Construction Dust

21) With the subject site currently being an active agricultural field, there is the possibility that construction dust blown off-site (with possible receptors being neighbouring residences, ESA, Park Farm and the recreation fields) may contain agricultural chemicals, including pesticides. The EIS fails to address this possible impact.

Noise

22) EIS fails to consider noise impacts from the ongoing operation of the proposed development. Noise is defined as "any human sound that alters the behavior of animals or interferes with their functioning". The level of disturbance may be qualified as damage (harming
health, reproduction, survivorship, habitat use, distribution, abundance or genetic distribution) or disturbance (causing a detectable change in behavior). Recent studies have suggested that noise may have a significant and wide-ranging effect at least on some species. Because of the pervasive nature and difficulty in mitigating noise, it may be the most significant factor impacting wildlife. By its very nature, the development will be active and busy many hours of the day and noise impacts will certainly be generated. EIS fails to consider these impacts on both wildlife and on human users of the ESA and Park Farm.

Salt Damage (p31)
23) Impact of salt content in storm water directed to woodland is not considered.

Litter (p34)
24) Identified mitigation measures do not adequately mitigate expected high degree of litter impact and have no likelihood of enforcement.
25) Proponent should be made explicitly responsible for regularly cleaning litter from ESA edge which abuts the subject property.

Landscaping Trees
26) All trees installed as finishing landscaping should be shade trees and not ornamental which never provide any degree of shade.
27) The grassed area between the parking lot north of Building A and the northern subject site boundary should be a minimum 2m wide to facilitate the long term health and vigour of planted shade trees.

Summary of Field Studies (Table 1)
28) The proponent is commended and thanked for providing a clear and complete summary of all field visits and studies conducted.
29) This table format should become a minimum standard EIS requirement for the City of London.”

London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH)
“The LACH expressed concern with the steep incline as any runoffs or spills would impact the Meadowlily woodlot.”

Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
“The TAC indicated that the proposed development on 168 Meadowlily Road South should not impede traffic flow along Commissioners Road, noting that development would permit a full widening of Commissioners Road, including turning lanes and signalization, and, further, that entrances should be located consistent with the Access Management Guidelines.”

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH)
“Based on the nature of this application, the following policies of the PPS are applicable in this case. Also, be advised that there may be other policies of the PPS that may be applicable, as the PPS must be read in its entirety.

Section 1.1.3 of the PPS states that settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted. Further, Section 1.1.3.3. of the PPS directs planning authorities to identify and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. Further, Section 1.1.3.7 states that new development taking place in designated growth areas shall occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities. Care must also be taken to ensure that, in accordance with the policies of Section 1.6.4 of the PPS, there is adequate sewage treatment and water supply available for the proposed development.

Based on the City of London’s Official Plan, we understand that the subject site is partially located within and adjacent to an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). Further, we note that we are not aware of the specific details for this ESA. As such, we note that Section 2.1.1 states natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term. Further, Section 2.1.2 states the diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas.
surface water features and ground water features.

Section 2.1.3 of the PPS states development and site alteration shall not be permitted in a) significant habitat of endangered species and threatened species; b) significant wetlands; and c) significant coastal wetlands. Further, Section 2.1.4 of the PPS states development and site alteration shall not be permitted in: b) significant woodlands; c) significant valleylands; d) significant wildlife habitat; and e) significant areas of natural and scientific interest unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

Section 2.1.6 states that development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policy 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.

As MAH staff are not aware of the specific details for the ESA, we note that the City should confirm the ESA characteristics and if necessary in accordance with the policies above require the completion of an EIS to determine whether no negative impact can be demonstrated as a result of the proposed development and site alteration."

Urban League of London

"...While currently zoned 'Urban Reserve - Community Growth', we do not believe the Associated Shopping Area designation is an appropriate use for this site.

While the Urban League recognizes that some form of development will most likely occur on this site in the future, the scale of the proposed development would have adverse impacts on residential, traffic and ecological features in direct proximity to the site. Additionally, background documents on market analysis for commercial development demonstrate a vulnerability of existing proximal commercial centres (specifically the Pond Mills Centre) to the proposed development. Planning staff have repeatedly indicated that there is a surplus of available commercial/retail space in London and the proponent has not adequately indicated why the use of such space is not acceptable for this development.

A review of the Environmental Impact Study prepared for the site indicates marked pressures and impacts due to litter, parking lot lighting, and stormwater management, for example, would be placed on the adjacent Meadowlilly ESA as a result of the scale of the proposed development.

Ultimately, it is our opinion that a smaller scale, perhaps residential development, might be better suited for the site in question, having lower impact commercially and environmentally within the region. We would therefore request that the application for rezoning and amendment of the Official Plan not be granted for land use in the proposed context.

As an additional matter of administration, the Urban League is also concerned about the timing of the request for public input on this file. Being such a potentially contentious application, it would have been more appropriate for the City to follow its convention of not seeking public input during the summer months but rather wait until autumn when public participation and engagement are more successful and robust."

McIlwraith Field Naturalists of London

The McIlwraith Field Naturalists of London (MFN) do not support the application by Ivan and Anna Kovac and Louisa Golf to have the zoning of land at 168 Meadowlilly Road South changed from Urban Reserve - Community Growth to Associated Shopping Area Commercial. The MFN would prefer to see this parcel of land at the northeast comer of Commissioners Road and Meadowlilly Road rezoned as Open Space in order to give maximum protection to the sensitive natural heritage features of the Meadowlilly Woods ESA. The MFN do not consider this land to be an appropriate site for a retail commercial development of 25,500 square metres by Smart Centres, and especially one that could see development of a huge Walmart store there.

The MFN's reasons are the following:
1. The property in question lies immediately south of an Environmentally Significant Area,
Meadowlily Woods, and the Park Farm property. Buffer zones are essential around ESA's to protect them from such adverse impacts as construction noise, alteration of existing drainage patterns that could affect vegetation in the ESA, contaminated and excessive water run-off, garbage, abuse by humans, heavy traffic, noise and light pollution that disturbs wildlife, and other detrimental effects of large commercial developments. A large retail commercial development would not permit a large enough buffer zone to truly protect the ESA from these impacts.

2. The slope of the land towards the Thames River is of concern, because it would be hard to control contaminating water run-off into the ESA from a large commercial development during and after heavy rains and major snowfalls.

3. Schedule B1 of London's Official Plan Review, 2007, defines the conceptual areas of "Big Picture" Meta-Cores and Meta-Corridors with cross-hatching, and the property in question falls partly within a Meta-Corridor of the South Thames River. Although the "Big Picture" concept is not a component of London’s Natural Heritage System, and policies for land use and development will be guided by the designations on Schedule A (Land Use), the MFN would like to see the City adhering to the statement in the Official Plan Review (15.4.12 Carolinian Canada Big Picture Concept) that "naturalization projects and landowner stewardship initiatives that support the "Big Picture" system of core natural areas and corridor connections will be encouraged by the City of London." A large retail commercial development adjacent to an ESA and Meta-Corridor can hardly be considered environmentally acceptable.

4. If there is to be any development under the current zoning of Urban Reserve – Community Growth, it should be restricted to small buildings, such as clinics, that have a small environmental footprint and would not threaten the ecological integrity of Meadowlily Woods ESA.

5. A more thorough Environmental Impact Study, carried out by a consultant who is independent of London's developers, is required before any land use is permitted.

**PUBLIC LIAISON:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On November 21, 2007, 72 public notices were sent to landowners within 120 metres of the property. Living in the City notice was provided on Saturday, November 24, 2007 in the London Free Press.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72 replies received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of Liaison:** The proposed amendments would permit the development of 25,500 square metres (275,000 square feet) of retail commercial floor space, comprised of an anchor retail store of approximately 20,000 square metres (215,000 square feet) and five smaller buildings with a total of 5,500 square metres (60,000 square feet) of retail and service commercial space.

Change the Official Plan land use designation from "Urban Reserve – Community Growth" to "Associated Shopping Area Commercial".

Change the Zoning By-law Z-1 from a Holding Urban Reserve (h-2"UR") Zone which permits existing uses to an Associated Shopping Area Commercial Special Provision (ASAB( ) Zone which permits a wide range of retail, commercial and service uses, such as (but not limited to) convenience service establishments, dry cleaning and laundry plants, financial institutions, grocery stores, restaurants, retail store, pharmacies, and service and repair establishments, with a special provision to permit a maximum of 25,500 square metres of retail commercial floor space on the site.
Responses: Several major issues were raised:

1. Natural Heritage/Proximity to ESA/Stormwater Management – impact on ESA, Thames River, Thames River Significant corridor – impact on wildlife, flora, fauna; potential for runoff/garbage/debris to enter the ESA, minimum buffers required more than 10 metres, EIS should be rejected

2. Built Heritage/Park Farm/Archaeology – interface with Park Farm needs to be addressed, area has potential for archaeological finds, where are studies?, area should be designated as a heritage conservation district, cultural significance

3. Commercial – vacancies in the area, existing commercial directly adjacent, should locate on existing and pre-designated/pre-zoned lands, not continue urban sprawl, existing commercial in area not doing well, many vacancies in the area, this use should locate in vacant area at Pond Mills and Commissioners

4. Better uses – parkland/open space, this is prime agricultural land, should stay as such, community facilities, better used for residential

5. Impacts on exiting residential - decreased property values, light, noise, odour, dust, litter issues, sewer installation paid for by applicant for six homes on Meadowlily Road

6. Traffic – will impact residents, ESA, safety concerns with respect to pedestrian traffic, no access should be permitted onto Meadowlily Road, Meadowlily has no sidewalks; noise, dust, lighting from commercial use will affect residents and ESA

7. Wal-Mart – bad corporate citizen, destroys communities, degrades the environment, provides low paying jobs

ANALYSIS

Subject Site

The subject site is located on the northeast corner of Meadowlily Road and Commissioners Road East. The site is surrounded by the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area to the north, the City Wide Sports Park to the east, existing single detached residential to the west and a large format retail centre of approximately 33,000 square metres to the south. The subject site is located approximately 250 metres from the Highbury Avenue Interchange. Commissioners Road East is an arterial road with an annual average daily traffic volume of 13,000 vehicles. Meadowlily Road is an unimproved local road.

Figure 1 – Meadowlily/Commissioners Intersection
Figure 2 – looking north into the site from Commissioners

Figure 3 – Meadowville/Commissioners Intersection looking northeast

Figure 4 – looking into the site from Meadowville
Figure 5 – looking west into the site from sports park

Figure 6 – Aerial view
What is the nature of the application?
The applicants, Ivan and Ann Kovac, and Louisa Golf, through Commissioners Centre Limited (CCL), the agent, have applied for an Official Plan Amendment that would redesignate the site to an Associated Shopping Area Commercial designation, and a Zoning By-law Amendment to an Associated Shopping Area Commercial (ASA) Zone, with a special provision to permit a maximum of 25,500 square metres of retail commercial floor space on the site.

The proposed amendments would permit the development of 25,500 square metres (275,000 square feet) of retail commercial floor space, comprised of an anchor retail store of approximately 20,000 square metres (215,000 square feet) and five smaller buildings with a total of 5,500 square metres (60,000 square feet) of retail and service commercial space.

CCL has also submitted an application to purchase a portion of the non-travelled Baseline Road allowance, which is located to the north of the subject site.

The applicant has submitted the following studies to support their application:
- Planning and Design Report - GSP - November 2007
- Environmental Impact Study - Dillon Consulting Limited - July 2008
- Commissioners Road Retail Transportation Study - iTrans - November 2007
- Commissioners Road Retail Transportation Study Update - iTrans - July 2008
- Southeast Market Demand and Impact Analysis - Malone Given Parsons Ltd. - November 2007
- Southeast Market Demand and Impact Analysis Peer Review - urbanMetrics inc. - March 2008
- Response to Southeast Market Demand and Impact Analysis Peer Review - Malone Given Parsons Ltd. - July 2008

The applicant has also submitted a conceptual site plan, included in the Planning and Design report, to demonstrate how they envision the property to develop.

Process to date
The application for Official Plan and zoning by-law was received in September, 2007. Since that time, several community meetings have been held with neighbourhood residents, and with interested individuals in the community.

Planning Staff recommend proceeding with the public participation component, so that Council can hear the public concerns raised to date. Comments received to date have been summarized and included in this report. Stakeholder concerns have also been included, and correspondence received is attached.

Outstanding issues
The following is a summary of the prevalent issues raised through the circulation process. This is by no means a compete list of issues that have been raised thus far.

a) Urban Reserve Community Growth
The subject site is currently designated "Urban Reserve, Community Growth" on Schedule "A" of the Official Plan. The Urban Reserve Community Growth designations "are intended to provide a general indication of the mix of urban land uses proposed for the area. Community Growth areas will be composed of predominantly residential uses but will include commercial, institutional, and open space uses that are supportive of the community as well as provide employment opportunities in a community setting." The preferred approach to planning areas designated "Urban Reserve" is through the Area Study process as described in Section 19.2. Council may, however, review and adopt site specific Official Plan Amendments for lands designated "Urban Reserve" provided it does not negatively affect the community planning process on surrounding lands. As stated within policy, Urban Reserve designations will predominately be comprised of residential land uses, with supportive additional land uses, such
as commercial, being adopted to support the community.

This application does not demonstrate how residential uses can also be integrated into this area, nor has it demonstrated how residential can still be the predominant land use.

Without the benefit of a more comprehensive analysis which takes into consideration lands on the west side of Meadowlily as well, the allowance for commercial at this location will set a precedent for further commercial uses along Commissioners to the west of this site. In order to ensure an appropriate mix of residential (the predominant land use) and ancillary uses, a coordinated review of all of the lands designated Urban Reserve east of Highbury and surrounding Meadowlily Road South should be undertaken. Commercial uses could possibly be an appropriate land use within the Urban Reserve designation, but a coordinated review is needed that looks at all the lands, the appropriate mix of land designations, and the need for and size of commercial node. As well, a coordinated approach can also look at adjacent environmental features, determine possible impacts and potential buffers, other possible land uses, coordinate servicing, transportation and access, and identify issues that will need to be addressed for future land use applications. Provincial Policy specifically supports this, as is detailed in Section 1.1.3.7 - "new development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities". The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) also encourages "promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term, accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential, employment (including industrial, commercial and institutional uses), recreational and open space uses to meet long-term needs, avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns, promoting cost-effective development standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs, and improving accessibility for persons with disabilities and the elderly by removing and/or preventing land use barriers which restrict their full participation in society, ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs" (Section 1.1.1.). The PPS has many policies that speak to the coordination of lands, servicing, and development that efficiently uses land and resources, provides for compact urban form, and encourages transit efficiency and pedestrian friendly design (Section 1.1.3.2-1.1.3.4, 1.8.1.) A coordinated approach to development in this area is necessary in order to meet provincial policy.

b) Environmental Impact Study
To date, the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has not been fully accepted by Parks Planning. The EIS, prepared by Dillon Consulting Ltd., has presented a detailed discussion of potential impacts and proposed mitigation to minimize impacts of a commercial development proposal for the subject lands. Staff are satisfied that the installation of a wider hedgerow along the east-west edge adjacent to Park Farm will address impacts in this area. However, staff are not satisfied with the level of information provided for the northwest corner of the site as significant impacts to this portion of the ESA may occur due to cut and fill requirements, and required storm water runoff control measures. A 10 metre vegetation buffer may not be sufficient to deal with issues without the requirement for installing 'hard' erosion control measures and outlet structures within the ravine portion of the ESA.

The Provincial Policy Statement, Section 2.1.1 states "natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term", and further, Section 2.1.2 states "the diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features". Lastly, Section 2.1.6 states "Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions". The EIS has not demonstrated that there will be no impact to the existing ESA. It is therefore recommended that the design for stormwater control be fully developed prior to the approval of the EIS in order to demonstrate no negative impact on the features and functions of the ESA. Additional effort should also be focussed on addressing the
unresolved issues of noise and light pollution on the ESA lands, and mitigation measures should be developed to address the possible impacts.

c) Traffic
A traffic study was conducted by iTans, with a subsequent revision to this traffic study provided in July, 2008. The Transportation Division has provided comment on both studies. The applicant is proposing a full signalized access point midway between Meadowlily Road and Meadowgate Boulevard. This change in access type has a major impact in the analysis particularly in determining the extent, timing and type of infrastructure required to accommodate development, which have not been adequately addressed by the studies. As well, insufficient information has been given with respect to the possibility of parallel left turn lanes (back to back left turn lanes) along Commissioners Road between Meadowlily Road and the easterly ramp to Highbury Avenue in place of constructing a new ramp, and with respect to the distribution of left turning traffic between the Meadowlily Road access and the first access to the east. Transportation Division has noted that a new ramp onto Highbury Avenue with a reconfiguration of turn lanes on Commissioners Road would provide for better long term service of motorists travelling through this area and is the preferred option. No traffic signal warrant analysis was included to justify additional signalization. The impacts and cost associated with additional signalization were not discussed. Holding provisions have been requested until appropriate agreements have been reached to accommodate concerns regarding access and infrastructure. An access via Meadowlily Road is also proposed, which will have an adverse impact on neighbouring residents and will increase traffic flows along Meadowlily Road. Overall, it has not been demonstrated how this proposed development will not result in adverse traffic impacts.

d) Urban Design and Green Initiatives
A review of design was completed, and Staff concluded that the information and proposed concept plan provided by the applicants does not adequately address the integration of the site within the broader community (or regional context), both existing and future. Further consideration should be given to creating built form elements, and creating active frontages along Commissioners Road and the City Park. Consistent with the PPS, the development should strive to achieve a transit oriented, pedestrian friendly design, and focus on mixed uses and compact urban form. Staff and the applicant should also work towards incorporating green initiatives into the overall development, as supported by Provincial policy.

e) Park Farm, Archaeology, Interface with Built Heritage
The subject site is adjacent to the Meadowlily Woods ESA, which also encompasses Park Farm, a built heritage and cultural heritage site, designed under the Ontario Heritage Act. Many individuals have commented that this parcel would be better suited for Open Space uses, and that the site should integrate and take into consideration the interface with Park Farm, as per the PPS policies. As well, archaeological studies have not been submitted, and are required for this application.

Next steps
The agent for the applicants has asked for a deferral, and have provided terms of reference, as attached. The terms of reference will help to establish general land uses and street network as well as urban design and built form considerations to support a City-initiated Official Plan Amendment. This concept study and guidelines will also provide direction for more detailed studies to be undertaken at the time of site specific development applications for lands on the west side of Meadowlily Road.

It is intended that this will be a scoped study and will not be undertaken to the same level of analysis as a typical Area Plan study undertaken in other larger communities in London. It is intended that this study will be undertaken in a short timeframe using a combination of existing information and data, site visits, and material and studies produced for the Commissioners Centres application.

Staff ask that Council consider allowing the deferral to provide the opportunity to work on a broader concept study and guideline, with the intention of reporting back with recommendations on land use designations in January, 2009. A second public meeting should occur at that time to consider the concept plan, guidelines and Commissioners Centres application.
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The following studies, reports and documents were used in the evaluation of the application:

Provincial Policy Statement - 2005
City of London Official Plan - 1989
City of London Zoning By-law Z.-1 - 1993
City of London – Commercial Urban Design Guidelines – November 1999
Planning and Design Report - GSP - November 2007
Environmental Impact Study - Dillon Consulting Limited - July 2008
Commissioners Road Retail Transportation Study - iTrans - November 2007
Commissioners Road Retail Transportation Study Update - iTrans - July 2008
Functional Servicing Report - Dillon Consulting Limited - November 2007
Southeast Market Demand and Impact Analysis - Malone Given Parsons Ltd. - November 2007
Southeast Market Demand and Impact Analysis Peer Review - urbanMetrics inc. - March 2008
Response to Southeast Market Demand and Impact Analysis Peer Review - Malone Given Parsons Ltd. - July 2008
Proposed Draft Terms of Reference
Meadowlily Area Study
September 12, 2008

City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
P.O. Box 5035
London, ON N6A 4L9

Attention: John Fleming, MCIP, RPP
Implementation Manager

Dear Mr. Fleming:

Re: Commissioners Centre Ltd.
Meadowlily Concept Plan & Guidelines

Further to our recent meeting, this letter outlines a draft Terms of Reference for a neighbourhood study to address land use and urban design matters for land currently designated "Urban Reserve" in the Official Plan on the north side of Commissioners Road in the vicinity of Meadowlily Road.

The intent of this study is to establish a plan for general land uses and street network as well as urban design and built form considerations to support a City-initiated Official Plan Amendment. This neighbourhood study will also provide direction for more detailed studies to be undertaken at the time of site specific development applications for lands on the west side of Meadowlily Road.

The study will provide a context for the consideration of an application for a large commercial development on the northeast corner of Meadowlily Road and Commissioners Road.

It is intended that this will be a scoped neighbourhood study and will not be undertaken to the same level of analysis as a typical Area Plan study undertaken in other larger communities in London. It is intended that this study will be undertaken in a short timeframe using a combination of existing information and data, site visits, material and studies produced for the Commissioners Centres application as well as charrettes and workshops with senior City staff members. It should also be understood that Commissioner Centre has filed applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment in order to develop a community shopping centre of approximately...
275,000 sq.ft. on the north side of Commissioners Road. This study will explore opportunities for various land use mixes and intensities on the Urban Reserve lands, understanding the broader context of the mix within the Highbury Avenue/Commissioners Road node. Given the limited scope of this study, it is anticipated that public consultation will also be limited to one open house and public meeting in which development concepts for the area are presented and explained, and public input is obtained. Throughout the study, consideration of the context of the adjacent Meadowlily natural heritage features will be recognized. The following sections outline the general scope of work to be undertaken by the Commissioners Centres project team in conjunction with City staff.

**Goals, Objectives, and Vision**

- Establish a vision for the area by exploring opportunities for various land use mixes and intensities on the Urban Reserve lands in relation to the broader context and mix within the Highbury Avenue/Commissioners Road node, the adjacent Meadowlily natural heritage area and Park Farm.

**Urban Design and Sustainability Principles**

- Prepare urban design brief to implement the neighbourhood concept plan having regard to:
  - Built form
  - Land uses
  - Building heights
  - Circulation system
  - Parks and Open space network
  - Architectural design

- Identify sustainability objectives and implementation techniques to be considered in the development applications and detailed design for the neighbourhood.

- Integrating transit with the movements of people and vehicles, public open space and land uses within the neighbourhood.

- Vision for the area overall.

**Natural Heritage**

- Prepare an inventory of existing natural heritage features based on work undertaken in previous City studies, Official Plan designations and zoning regulations, conservation authority databases, air photo interpretation and recent Commissioners Centres studies in the area.

- Where access is permitted, conduct a site visit to identify general limits of natural areas to be maintained with an understanding that limits will be refined through more detailed study in the future in conjunction with development applications.

- Prepare an opportunities and constraints assessment which includes identifying areas of enhancement, possible buffers and relationships to the Meadowlily Park Farm area.

- Prepare mapping of the open space and natural features including linkages between various components.

- Develop sustainability objectives relating to the form of future development and relationships to the natural heritage corridor.
Cultural Heritage and Recreational Environment

- Identify archaeological and cultural resources based on a review of available information and identify areas where more detailed study will be required in conjunction with future development applications.
- Review existing City plans for Park Farm, and identify opportunities for linkages and integration with future land uses.
- Identify existing and planned area recreational resources and anticipated park land requirements for the study area and provide for integration into the concept plan and possible linkages to the surrounding area.

Servicing Study

- Compile topographic mapping and review current servicing systems.
- In conjunction with concept development, prepare conceptual sanitary sewer routing and as necessary pumping facilities, and conceptual water service routing.

Drainage and Stormwater Management

- Review and prepare background topographic mapping, aerial photography and soils information. This will be based on existing available information and mapping.
- Review previous drainage and stormwater management studies for the area. Prepare mapping of subcatchment areas and possible stormwater management locations.
- Consider range of stormwater management techniques which could be implemented through development in the area.

Transportation Study

- Review existing transportation and traffic data available from the City and the Commissioners Centre traffic impact study.
- Prepare conceptual alignment for Highbury Road interchange.
- Prepare conceptual designs for internal collector and local street network in conjunction with the development of land use concept plans.
- Review LTC transit requirements and design criteria to facilitate transit services.
- Review opportunities for cycling and pedestrian routes at a neighbourhood and community scale.
- Identify possible roadway improvements required at accommodate neighbourhood development.

Alternative Land Use Concepts

- Prepare a general urban structure plan for the neighbourhood which considers natural features, movement systems and linkages, servicing strategies, natural heritage interfaces, sustainability objectives and a desire to create a community focal point/node in the vicinity of Highbury Avenue and Meadowlily Road.
- Prepare neighbourhood development objectives and principles based on Provincial and local policies and the City's place-making study.
- Prepare several development concepts for the neighbourhood in a charrette setting.
- Present development concepts to a public open house and/or public meeting to obtain feedback from agencies and public.
Select a preferred neighbourhood concept based on Official plan policies, inputs received and development objectives.

Implementation Strategy

Prepare a general implementation program identifying further studies, application requirements and capital improvements for incorporation into an official plan amendment.

It is anticipated that the majority of the planning and design work will be undertaken by the Commissioners Centre project team in conjunction with City staff. A Working Committee consisting of representatives from the Planning and Development Department, Environmental and Engineering Services Department and the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority would be established to provide project direction and will be the basis of the charrette and workshop group.

It is anticipated the project would begin in early October 2008 and be completed in January 2009.

Following your review of this draft Terms of Reference, please call and we can discuss moving forward with this project.

Yours truly,

GSP GROUP INC.

Glenn Schenk, MEng, P.Eng.

c.e. Mr. P. Nikolakakos - Commissioners Centres Ltd.
    Mr. G. Scully - Commissioners Centres Ltd.
    Mr. E. Sauselleja - GSP Group Inc.
    Mr. R. Panzer - City of London.
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Responses to Public Liaison Letter and Publication in “Living in the City”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Stolarski</td>
<td>Anita Caveney, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kintail Crescent</td>
<td>Mcllwraith Field Naturalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also written)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Allingham</td>
<td>Judy Melvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Meadowlily Road South</td>
<td>171 Meadowlily Road North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Melvin</td>
<td>Joshua Hurwitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 Meadowlily Road North</td>
<td>2-487 Richmond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Hurwitz</td>
<td>Andrew Stolarski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-487 Richmond Street</td>
<td>1140 Pond View Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Stolarski</td>
<td>Summerside Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140 Pond View Road</td>
<td>Carl &amp; Heather Lokko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135 Meadowlily Road South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl &amp; Heather Lokko</td>
<td>Alan Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Meadowlily Road South</td>
<td>On behalf of Loblaws Properties Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Patton</td>
<td>1512-140 Fullarton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On behalf of Loblaws Properties Limited</td>
<td>146-2025 Meadowgate Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Lukianow</td>
<td>Gary Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-2025 Meadowgate Boulevard</td>
<td>141 Meadowlily Road South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Smith</td>
<td>Mark &amp; Tricia Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Meadowlily Road South</td>
<td>Mike &amp; Trish Grieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Tricia Sweeney</td>
<td>Rik &amp; Michelle Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Trish Grieve</td>
<td>Laurie Dunbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rik &amp; Michelle Woods</td>
<td>Andrew Stolarski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Dunbar</td>
<td>1140 Pond View Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Stolarski</td>
<td>Kaela Stradiotto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140 Pond View Road</td>
<td>Barbara Barclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaela Stradiotto</td>
<td>93 Sackville Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Barclay</td>
<td>Lynda Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Sackville Street</td>
<td>6 Eula White Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Holmes</td>
<td>Florence Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Eula White Place</td>
<td>165-2025 Meadowgate Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shawn Lewis
67 Trapper Street

Greg Thorn
512 Maitland Street

Keith E. Risler
5-192 Elmwood Avenue East

Kevin & Kathleen Lomack

Cory Morningstar

Michael G. Peck
1396 Reardon Boulevard

Dan Hammond
671 Ridgeview Drive

Peter Meisenheimer
127 Hale Street

Louise Graham

Betty Taylor
246-2025 Meadowgate Boulevard

Gordon Leffey
11-1199 Reardon Boulevard

Michael Hurley

Alice Gibb

Nancy Manners
110-159 Sandringham Crt.

Emily Furfman

Fred Lukianow
146-2025 Meadowgate Boulevard

Patricia Mockler
233 Estella Road
As a result of a recent meeting on September 4, 2008 as requested by the representatives of Smart Centres and with residents and family members of Meadowlily Road South, the residents and families of the area would like to raise the following objection to Smart Centre’s plan to develop 168 Meadowlily Road South into a large commercial development:

In the proposed plan for the site, Smart Centre’s plans to have a driveway opening onto Meadowlily Road South that will increase the traffic on our street dramatically and even astronomically by some estimates! This does not even include such considerations as delivery vehicle traffic (diesel pollution) to such an area! We have tried on three occasions to raise our objection to the developer that we think that this will lower the quality of life for the residents of our street, lower the level of safety for our children and residents due to the increased traffic and endanger the health of the people who live here due to increased car and vehicle emissions (see Ontario Planners’ Institute document, Healthy Communities, Sustainable Communities, 2007) and other environmental impact due to such an increase onto a residential area. We, the residents of Meadowlily Road South, are working people, retired people, seniors, children and youth, and we appeal to the Planning Committee of the City of London and its mayor to not allow this entrance onto our street keeping in mind these concerns regarding the environment, safety, health and quality of life of Meadowlily Road South.

Our area has been in existence since the days of settlement in the London-Middlesex corridor and it has a special environmental, historical and social character and significance that we feel is worth maintaining as it has been since 1848 with the building of Park Farm and subsequently with the formation of our neighbourhood as it presently exists for more than sixty-five years.

We appeal to the City of London and its council to not allow and reject the rezoning of this significant natural area and to not allow this incursion onto Meadowlily Road South.

Submitted by the Residents and Family Members of Meadowlily Road South:

Gary Smith & Susan High
Carl and Heather Lokko
Dorothy Stolarski
Andrew Stolarski

Forward to: Nancy Pasato, Planning Committee, City of London
Anne Marie DeCicco-Best, Mayor, City of London
September 10, 2008

City of London
Planning Division, 6th Floor, City Hall
P.O. Box 5135, 300 Dufferin Ave.
London, Ont, N6A 4L9

Attention: Nancy Pasuto

RE: Notice of Application to Amend Zoning OZ-7430 – Ian and Ann Kovac, 188 Meadowlily Road South

Thank you for receiving my letter. I have two general concerns with the proposed zoning change: the impact on the environmentally sensitive area and the impact on existing shopping complexes. I have no expertise in either field but speak as a concerned resident of this area in London.

Impact on the Environmentally Sensitive Area

The final report – July 18th, 2008 by Dillon Consulting has done a good job of trying to establish a baseline from which to measure the impact of the proposal. However, I believe this is fundamentally, the wrong approach for the city to follow. Dillon have pointed out there is already signs of environmental stress in the area to the north of the proposed site. If we are only to preserve the status quo for the area, it may result in the eventual loss of this natural area that has been set aside for preservation. I believe it is essential for the city to look at what is needed to ensure sustainability of this area. Any zoning change must be measured against the standards of what it will take to ensure long term viability.

As a professional myself, I am hopeful that London can attract and build its high tech industries. A high percentage of the Engineers and other professionals that I have worked with around the world, have chosen their locations based on lifestyle choices. We cannot have high tech industrial development if we cannot attract the workforce and we need to be diligent, not only to maintain, but to build up the natural areas that have been set aside such as the area to the north of this proposed site.

There is a plethora of documentation and I neither had the time or expertise to evaluate but even a casual review of the Dillon report leaves me with many questions such as:

- The increased salinity of the run-off water. I am concerned that the studies quoted are misapplied for this case. The development is removing the buffer area between the road and ESA and the run-off from the parking areas will have significantly increased salts which they will take through the ESA to the river system. The study did not indicate what effect this will have.
- The plan ensures the run-off rates are limited to the 100 year event. First, we are seeing many areas where the frequency of major storms is increasing so previous frequencies are not a good indication. Should such an event occur, I am concerned with the proposed development, the results will be much more catastrophic once the catch basin limits are reached as opposed to having more natural absorbents. This might be an acceptable risk if the area in question, was not an ESA.
• High volumes of people will mean higher volumes of litter. Dillon's key suggestion for mitigation depends on the diligence of future maintenance staff. And this is only to mitigate. There will be significantly more litter inherent in this type of development.

Although the proposal indicates the steps it will do to mitigate the negative impacts, this seems to contradict the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 – Section 2.1.6 which as stated in the Planning and Design Report says: "...development shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the identified natural heritage features and areas unless an evaluation has been completed that their be no negative impacts" It is hard to believe there will be no negative impacts.

**Impact on the Existing Shopping Centres**

The Planning and Design Report as part of this proposal states the "Existing supermarket, department store, and non-department store DSTM stores are operating at healthy sales levels..." There is a high vacancy in both the Pond Mills Shopping area and the strip mall to the west. The graffiti on the one building is disgraceful. I do not need to be an expert to recognize the local retail environment in general is not healthy in this area. The local Hardware store in the Pond Mills Mall closed when the larger Rona lumber store moved into the neighborhood.

A continuation of this type of planning with the current proposal will see more empty spaces in the existing shopping facilities and this is not only aesthetically unpleasing, it is not good for the area. The grocery store was struggling to survive for years and was closed for 6 months recently when Food Basics came in. Although Food Basics business appears to be stable, is obvious that a Wall Mart in the area will hurt their business.

It would be nice to see research which confirms or denies the comments in general circulation that indicate the addition of a Wall Mart has caused the closing of local grocery stores without lowering the overall cost of groceries. Whether or not Wall Mart will continue to deliver lower prices overall on the select items it carries, Wall Mart is not a complete grocery store. A complete grocery store is key for this area as many residents in the proximity of Food Basics walk to shop and are not in a position to travel easily which will raise the overall cost of their groceries – some of the people who can least afford this.

Likewise the MGP report on the Retail Market Demand and Impact Analysis was intended to "...evaluate whether the development will compromise the planned function of existing commercial areas in the surrounding area". Clearly, in my mind, there will be a negative impact to the existing malls which are currently struggling. To build another shopping complex in such a close proximity will add to the already vacant retail spaces which in some cases are marked by graffiti and an eyesore to the neighborhood. This is not good for the neighborhood and city council should not be changing the zoning to accommodate this proposal. As a concerned resident of the neighborhood, I ask that you put a stop to this development.

Sincerely,

Gary Longhurst, P.Eng.
Ms. Nancy Pasato
Planning Division, Planning and Development
City of London
300 Dufferin Ave. P.O. Box 5035
London, ON N6A 4L9


Re: Development Application OZ-7430 - 168 Meadowlily Road South

Dear Ms. Pasato:

I am writing as a concerned resident of London and also as a concerned biologist, regarding the development proposed by Commissioners Centres Limited at 168 Meadowlily Woods Road South. My wife and two young boys and I have enjoyed many outings to Meadowlily Woods ESA, as well as the trails on the North side of the Thames River East of the Meadowlily Road footbridge. I work at the University of Western Ontario as a professor of biology and my research area is the impact of disturbance on the diversity of soil fungi. I have a background as a naturalist, nurtured here in London as a young member of the McIlwraith Field Naturalists, which led to a position as a summer naturalist in Algonquin Park, and to my interests in field biology that took me through degrees in Landscape Architecture, a Master of Science in Environmental Biology (both at the University of Guelph), and a PhD in Botany (University of Toronto). For six years at Western, I taught Environmental Biology (Bio 285b), which presents the biological basis of world and regional environmental issues. Therefore, I have considerable background on the intersection of urban and regional planning and biology.

My concern as a London resident is that such a marvelous natural recreation area should not be lost to or threatened by an unnecessary shopping development. London clearly has excess retail capacity, evident to any sensible person, despite what two market strategy reports have to say to the contrary. There is no need for another Walmart in the southeast end of London, since there are already two within easy driving distance - one at White Oaks Mall and one at Argyle Mall. Again, although the market consultants were not concerned at Walmart's apparent decision to put their existing stores at risk with this new development, I think that the City should be very concerned. There are many opportunities in London for revitalization developments of under-occupied or under-utilized commercial areas - notably the Galleria, the Huron/Highbury mall complex and the nearby Pond Mills Square. These should be developed for commercial retail space ahead of precious green space.
My concern as a biologist is for the well being of the very special natural area designated as the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area. Note that I did not say "protected as the Meadowlily Woods ESA." Many examples worldwide, including the Sifton Bog ESA right here in London, show us that designating a green spot on the map as a conservation reserve of some kind does not provide protection to that area from the development and pollution of the surrounding areas. In the early 1970s, I learned from my geography classes in A.B. Lucas High School that planning in the City of London was backward, and that we had not learned from the lessons of urban sprawl that developed in U.S. cities since the 1940s; it seems we still have not. I learned about "CCB" conceptual planning — cores, corridors, and buffer zones. It does seem that City planners had this in mind when they designated the area affected by this proposal "h-2", with the requirement that any proposed development be appropriate for the adjacent natural area. However, the proposed development at 168 Meadowlily Woods Road is not part of a commercial core, but instead would eat away at a valuable natural buffer zone that currently protects a natural core — the ESA — and is not appropriate in this location.

The Environmental Impact Statement (Dillon Consulting Limited, July 18, 2008, hereafter referred to as the EIS) misses this main point. Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area (the ESA) is a natural jewel, currently protected in a buffering green setting. As with a diamond in a ring, the jewel is lost without the setting. Although Dillon Consulting Limited found "no natural features ... on the property with the exception of the two remnant hedgerows that provide minimal habitat for common wildlife species" (EIS, p. 36), the aerial photographs tell a different story. Any school child could detect the difference between an area of agricultural fields and abandoned hedgerows and a massive retail complex and parking lot, and would guess correctly that the former provides greater protection for an adjacent Environmentally Significant Area that lies downhill! Development will eliminate not only the cover of agricultural crops and perimeter vegetation, which reduces overland flow (run-off) during snow-melt and major precipitation events of the spring, summer and fall, but will also wipe out the community of soil organisms (thousands of species and millions of individuals, without even counting the bacteria) that provides multiple ecological services which benefit the site and its neighbours. Trading a green, agricultural landscape for a hard-surfaced commercial landscape will radically alter runoff patterns as well as the quality of water running off the site and into the ESA. This impact is very deceitfully downplayed in the EIS. Dillon Consulting noted that the ESA to the northeast of the proposed development site has been adversely affected by drainage from the City of London sports fields (EIS, p. 3), which is very true: gully-erosion within the hardwood forest site that is the cores of Meadowlily Woods has greatly increased within the past decade. If this impact was created by a sports development with grassed surfaces and engineered storm-water retention pond, what impacts could be expected from a commercial development that is >95% building and hard-surface paving?

Another logical flaw in the EIS is the assumption that edge species have little ecological value, and that the development will have little impact on the more "valuable" species within the interior of the ESA. Without this buffering edge there is less interior, and the effective size and quality of the ESA is reduced. The interior of the hardwood forest to the northeast of the proposed development is a special place indeed, and London is very fortunate to have protected this area when the opportunity was there. There are small patches within this forest that have old-growth characteristics (e.g., very old trees and a lot of large, mossy
fallen logs), and support fungi and invertebrates that are at peril in all of Southwestern Ontario. This interior habitat is at risk of degradation by invasion (from the edges) of alien plants (e.g., garlic mustard) and invertebrates (e.g., non-native isopods, or “pill-bugs”) that have major impacts on the ecological balance. The closer and more disturbed the edge is to the interior, the more easily these invasives reach the interior and begin to degrade it. This pattern is well documented in the Byron (“Sifton”) Bog, around which development has been allowed to proceed right to the edges of the protected property. Nutrient-rich runoff from adjacent housing and commercial complexes has altered the plant species composition in the most special part of that property, the sphagnum bog. At Meadowlily Woods, the City of London has the opportunity to learn from these mistakes and prevent them here.

Use of land designated as h-2 Urban Reserve – Community Growth for major commercial development is inappropriate, especially since that holding designation was put into place in order to require agreement on appropriate development in consideration of the adjacent natural features, i.e., the Environmentally Significant Area Meadowlily Woods. Referring to the redevelopments of Masonville, Argyle and Oakridge Malls, Malone Given Parson Ltd. stated that, “These local examples demonstrate how the reinvestment in enclosed shopping centres has the potential to revitalize older shopping areas through redevelopment.” (South East City Of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis, November 2007) This, and the commercial development of other vacant developed urban lands, is where the City of London should find the space needed for additional commercial-retail space.

In summary, the City of London should reject the proposed development as inappropriate for the location due to the adjacent ESA. The City should hold out for a proposal that would maintain or create predominantly green space, possibly with residential/commercial uses directly along Commissioners Road where the drainage is away from the ESA and the biological impacts on the ESA are minimized by maintaining an adequate biological buffer zone.

In your response to this letter, I hope you can also provide pages A2, A4, etc., which are missing from both posted and printed versions of the EIS.

Sincerely,

Greg Thorn.

Cc: members of the Planning Committee,
Mayor Anne Marie DeCicco-Best (Ex-officio), Councillor Judy Bryant (Chair), Controller Gina Barber, Controller Bud Polhill, Councillor Roger Caranci, Councillor Nancy Branscombe, Councillor Paul Van Meerbergen
Dear Nancy Pasato,

The London Coalition for Sustainable Cities is very concerned about the application for rezoning OZ-7430 (168 Meadowlily Road South) at http://www.london.ca/d.aspx?s=/Planning/oz-7430application.htm and we are preparing a submission in opposition to the application.

In doing so, we note that the EIS http://www.london.ca/Planning/PDFs/OZ-7430EIS.pdf refers to an archaeological assessment by "Archaeological Services, Inc." but this document does not appear to be on the website anywhere among the associated documentation.

This is just one of the grave inadequacies of the EIS for this application, but one which seems to us to point towards a serious lack of respect for the established process on the part of this applicant. It is simply not possible for the concerned members of the community to respond in a adequately informed fashion to the proposal if this sort of information is not provided in a timely fashion.

While we of course hope that the archaeological assessment becomes publicly available before your August 29 deadline for comment, our position right now is that this application should be rejected as incomplete until and unless all the relevant documentation is published, with enough time for meaningful analysis and comment. At very least, the applicant's failure to provide this report should raise many well-founded suspicions: what are they trying to hide by keeping this report from the City and from the public? Indeed, such unprofessional behaviour must cast serious doubt on all aspects of their application (what else might they be hiding?). At very least, if and when they do provide this report, it will need to be compared to another, independent report from autonomous professionals: the applicant has severely compromised any credibility they may have enjoyed by failing to submit this crucial information along with the EIS.

I look forward to your response (though it may be another member of LCSC who continues this correspondence, as I will be away next week), and I am copying this message of concern to the chair of the planning cmtee, who also happens to be my councilor. Thank you very much for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
David Heap
on behalf of the London Coalition for Sustainable Cities

The 10 sins of retail sprawl

* It destroys the economic and environmental value of land.
* It encourages an inefficient land-use pattern that is very expensive to serve.
* It fosters redundant competition between local governments, an economic war of tax incentives.
* It forces costly infrastructure development at the edge of towns.
* It causes disinvestment from established core commercial areas.
* It requires the use of public tax support for revitalizing rundown core areas.
* It degrades the visual, aesthetic character of local communities.
* It lowers the value of other commercial and residential property, reducing public revenues.
* It weakens the sense of place and community cohesiveness.
* It masquerades as a form of economic development.

http://londoncoalitionforsustainablecities.wordpress.com/
Pasato, Nancy

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2008 5:04 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: 02-7430 Ian & Ann Kovak

This e-mail is in reference to the above rezoning application. We own a property located at 25 Meadowlily S., and we attended the Planning Committee Meeting held recently, at which it was explained the agenda item that day was for housekeeping purposes only to bring the zoning designation in line with City zoning, rather than County zoning.

Although we own property on Meadowlily Rd., we did not receive any Notice of Application, which we now understand is a courtesy only and also only mailed if it is within a certain number of metres of the proposed rezoning property. However, with so few homes on Meadowlily Rd., that may be something to consider regarding number of residents who are aware of any application for rezoning. I believe we may be the tenth property on Meadowlily Rd. S., which must have fallen outside the distance boundaries for notification.

Fortunately, one of the residents posted signs on the road giving notification of the Planning Committee Meeting, so we were informed and able to attend.

Please consider our comments regarding this rezoning application:

1) There are stores West of Meadowlily only one block away which are closed down and which would be a much better location for any shopping designation. a) There is already a large paving area there and b) it would seem that approval of another Retailer so close to stores which are already struggling to remain open would not be the best planning decision.

2) The area of Meadowlily South is almost completely designated ESA, and any use of land on Meadowlily Rd. for a large shopping complex would generate runoff into the ESA as well as other activities which would directly impact on the ESA; e.g. security lighting may also be an issue, reflecting back into the wooded area.

3) There is a Sports Field adjacent to the lands being considered for a large shopping area; families are coming and going - young children are playing there; traffic entering and leaving a shopping complex would be considerable with shoppers arriving from early in the morning to late at night (some of these stores are now open 24 hours per day) – and so I hope the City Transportation Committee or whomever looks at traffic patterns would consider the impact this would have on safety of people using the sports field.

4) Every Spring, our property is always affected by water runoff from Commissioners' Road; it washes away any new gravel we put on our driveway and deposits it into the grassy area beyond the driveway. The culvert becomes completely blocked with debris every year as well; there is not adequate drainage or ability to deal with water runoff on Meadowlily Rd. South.

Since we attended the meeting, I understand there are other groups and individuals who may be providing comments to Planning, and will address issues other than those outlined above.

A Creative Alternative:- Please consider zoning this land for a more appropriate use, such as a Community Centre, which might include broad applications, such as a Medical clinic, nature centre, etc. and which could be built using "green construction practices" as an example of what the City of London can model to other communities and neighbourhoods.

A Community Centre such as this could serve the Summerside area as well as Pond Mills area, since there is a bike lane crossing the Highbury Overpass on the East side. After-school classes could be held, with direct access to the Meadowlily Woods and Meadowlily Nature Preserve for nature studies. School classes could be bussed in with parking at the Sports Field already available when games are not in progress.

The City of London has committed to the Creative Cities Concept, which will attract people to move to
London and which will enrich the lives of those of us already living in London - please consider how this zoning will "fit" in with that creative concept, and follow through with a creative alternative, rather than zoning for another shopping area when there is vacant space already available and already zoned for that purpose.

Thank you for considering our comments.

sincerely, Carol and Rick Richardson.
Hi Nancy,

As per your instructions at the town hall meeting regarding the proposed development of "Meadowlily Woods, an Environmentally Sensitive Area".

I would like to go on record. I am opposed to any such development of Meadowlily Woods.

Stephen Kedves
551 Stokes Drive
London, Ontario
N6M 1K2

2008-09-08
From: kevin lornack [mailto:kevinlornack@cyrodyne.com]
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2008 6:28 AM
To: Polhill, Bud; Bryant, Judy; Branscombe, Nancy; Van Meerbergen, Paul; Caranci, Roger; Barber, Gina
Cc: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: Meadowlily Road - Development Application - OZ-7430

Development Application
OZ-7430 - 168 Meadowlily Road South

August 28 2008,

Dear Members of the Planning Committee - City of London,

It is our impression that there is an application for development being considered for the Meadowlily Woods area and we would very much appreciate if you would acknowledge our collective thoughts.

This precious and distinct area is of particular importance to us as a family as a result of our many pleasant experiences there over the past 30 years. We have spent many an enjoyable day relishing the peace, tranquility and uniqueness of this special retreat with our family and friends.

London is changing, very rapidly, and I would argue not for the better in many respects such as when it comes protecting greenspace and the issue of managing growth. It does not at all seem that we are in tune with the concept of establishing a sustainable city or even following some of the principles. Sometimes it appears that the developers in the area have been led to believe that they have the power to control and manage growth and as you all know, this is not the way it should work.

Why is it that we should conclude that whenever someone wants to build, especially on a sensitive piece of property such as this, that this somehow would be in the public interest? I am almost positive that no one will be left wanting if we did not have an additional Walmart or the associated big box stores that would come with a Smart Centre development.

This recognized Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) is one of the largest remaining in the London area. Individuals are able to enjoy many significant and rare flora as well as the many century old trees. We dream each and every spring - as we brush off the ravages of the winter season, of the hours that we can peacefully spend walking amongst the violets, bloodroot, trout lillie's and wild ginger so close to our home. A truly majestic beauty exists in this area during all seasons.

With over 100 species of birds enjoying a brief stopover or indeed deciding to nest in this area along with the many mammals, water-dwelling creatures and insects - one must ask, how can we take this away from them. The thought of disturbing this refuge is unbearable.

I am of the belief that many citizens and a significant quantity of those on Council have aspirations to become a municipality known for leading edge thinking with respect to Smart Growth and responsible urban planning principles.

This is your chance to show - once again, your true capabilities within the broad realm of progressive
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public policy decision making. A very large contingent of those who pay attention to what is happening in the municipal policies arena would like to see you as a Committee and ultimately Council embrace the concept that this area needs to be saved and if this should result in an OMB challenge, so be it.

We appreciate that the public is being consulted and look forward to hearing you all conclude that this application should be rejected.

Thanks for your attention,

Kevin & Kathleen Lomack
London
Dear Planning & Council,

We at Council of Canadians London are opposed to the commercial development currently being considered for 168 Meadowlily Road.

We understand that sustainable community development is the ability to make development choices which respect the relationship between the three "E's"-economy, ecology, and equity:

- **Economy** - Economic activity should serve the common good, be self-renewing, and build local assets and self-reliance.
- **Ecology** - Human are part of nature, nature has limits, and communities are responsible for protecting and building natural assets.
- **Equity** - The opportunity for full participation in all activities, benefits, and decision-making of a society.

We understand that sustainable community is the deliberate effort to ensure that community development not only enhances the local economy, but also the local environment and quality of life.

We understand that Canadian 'Smart growth' basic principles include:

- **Renew Existing Communities**: Principle: Direct development away from unsettled areas and encourage growth and renewal in existing communities.
- **Green Space, Farmland and Ecologically Sensitive Areas**: Principle: Preserve and enhance green spaces, farmland and environmental sensitive areas.
- **Green Infrastructure**: Principle: Utilize green infrastructure to save money and protect the environment.

The current proposal being considered completely disregards these basic principles of what encompasses a sustainable community. It ignores smart growth principles. There is vacant land already designated and available for commercial use just west of the proposed site.

We would refer you to the official plan, chapter eleven, which has been voted upon & adopted by London City Council. It clearly states the following:

1) [Official Plan section 11.1.1] Design Principles, "new development shall complement and protect any significant natural features." We believe an intense commercial development directly adjacent to one of the City's most beautiful Environmentally Sensitive Areas is inappropriate to say the least. An intense
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commercial property such as the one being considered does not complement nor protect the ESA in any way, shape or form. An intense commercial development such as the one being proposed would desecrate the significant area both ecologically and culturally.

2) [Official Plan s.2.3.11 Planning Principles states “Land use planning should promote attractive, functional and accessible site and building design, which is sensitive to the scale and character of the surrounding area.” Use of the subject property for a commercial development does not adhere to this land use planning policy.

Taken from the CLEAR network City of London website it states the following under Urban Planning & Smart Growth:

Smart growth encourages the development of lands and buildings within the City that are already serviced and either abandoned or underutilized. Greater Infill development, brownfield redevelopment (former industrial or commercial lands), downtown revitalization and the conservation and re-use of cultural heritage buildings are essential to realizing compact form and livable communities. The best methods to achieve the Smart Growth goal of protecting and enhancing the environment are to clearly identify natural heritage features and areas, and prime agricultural lands, while steering growth pressures away from those areas.

Taken from the CLEAR network City of London website it states the following under Infill vs. Greenfield Development:

- Smart growth and good planning encourage infill development as a desired growth pattern. It optimizes existing infrastructure, often results in intensification and generally does not “consume land”.
- The priority should be to optimize existing infrastructure and to accommodate expected growth in the most efficient manner possible.

We urge you to reject the current proposal put forth by Smart Centres for 168 Meadowlily Road. We urge our city to lead by example. Let us shape our future by working towards a sustainable city. Let us conserve our resources in order to meet current needs while ensuring that adequate resources are available for future generations. Let us seek improved public health and a better quality of life for all its residents by limiting waste while working towards a zero waste future. Let us work towards a sustainable future by preventing pollution, maximizing conservation and promoting efficiency. Let us develop local resources to revitalize the local economy.

Sincerely,
Cory Morningstar
President | Council of Canadians | London
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Ms. Nancy Pasato  
Planning Division, Planning and Development  
City of London  
300 Dufferin Ave. P.O. Box 5035  
London, ON N6A 4L9

29 August 2008

Re: Development Application OZ-7430 - 168 Meadowlily Road South

Dear Ms. Pasato:

I am writing this letter to strongly encourage London City Council to refuse the rezoning request for property adjacent to Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area. I am writing as a concerned resident of London, as a parent, and as a biologist.

Some of my relevant credentials are as follows. I have a MSc and PhD in systematic entomology from the University of Wyoming, USA. As a graduate student under the direction of the internationally renown Hymenopterist Dr. Scott Shaw, my biological field research took me to many pristine habitats within the Rocky Mountains, as well as to the tropical forests of Costa Rica. In Costa Rica I spent six field seasons studying insects in some of the most diverse ecosystems on Earth, including lowland tropical dry forest, lowland rainforest, and mid and high elevation rainforest. Closer to home I spent one year as a postdoctoral fellow doing entomological field surveys in Pinery Provincial Park and Newport Forest (along the Thames River). I have been a naturalist all of my life.

As a resident of London and parent of two boys, aged seven and two, we have spent a lot of time in Meadowlily Woods ESA, as well as in other ESA’s in London. Because of my experience as a field biologist and lifelong naturalist, I am able to recognize Meadowlily Woods ESA as a very special place. It is incredibly beautiful as well as biologically and ecologically rich. Meadowlily Woods ESA is one of London’s treasures. Please refuse the rezoning request for property adjacent to Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area.

As a person of middle age I am well aware of the ongoing conflicts worldwide over development of lands, and the difficulties government officials face in making development decisions. I realize your need to balance growth and development while at the same time protecting natural areas within London. But as a biologist I am aware of the profound complexities of nature, and I urge you to refuse the rezoning request.
Meadowlily Woods ESA is already protected in some ways, given that it has been designated as an ESA. The problem is, biological processes do not stop at human-imposed borders. Additionally, human actions can have far-reaching effects that go well beyond the site of the original action. The first step in protecting a natural area is to designate it an ESA, which has already been done in this case. But because biological processes and human actions do not stop at random borders, the next step is to determine the necessary buffer zone around the ESA.

In order to determine the necessary buffer zone, an EIS has been produced, and I have read the EIS for this particular case. I am not impressed with the work in any way. The EIS is not adequate in this case. Further study is required. Meadowlily Woods ESA should be given special attention. It should be given extra protection. Please take the necessary steps to further study the situation and please do not underestimate the beauty and diversity of life within Meadowlily Woods ESA.

As stated in the EIS (page 3), “For a development proposal to be acceptable, the EIS must clearly demonstrate that the Proposed Development will have no negative effects on the area...”. As a biologist I am telling you that there is no question that the proposed development will have a negative effect on the ESA. The only question is, how negative? We all have to decide how much degradation of our natural areas we are willing to accept for the sake of development. In this case, because of the special nature of Meadowlily woods, I am urging you to refuse the current proposal.

One of the most significant facts that lead to the conclusion that the proposed development will have a negative effect on the ESA is that the subject site DRAINS THROUGH THE ESA TO THE THAMES RIVER. I apologize for using all caps but I cannot overemphasize this point. The EIS does not sufficiently make this point nor consider this fact in its conclusions.

Secondly, the EIS states (page 36) “...no natural features exist on the property with the exception...”. To say that agricultural land has no natural features is an outrageous statement and to be frank, shows the inexperience of the workers who prepared the EIS. Agricultural lands have many natural features, namely soil. It is irresponsible or ignorant (or both) not to make this point.

Thirdly, the EIS overall does not make the fundamental point that the ESA in question is home to a significant diversity of native plants, animals, fungi and other forms of life. To be frank again, I do not believe the workers who put this EIS together are even aware of this fact. To give you just one example, on my first visit to the ESA, about three years ago we spent perhaps one hour walking inside the ESA, starting from the trail near the northeast corner of the subject site. During that one-hour period we found a wetland habitat with a very large patch of skunk cabbage and many red-backed salamanders (our boy, about 4 at the time, found the first salamander) (please see EIS pages 14-15 for relevance). We have been back to this gorgeous wetland and home of the salamanders several times since. This site is approximately 200 m from the northeast corner of the
subject site. Since it is outside of the “Area of Focus” we would be more than happy to take you there.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Nina M. Zitani, MSc, PhD

512 Maitland St.,
London, ON N6B 2Z6
Dear Mayor DeCicco-Best,
Dear Councillor Branscombe,
Dear members of the Planning Committee,

As a London resident, I want to inform you of my opposition to the proposed development of a large commercial space in the vicinity of Meadowlily Woods. I do not find any reason why such a development should be approved. Meadowlily Woods is a truly valuable landscape that makes London live up to its moniker of Forest City. This cultural heritage space should be protected, and local residents should be allowed to participate in discussions about more appropriate, lower-impact uses for this adjacent property. Zoning this area for commercial purposes would only tarnish it instead of enhancing it. Cement and asphalt, increased traffic and pollution would seriously compromise the ecological balance of the woods, as well as negatively impact the well-being of the neighborhood. If there is a need for additional retail stores, these stores should go in the Pond Mills mall that is half empty West of Highbury.

London City Hall needs to stop the way it is planning growth. I am tired of seeing our taxpayer money go into the development of new malls on the outskirts of the city, while it already has a plethora of zoned commercial land that are not used. I live in Ward 6, and the development of the Fanshawe and Hyde Park mall has brought nothing to me, but more cars and the closing of several retail spaces in Sherwood Mall.

London has many riches, and a great potential for growth. Such growth cannot be done at the expense of our quality of life, or our woods. This city is in desperate need of a cohesive and comprehensive plan that is designed around a vision. Visitors appreciate the health of a city by its downtown core. We should be ashamed of our downtown. No creative and ambitious business will want to invest in London as long as the downtown area is not seriously revitalized. Considering putting a big box store in a neighbourhood so beautiful as Summerside will do nothing to make London greater.

This rezoning application defies logic. Please reject it. Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter.

Sincerely,

Valérie Prat
41 Scarlett Ave
London, N6G1Z3

CC: Ms. N. Pasato, Planner, npasato@london.ca
Ms. L Fisher, Planning Committee Secretary, lfisher@london.ca
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Hello,

I would like to ask that you reconsider the location of the proposed Wal-Mart. I understand the desire to improve the tax base in Ward 1, but I feel there are ample empty spaces available that are not on the edge of a downward sloping Environmentally Sensitive area. I don't object to a big box store in Ward 1, but I do object to it in this location.

I attended the community meeting at Summerside church and a woman had suggested that you told her that there were enough parks in the city. I would like to ask for your side of that and do you think this is an appropriate alternate use of this space other than a big box, given that you have several other acceptable locations for a supercenter, including all of the east side of Jackson Road. After all, it's a Wal-Mart, build it and they will drive there.

Regarding the environmental assessment supplied by SmartCentres – I believe Z Group also supplied one for their condo development on the edge of Sifton Bog, and I can tell you that there is a drain from their parking lot directly into the bog. This is visible from the east side of the bog on the hiking paths. Salt, dirt and garbage run off directly into the bog. The problem with environmental damage to ESA's is that it doesn't happen overnight.

As I said in my letter to the editor, please let the preservation of Meadowlily be your legacy to this city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laurie Dunbar
Hi- Thank you and I did review these. A couple more comments:

Although I object to this development based on the environmental issues, I also question the transportation and marketing studies. Please give special consideration to the transportation study when considering this proposal:

The Transportation study provided a map showing proposed access to the site with two (2) traffic signals. The transportation study does not make note of the obvious - there will be six (6) traffic lights in a 1.25 km distance: Commissioners at Deveron; Southbound exit to Highbury; Northbound exit from Highbury; Meadowlily Road (aka Driveway 1); Driveway 2; and Meadowgate Blvd. These 6 traffic lights do not include the turning lane into the loading dock for Walmart which would be located between the Driveway 2 and Meadowgate (Exhibit 4 of the iTrans study). There will be a substantial number of trucks needed to supply a store of this size, creating even more congestion.

Additionally, if you look at the site layout for the Wal-Mart, the loading dock is in the Northeast corner of the lot, which means that the trucks will not be able to turn around behind the mall and the only logical way out of the mall for large transports is to follow the parking lot to the Driveway 1 exit on Meadowlily road. The exhaust and fumes from this loading area are not accounted for in the environmental study and do not consider the impact of noise and exhaust on sports fields to the immediate left of the loading area.

I have several questions regarding the environmental study; among them how the runoff drain in the northwest corner can withstand the volume from a spring snow melt or a heavy rain, including the salt, dirt and oil from cars, which will run right into the Thames. Dillon Consulting doesn’t feel there will be a problem, but it is not likely they will be consulted 3 years from now when the drain needs to be dealt with or the Thames in the east end is even more polluted that it currently is. I have the same concern regarding the damage to the Woods several years from now when the environmental damage has already begun. I understand that the land is zoned for commercial, but I think the scale of a Wal-Mart supercentre, plus 6 additional buildings is wrong for this location.

The Marketing Study states that the Food Basics in Pond Mills Square will suffer a 9.1% drop in business and then recover. If Wal-Mart has a supercenter with a grocery store included, and there are plans for a 275,000 sq ft Loblaw’s across the street from it, how will Food Basics recover? It is true that Loblaw’s doesn’t cater to the discount shopper, but Wal-Mart does. Zellers is sure to close because as the marketing study points out, they have been an underperforming store for a long time. How does the city planning committee deal with large expanses of abandoned and decaying shopping centres? Malone, Given, Parsons doesn’t think there will be an abandoned mall left behind, and even if there was, it wouldn’t be a problem for them because they don’t live near it.

Malone, Givens and Parsons, also report that the Wal-Mart at Whiteoaks will continue to exist, but there are reports of another Wal-Mart supercentre planned in the Lambeth / Wonderland Road area. Why would Wal-Mart plan two supercentres, 15 minutes apart and then keep a small store in White Oaks Mall? The answer is that they won’t and any quick check on the Internet would provide all the information that the market study group needed.

The problem with these market, environmental, transportation studies, etc, is that the original authors are not called on down the road to justify their comments.

Thank you for responding to my email and considering my comments on the studies provided.

Regards,

2008-08-11
Pasato, Nancy

From: Gosney, Adam
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2008 3:41 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy; DeCicco-Best, Anne Marie; Bryant, Judy; Barber, Gina; Polhill, Bud; Caranci, Roger; Branscombe, Nancy; Van Meerbergen, Paul; info@meadowlillywoods.ca; londonchapterio@gmail.com
Subject: Take a stand for London, keep it green.

Dear Ms. Pasato:

My name is Adam Gosney. I am writing this letter to you regarding the recent proposal to place a commercial development in Meadowlilly Woods Environmentally Significant Area.

I was born and raised in London, Ontario. After graduating from UWO and then from Wilfrid Laurier where I obtained my Masters of Social Work I moved to Eastern Ontario and now reside outside of Kingston, Ontario. I am very fond of London and have seriously contemplated moving 'home' in the future. However self-evident this is to note, London is not the same place I left even 3 years ago. Development appears to have skyrocketed and what little green-space our city has left appears to have been sold off to the highest bidder in an attempt to feed the appetite of an already overburdened and over serviced consumer base. I would urge those involved to consider the feeling of coming 'home' one weekend to find that the field you had played in as a child and had just seen children playing in some months before had been filled by (a now closed) Hooters Restaurant. Disappointment, dismay, disgust, "what is happening to my city?" I said aloud. London is quickly becoming tarnished. It now pales in comparison to places in Eastern Ontario such as Brighton, Belleville, Kingston and even Ottawa in regards to natural aesthetic, access to waterways, environmental conservation areas and basically beautiful places to live where nature and modern city life appear to share some form of harmony. With the trend towards development in London over recent years it is no wonder London can no longer be known as the "Forrest City", apart from a relic slogan reminiscent of a time where London was actually forested, natural and beautiful. We are quickly becoming the likes of Burlington, Oakville and other Big Box manufactured communities. London has far to much culture and history to allow this erosion to continue.

I would urge city council to take a bold stand. One they have been unable to carry forward in recent years. Protect what little green space London "the Forrest City" has left. Retain the very thing that branded London as a wonderful place to live, raise a family and do business. Balance must be maintained. Take a stand. Do not allow Meadowlilly Woods to be developed.

Sincerely:

Adam Gosney BSW., MSW., RSW.

2008-08-11
Nancy,

I am writing this letter in respect to the rezoning application of currently not developed land in the London, Ontario area.

Once any amount of land like Meadowlily is taken for development, the green space is gone forever, this is an absolute. There is no turning back, forever.

Wal-Mart is within their rights to grow and profit and prosper and I applaud their veracity. However, planning departments on a go-forward basis, should require developers to redevelop land currently zoned or currently developed.

One would think that Wal-Mart executives, board members and upper management, their general contracting team alike would own some sense of remorse for destroying forested land or green space.

I certainly hope the powers that be in London, the municipal or city government possess some sense of pride.

Wal-Mart is already the very largest player in the world. How big do they need to be?

Does London care?

I really hope so. Malls, big box stores and the like are not providing a service that doesn’t already exist not too far away.

Please say no to Wal-Mart and set a precedent for others to follow. London does not need a massive Wal-Mart, flogging cheaply made products to people who refuse to go to existing big box retailers elsewhere.

Additionally, Wal-Mart stores are not exactly nice to look at, they are behemoths, large square permanent eye-sores.

They pay poorly too and unseat their competition - low income earners do not have money to spend and businesses that are forced to move or close, leave money behind for taxes and good and services.

Just say no to Wal-Mart. Be a hero, not another victim of flashy corporate tax promises from a giant bully.

Christopher Kelsall

2008-08-29
Dear Ms Pasato

In the 25 years I have lived in London, more and more of the natural space in and around the city have either disappeared or been degraded. Right now I am particularly concerned about Meadowlily Woods. Meadowlily Woods is one space not too far from my home where I can go to walk and enjoy the natural world.

However, Meadowlily is threatened by a request for a zone change by SmartCentres, which want to put a Walmart and other stores in the field between the Woods and Commissioners Road. The pavement and lights and traffic will destroy this area, frightening away wildlife and degrading the river with runoff, and the forest with garbage. There is plenty of nearby brownfield space, already zoned commercial, where Walmart could go if it must go somewhere.

I attended the recent community meeting hosted by MP Irene Mathyssen, and it was quite obvious there that most of the people do not want a big box store anywhere near their woods, which they regard as a rare treasure within the city.

Please recommend to Planning Committee that they reject the proposed zoning change, and that if SmartCentres choose to appeal to the OMB, that they fight for the rights of the people and the city.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Guthrie
108 – 230 Clarke Road
London ON
N5W 5P8

2008-08-11
I would like to express my opposition to commercial development which has been proposed. This area is adjacent to an environmentally sensitive area and the proposed development is likely to be deleterious to the biological aspects of the area. As well, the city is already well served by a plentiful supply of large and small retailers. I oppose the establishment of another such business at that location at this time.

Geoff Crealock
20 Regina St.
London
Dear Planning Committee Clerk and Members

Re: the development of a new Wal-Mart adjacent to Meadowlily Woods:

THE ISSUE: A proposed large commercial development on property adjoining the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), located east of Highbury Ave near Commissioners Road, is an inappropriate use of this land.

The Thames River has been a recent focus of public debate in London, increasingly recognized as an under-valued asset already seriously degraded by inappropriate development like the Wal-Mart and accompanying big box stores now targeted beside Meadowlily Woods.

I oppose this proposal because of the serious threat it poses to the rare ancient landscape that is Meadowlily Woods. This proposal continues a pattern of development in London that damages neighbourhoods, natural systems and the overall livability of London.

The Forest City doesn't need another Wal-Mart.

I request that this e-mail appear on the Planning Committee agenda when the matter is being considered by the Committee.

Thank you,

Melissa Parrott
From: Leslie Graham
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2008 10:30 AM
To: Fisher, Lorelei; Pasato, Nancy
Cc: DeCicco-Best, Anne Marie; Bryant, Judy; Barber, Gina; Polhill, Bud; Caranci, Roger; Branscombe, Nancy; Van Meerbergen, Paul
Subject: Meadowlily Woods

I am very concerned about proposed development beside Meadowlily Woods. Allowing commercial development on property adjoining the woods is totally inappropriate, and would be very poor planning. To harm or destroy a beautiful, sensitive nature area for financial gain demonstrates greed, shortsightedness, and morally bankrupt decision-making. Please do the right thing: save this lovely area. Once gone, it's gone forever.

Leslie Graham
801- 22 Picton St.
London, ON N6B 3R5

2008-08-11
To Ms N. Pasato,
Planner II
Please add the following comments to your report to the Planning Committee, City of London:

The decline in migrating songbirds over the past few decades has been well documented (Breeding Bird Atlas of Ontario 2001-2005) due in part to the loss of suitable habitat. Meadowlily Woods has been an important breeding area and stop-over point for warblers and other small song birds moving north in the Spring and Summer from their wintering grounds in the South. Most of the birds have a rather secretive and cautious nature, so they will bypass or stop only for a brief stay and not breed in an area surrounded by or close to a busy concrete site, crowded with buildings, humans and vehicles. The Summerside subdivision has already had an impact on the number of birds migrating through this area. A big box development abutting the woods will certainly effectively chase away all but the most common birds, closing yet another site to the migrating birds who fly enormous distances to return North. Arriving totally spent, after crossing Lake Erie often battling winds and other bad weather, the birds search desperately, following the major rivers, trying to find fewer and fewer quiet, green, thickly wooded spots where they can be relatively undisturbed, while they recuperate, moult and get ready for breeding. A few may remain to nest, but most then continue flying up to the northern boreal forest, the major breeding ground for many of our colourful songbirds. Building yet another unnecessary shopping mall takes away one more cool, green breathing space and continues to shrink habitat for these creatures who more than earn respect for the tons of insects they eat and the pleasure they bring. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROPOSAL.

Sincerely,
Renee deWit, Apt #53, 44 Genevive Cres. London, ON N5Y 4A8
Dear Members of the Planning Committee,

My name is Brianna Newman and I live at 164 Harris Rd, Delaware. I write to you today in regards to the proposed SmartCentre development adjacent to one of the few remaining wonders of London, Meadowlily Woods. I was born in London and spend most of my time there enjoying the beautiful bike trails and diverse unique ecosystems that every different part our city has to offer. It saddens me to see our city slowly become no longer the forest city, due to poor planning and urban development.

As a result we see fewer farm fields and green area in London and its surroundings. It is slowly being taken over by big box corporation whose sole concern is profit. Rather than growing local farm food on the fields that are left, SmartCenters are being built and importing produce and merchandise, selling them at the lowest prices possible and leaving enormous carbon footprints, along with the exploitation of little children and workers worldwide. These SmartCenters are detrimental to our society mostly our precious environment, the light, sound, and air pollution disturbs the surrounding ecosystems; the solid waste they produce is rarely correctly disposed of; the huge area of concrete disrupts the hydrological cycle, and in the near future our energy scarce society will not be able to conveniently access these centers making them obsolete. Our farmers' fields will forever be the foundation of the concrete jungle that we have created out of our "forest" city.

I may not be apart of the Meadowlily community nor live in London, but feel the need to stop the big box corporations of raping the beautiful farm fields and woods that the city of London has to offer. I find it somewhat ironic that the SmartCenters can call themselves smart when they lack the ability and completely ignore any consideration of the environment, social, or economic problems that they cause.

We have a crisis on our hands and the future generations are at risk, the solution lies in the hands of the planning committee to make our city more sustainable. You can make a difference, you can plan intelligently, you can oppose this multinational corporation, and you can make this neighborhood livable for years to come. This is why you occupy your fulltime position with the City of London. In the name of the dedicated citizens who clearly do NOT want their natural land to be invaded and exploited, please help us save Meadowlily Woods.

Sunday, August 9th 2008
Dear Councillors and City Planners,

Open space preservation supports smart growth goals by bolstering local economies, preserving critical environmental areas, improving our communities quality of life, and guiding new growth into existing communities.

Please say "No" to the proposed large commercial development on property adjoining the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), located east of Highbury Ave near Commissioners Road.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Teresa Rutten
Dear Chair and Members of Planning Committee,

I am writing this letter to state my opposition to the proposed commercial development adjacent to Meadowlily Woods. I have just learned that the written submissions should be received by tomorrow. I trust that my written submissions later this month will be considered by the Planning Committee prior to the Public Participation Meeting on September 8.

Sincerely,

Rachel Bezner Kerr

Rachel Bezner Kerr
Assistant Professor
Department of Geography
The University of Western Ontario
1151 Richmond Street N., SSC 2409
London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2
June 16, 2008

Dear Honourable Mayor, Board of Control Members, and Councillors;

I am writing in regards to the proposal from SmartCentres for a zoning by-law change that would allow it to build a large commercial property (including Wal-Mart) near the Meadowlily Woods.

Please honour your positions as elected officials and do what is best for the citizens of London and the land we live on, not the pocketbooks of an already massive and wealthy corporation who will have nothing but their bottom line in mind. We need as many natural spaces as we can possibly have here in London. We are living in the era of the tipping point of environmental destruction: please consider, in this light, the importance of such a space to protect wildlife, clean our air, protect us from climate change, and to show people the importance and beauty of the world we live in.

Wal-mart destroys local economies, exploits cheap labour abroad and at home, has been scrutinized for various human rights and environmental abuses, and is in no way a positive addition to our city. Besides, we have many of them already, why do we need more?????

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

Kaela Stradiotto

2008-06-17
Hi- I would like to ask that the planned WalMart for this location be stopped and Walmart be relocated elsewhere in Mr Caranci's ward. There is ample space available that does not encroach on an ESA. Since it is a downward sloping area, all run off will be into the park. This is exactly what happened to Sifton Bog and the Z group condo development. In that location, the parking lot run off drains directly into the bog and salt and dirt run off down the slope (this is visible from the hiking paths).

My concern is that the same will happen to Meadowlily, and therefore, I ask that this proposal be blocked from development.

I would also like a copy of the environmental assessment study provided by Smart Centres.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laurie Dunbar
Hello,

I have just sent Mr. Caranci an email, copying yourself and a few others, regarding the proposed location of the planned Wal-Mart. Although I object to the location of the planned center because of the Meadowlily ESA, I would like to ask if you are concerned about the Pond Mills Plaza at Commissioners and Deveron. The Zellers and Food Basics will surely close, offsetting any jobs created by Wal-Mart, even if they are part-time at $8/hour. In addition, we will be left with an abandoned mall that will probably sit empty for decades adding to the decay that is beginning to happen already along that stretch.

Anything that is abandoned increases the chances of vandalism and crime. If you think this is an exaggeration, then drive along Commissioners and look at the plaza that used to have the Shoppers Drug Mart and see the smashed in/ boarded up windows and the graffiti.

An abandoned mall that is 3 times the size of the small plaza mentioned above will only worsen the situation here. This will certainly lower the property values in the area. What is your opinion of the proposed location of the planned big box and the impact to your ward?

Thank you for your consideration.

Laurie Dunbar

2008-08-11
Ms. Pasato,

It is my understanding that an environmental impact study of the plants, birds and animals related to building next to and environmentally significant area like Meadowlily Woods that the group making the study is supposed to provide inventories based on site visits and information not older than five years and also based on a three-season sampling of the flora and fauna of the area. My understanding is that the EIS offered by the Dillon Group for Smart Centres was based on a single visit, early in the season when it would be impossible to verify some species of plants and when certain birds would not be in the area yet due to migration. Dillon group is also basing a lot of their information on the D. Stephenson study which is now twenty years old!

I would say that such a study is inadequate to the task.

Also on a recent visit to Meadowlily Woods I saw two red-tail hawks close to the development area and also made a visit to the ravine on the northwest corner of the proposed development site. Dillon Group's pictures of the area do not show that there are certainly large mature healthy trees immediately adjacent to that ravine (within a metre). They may in fact qualify according to one naturalist that took the trip with me down that ravine as being examples of old growth! The EIS does not reflect this fact adequately either. I can show photographic evidence to that effect.

I would appreciate it if this correspondence could be attached to the report for the September meeting of the Planning Committee.

Respectfully,

Gary Smith
Meadowlily Road, South
From: Tricia Sweeney
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2008 8:30 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: 168 Meadowlily rezoning application

We are residents of the Summerside community and we wish to express our concerns regarding Smart Centre’s application to have the area at 168 Meadowlily rezoned from Urban Reserve-Community Growth, to Urban Reserve-Associated Shopping Area Commercial.

We have reviewed the proposed site plan, and although we appreciate the convenience created by the close proximity to retail outlets in our area, we do not feel that a “big box” store is the most appropriate use of land adjacent to an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA).

This area is more suited to a community center, church, library, residential, or even just the 5 smaller (60,000 total square feet) buildings that is listed on Smart Centre’s Notice of Application. We feel that the introduction of a large retail/service business (be it a Walmart, Canadian Tire, Home Depot etc) would simply create far too much customer and goods traffic, light and noise pollution and garbage. All of these things could potentially upset the delicate ecosystem of the nearby ESA.

We understand that there are no other sites in our area designated as ASA that will accommodate the size and scale of Smart Centre’s plan. We suggest that they scale down their plan or build in a more suitable area.

Furthermore, we would be very upset to see an increase in our taxes to assist in the building of the infrastructure required for these types of businesses. Our taxes should not assist in further increasing big business revenues.

Thank you for listening

Mark and Trish Sweeney
Mike and Trish Grieve
Rik and Michelle Woods

2008-08-11
I would like to go on record as opposing this zoning request for a number of reasons.

Firstly, even though the site in question is not part of the ESA earlier designated, it is close enough to have a significant potential impact on this ESA. Questions were also raised about first nations burial grounds being located on or near this site.

Secondly, I believe Walmart is pursuing a program of what I would consider "preditory development". We have seen this by Tim Horton's and McDonalds' (as well as some others). I would characterize this as an effort to economically destabilize competing businesses by locating stores to make competing businesses unviable.

It seems to me obvious that (given the weak retail historical performance of the Southside mall just up the road) that the choice of this location is simply to try to force Zellers to close and to prevent the already planned development of a Loblaws store. Further, this location will facilitate the WalMart desertion of White Oaks Mall location. If approved, this location promises to slow development in this area, reduce jobs on a net basis, and leave the city looking at more empty unwanted retail space.

Thirdly, given the extensive vacant tracts of serviced land just up the road from this location, I think Walmart should be encouraged to change their development plans. I think that, denied this location, they will quickly come up with another. It will perhaps be less effective from a preditory development standpoint, but that only makes it more possible that Zellers will survive and the Loblaws development will go ahead. This will mean a net gain in jobs, and thus be better for the city and its residents.

Gordon Leffley,
#11-1199 Reardon Blvd.,
London ON
N6M 1H7

Now with a new friend-happy design! Try the new Yahoo! Canada Messenger
Pasato, Nancy

From: Betty Taylor
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2008 2:39 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: Development/Meadowlilly Woods.

To: Nancy Pasato and Gena Barber
Planning Division,
City of London, Ontario

Re: Commercial Development of the Land Adjacent to and east of Meadowlilly/Road and Commissioners Rd.

Date: July 31, 2008

I am strongly opposed to commercial development of the above specified parcel of land. A big box store is the very worst of commercial development. I live in Coventry Walk (Summerside) and walk daily, with few exceptions, in Meadowlilly Woods four seasons of the year. This woods is much more than a "Significant Environmental Area" - it is a gem; a rare gem that cannot be replaced. It must be protected from even the possibility of a negative impact resulting from extensive commercial development of the adjacent land. Apart from all the other dangers, the salt run-off downhill through the woods from the winter salting of the extensive tarmac would be devestating to the flora and fauna of the woods.

Moreover as a taxpayer I strongly object to any portion of my tax dollars being used in any way (directly or indirectly) for commercial development of this parcel of land. Any commercial development should/must take place on already serviced land, designated commercial. For the city of London to change the designation of the property involved to "commercial" can not be justified.

Betty A. Taylor
#246, 2025 Meadowgate Blvd.
London, On N6M 1K9

2008-07-31
Dear Nancy Pasato,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed SmartCentres commercial development anchored by a Walmart at the corner of Meadowlily and Commissioners Road in southeast London. I am opposed to this development not only because it constitutes an inappropriate land use for its immediate surrounding area, which includes the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area, but also because Walmart has a history of contributing to urban sprawl and blight in the communities where it locates.

For example, Walmart’s rapid expansion of Supercenters and Sam’s Clubs and its simultaneous abandonment of older discount stores have resulted in hundreds of vacant stores across the United States. In May 2006, Walmart Realty had 320 vacant or soon to be vacant properties listed for lease or sale. However, because the average Walmart Supercenter is nearly twice as large as the average discount store, Walmart buildings are often too large for new tenants to occupy. Communities are consequently left with ugly, blighted landscapes every time Walmart abandons an old store in order to open a new one elsewhere, as is currently the case with the company’s move from East Dundee to West Dundee, Illinois. Moreover, as the residents and politicians of East Dundee, IL, can attest, while the opening of a new Walmart may increase the tax base of the community in which it locates, the company’s routine store closures have ravaged local economies due to the subsequent losses in tax revenues.

The only way to ensure that this scenario does not unfold in London is to prevent Walmart from locating in our community altogether. Responsible planning on behalf of London’s Planning Department will involve preventing SmartCentres and Walmart from building an additional sprawling development that will either destroy or negatively impact our city’s woodlands and green spaces and potentially contribute to blight down the road. This is to say nothing of Walmart’s devastating impact on communities in the form of regularly mistreating its workers, driving down wages and employment standards, polluting the environment, shutting down local businesses, and externalizing development costs and other expenses to taxpayers.

I am asking you to please reject any proposal from SmartCentres or Walmart to build a commercial development at the corner of Meadowlily and Commissioners Road or anywhere else in London. The health of London’s economy, environment, and residents will rely substantially on your rejection of any such proposal.

Thank you,

Michael Hurley

2008-07-21
Hi Nancy,

Hope you are well and have enjoyed the summer!

I am sure that you have received much feedback for your report on the Meadowlily proposal. I did submit a letter long ago, but would like to reiterate my concerns regarding big box development adjacent to the ESA - Meadowlily Woods. Meadowlily Woods is a treasure in London that we need to do our best to preserve. The coyote/wolf, deer, possums, and fox that we have been seeing this summer would agree!! It is clear that the tract of land will not stay undeveloped indefinitely, however, it is crucial that the development be responsible, with appropriate buffers (not only 10m!!), that will ensure minimal environmental impact. I do not support big box development at Meadowlily and Commissioners Rds.

I also have some suggestions that I would like to express. I did briefly address these at one of our meetings, but would like to formally bring the suggestions forward.

I would support the development of a park/community centre on the property under discussion. Having a park area would more effectively protect Meadowlily woods and have less of an environmental impact than a big box commercial area. I think it would also provide a positive influence on the community - encouraging active living/recreational activity and social/family interaction, which we know increases the health of individuals, families and communities. A park area would also provide an aesthetically pleasing addition to the community, and would be used by those both east and west of Highbury.

Having a well-equipped community centre would be highly beneficial for the residents both east and west of Highbury, as well as for those who will be moving into the areas that are yet to be developed residentially east of the property being discussed. I do understand that building a park & community centre would be a significant expense for the city. However, this area of the city is underserviced in regards to community centres. Throughout the city, one can find excellent community facilities: Whiteoaks in the south, Stronach in the northeast, Earl Nichols in the southwest, Kinsmen and Carling Heights in central areas, Medway arena and the CG Aquatic Centre in the northwest, and a new comprehensive facility planned for the north at Adelaide and Sunningdale. I find it interesting that the city has planned and budgeted for a wonderful, fully resourced community centre in the newly developing areas at the north end (Adelaide/Sunningdale), and yet has not planned for one in the east end, even though there has been recent development in Summerside, Gore road, etc. and more residential development coming to this area.

Alternatively, instead of a park with a large community centre, the area could become a park and an extension of the Citywide sports fields complex. The property closest to Meadowlily Rd. could be a park area, to fulfill the above mentioned purposes, and to provide a satisfactory buffer for the single-family home residents on Meadowlily Rd. The area adjacent to the...
Citywide fields could be extended to include a number of additional fields, and a washroom/change facility. Soccer is a rapidly growing sport among children and adults (the women's recreational soccer leagues have grown exponentially in the last 2-3 years). Unfortunately, it can be a challenge for teams to find adequate space to practice and play. Having been involved in child and adult soccer in London for the last 9 years, I am absolutely positive that additional fields would be very welcome and would be well used.

I look forward to hearing from city council on this very important decision, that can have significant environmental, economic, social, and health outcomes. Wishing you all wisdom as you move forward in your discussions!

Regards,

Heather Lokko

ps - I would appreciate just a quick email to acknowledge receipt of this correspondence.
August 10, 2008

Nancy Pasato, MCIP, RPP
Planning Division
Planning and Development, City of London

Dear Nancy Pasato, Planning Division

I am writing to express my deep concern about a possible Smart Centres development in the area of Meadowlily Woods. Meadowlily is one of my favorite natural areas in the City of London. It is an easy bicycle ride (or bus ride) from the SOHO neighborhood where I live, following the bicycle trails along the Thames River. I always return from my time at Meadowlily with such a sense of calm and well-being. Not only is it an Environmentally Sensitive Area, but I usually also explore the remaining ruins of the old Meadowlily Mill - historians like myself love such remainders of our past. With the Thames River having been declared a part of the Canadian Heritage River System, I think it is important to preserve this unique part of "wild Canada" which is just on the outskirts of our city. Whenever I visit Meadowlily I meet other hikers and naturalists, young families or dog walkers - all soaking up the beauty of such a unique area right in our own backyard. The vistas often resemble the natural landscape of northern Ontario. I would hate to see Meadowlily become a "suburb" of another huge shopping mall with the attendant noise, traffic congestion, and litter. Sincerely, Alice Gibb,
Dear Ms. Pasato:

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak to you about the Meadowlily Rd. rezoning. I read about it in a letter to the editor of the London Free Press in today’s paper. I do not have a lot of details about the rezoning, but I know Meadowlily Woods and surrounding area well enough to be totally against any building there at all.

I am adamantly opposed to any rezoning or construction in that area. It is a beautiful, quiet neighbourhood with an nearby park of environmental importance. It is, as the letter says in the paper, a low-density housing neighbourhood and that is part of what makes it so special. My husband and children have enjoyed many hikes and picnics in the wooded area there. Any construction would completely ruin this wonderful locale.

It is absolutely outrageous that the city would be thinking to allow someone to build a shopping center there. And now that I have listened to your message on my answering machine, am I correct in understanding that it is a WalMart that is building this shopping center? If so, this only increases my objections one hundredfold. There is a Canadian Zellers just down the road from Meadowlily Rd. There is no reason to build another big department store, especially an American-based one five minutes away. We should be trying to support Canadian businesses - building the competition right down the road would probably put Zellers out of business. We have had enough of WalMarts inserting themselves where they are not wanted.

There has been too much building in that area on the south side of Commissioners Rd as it is. We do not need another big box store or even a mini-mall there. There are plenty of stores in and around the Summerside area already.

I hope with all my heart that the City of London considers the impact on the nearby park environment and the ambiance of this idyllic neighbourhood. Please, please, please DO NOT ALLOW ANY CONSTRUCTION ON MEADOWLILY RD.

Nancy Manners
159 Sandringham Cr. Unit 110

2008-05-23
It has come to my attention that Walmart, as a part of SmartCentres' master plan for our environment, wants to settle down and make sales in the wilderness area widely known as Meadowlilly Woods. Historically, when a similar infringement occurs, the abutting area to the commercial project slowly and almost unnoticeably deteriorates. Yes, I said almost. Eventually birds and other wildlife steer clear of the shrubs and other fauna close to the buildings. Bugs swoop in, and, no longer being consumed by birds, toads and so on, simply proliferate and defoliate the plants and trees. Add to that the litter that accumulates...and the vegetation literally dies and less fussy vegetation moves in...such as dandelion. They (the wildlife) had a biome going on, when suddenly, craftily, a huge corporation changed all that. Then, sadly, other developers challenge the notion that is an ESA. (I mean, hey, look at all the scrub and insignificance of it all) and a slanted review, commonly known as an Environmental Impact Study, is produced.

With lots of omissions of what really lives within the ESA, the city planners can be hood-winked; because according to the Study, there is little of significance on the easterly edge for 200 meters, for example. That section or parcel is then rezoned, as it has lost its Ministry of the Environment designation as an ESA. It just isn't special anymore. Except to the developers. It is a cyclical process that developers have loved for years. Simply put: We, along with the flora and fauna, pay a lot for those rock-bottom prices that the smiling yellow faces promise us. Sincerely, L. Graham
Dear Ms. Pasato:

I have huge concerns regarding the short and long term impacts on Meadowlily Woods ESA, incurred by the development of the adjacent site, should the zoning be changed that would allow a use change. I feel that we owe this Natural Heritage Site much more respect and consideration of its inhabitants. I wholly oppose the presently proposed zoning change and feel it should be changed to ESA Expansion Area.

I would like an opportunity to discuss my concerns further and to expand on a concept for development that would, I believe be of great benefit to all Londoners and Meadowlily Woods. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Louise Graham
Dear Ms. Pasato:

The following comments are submitted with respect to the proposed large commercial development at the top of the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). I have also sent the comments below to the “Chair and Members of the Planning Committee” care of L. Fisher, as I was advised to do so when I called City Hall to verify the correct procedure. I requested that this submission appear on the agenda for the upcoming Public Participation Meeting to be held by the Planning Committee, which I understand is to be held on Sept. 8th, 2008 or on a later date if that meeting is rescheduled. These comments come to you, however, as per the directions that were given at the “Town Hall Meeting” on July 29th, 2008. However it is phrased, my intention is that these comments be “on record” for purposes of later having standing before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

I previously faxed my Ward Councillor Mr. Roger Caranci with my initial thoughts on this matter, and I submit these more refined comments to you at this time.

Several weeks ago, while out on my daily cycling ride, I noticed some signs along Meadowlily Road referencing a proposed development. I have come to enjoy a route that runs along Commissioners Rd E to Meadowlily Rd S, down the hill on Meadowlily, and back along the Thames River bikeway to my residence in Old South.

I was dismayed to learn of the major commercial development proposed just above the Meadowlily Woods ESA, to be perched a meager 30 metres from this rare landscape.
The development mandates an amendment of the Official Plan and a rezoning of the area to permit this development, said to be comprised of a Wal-Mart store and a number of other stores in a "big box" configuration.

A website blurb posted by what appears to be the controlling company describes the proposed development:

SmartCentres London Southeast is a 22.5 acres site located in the rapidly growing area of Southeast London at the intersection of Commissioners Road and Meadowlily Road. Anchored by a large department store, this project will open in 2009. This 270,000 square foot site will offer both pads and inline stores. [Emphasis added]

There are problems associated with the evident developer assumption that this project is a done-deal:

My understanding is that at the provincial level there exists a policy expectation that already-in-use, already-designated or vacant sites be used up for commercial development prior to undeveloped space being consumed. London suffers from a growing blight of empty commercial space in both strip malls and conventional large malls. Westmount Mall, for example, appears to have much of its vast second floor store space empty and unused. Partially-occupied strip malls increasingly blot our neighborhood streetscapes.

It looks like the open space proposed for rezoning to serve the proposed stores sits in an area already more than a tad over-developed in terms of commercial space. The Pond Mills Square mall which houses the Zellers and Food Basics stores west of Highbury Ave on Commissioners Road East, amazingly close to the proposed development, is a largely vacant facility.

1 Screen captures on file.
2 The Province of Ontario notes, among some other policies in the PPS that would appear to apply to this proposed development, that "Planning authorities shall identify and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs." (Provincial Policy Statement, 1.1.3.3, Queens Printer for Ontario PDF, p. 5). The Provincial Policy Statement stresses that it "focuses growth within settlement areas and away from significant or sensitive resources..." (Provincial Policy Statement, p. 2).
The SmartCentres website implies that the company targets its locations on the basis of demographics, typically showing statistics as to income levels within certain distance ranges from each of its big box developments. From the website, it would seem that the demographic data showing the income levels as a function of distance is the major selling point aimed at potential site tenants. Nothing appears on the site that suggests any allowance for provincial or municipal policies in terms of location-targeting.

With provincial policy implying that existing commercially-targeted space be used up before other space is consumed by commercial development, a reasonable person would say that the developer’s business model potentially treads atop both provincial policy as well as London’s Official Plan, since the main driver is favorable demographics, coupled with what the firm asserts to be an emphasis on value for consumers.

These factors reasonably infer a stress toward determining locations based on minimal cost, which in turn creates an inherent drive toward open space, as open space is cheaper to develop. That drive runs counter to what Ontario and London set as priorities.

Contextually it is therefore inappropriate to permit this development, simply because the business model in play would seem to impose an implicit drag on provincial and City planning initiatives in placing demographic assessments as a top consideration. Allowing the rezoning would imply a significant inconsistency with London’s expressed goals as represented by the Official Plan, which does not appear to posit commercial profit levels higher than other stated City goals.

There is, reasonably speaking, a greater contextual problem in that such developments are also to be evaluated in terms of whether or not they may adversely affect retail space usage elsewhere, in part because such developments should not engender more empty retail space elsewhere, but also because of the provincial policy of considering existing locations and brownfield sites.

Problematically, because Wal-Mart is not the applicant for the zoning change, Wal-Mart has no obligation to state its intent as to whether it plans to ultimately close its White Oaks Mall store. The best the applicant documents can do in this regard is the following pondering presented in the their commissioned document entitled South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis, which notes that:

1 The Province of Ontario defines what the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) means when it says that planning “Shall be consistent with” the PPS: “it requires decision-makers to apply the policies and make decisions that are consistent with the applicable policies of the PPS. It is a strong implementation standard focusing on achieving policy outcomes, but it retains some flexibility for implementation.” (Infosheet: Applying the Provincial Policy Statement, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing PDF, p. 2)
While the proposed department store and non-department store DSTM space on the CCL Site will result in sales transfers from White Oaks Mall, they are not significant enough to cause store closures. While the Mall's Wal-Mart department store will experience the greatest competitive effects, the corporate decision to add additional Wal-Mart space to south east London demonstrates their confidence that the new space is supportable. CCL's Proposed Development will not compromise the planned function of White Oaks Mall.

Without a binding verification from Wal-Mart as to their intent to keep their White Oaks Mall store open long into the future, a commissioned assurance of mere confidence makes it difficult to meet any requirement to guard against adverse affects such as closures or mounting vacancy blight. Moreover, only the marketplace can determine who closes and who stays open; with mounting fuel costs that are likely to remain high, it's reasonable to assume that big mall and big box commercial models will become significantly less viable over time, rendering any assertion as to store presence doubtful if not moribund.

Indeed the document entitled *Peer Review: Malone Given Parsons, South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis, November 2007*, which the City appears to have commissioned in review of the developer-funded report referenced above, expresses doubt that the White Oaks Wal-Mart store will survive:

> For the White Oaks Wal-Mart, the sales decline would be even greater at 39.1% or to $278 per square foot in 2009. Some recovery in future years would be realized, however, by 2015, sales declines are expected to average some 20% from the current level of $456 per square foot. **Given the significant sales decline for the White Oaks Wal-Mart forecast, this store could be considered at risk.**

Moreover, the *South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis* glosses over the point that development should go into already-developed areas first, and that it is much less if it all a question of this proposal enhancing demand in such places nearby that may have empty retail space. It is the new stores to be hosted by this proposed development that should go into already-designated or empty retail space, not stores that might be thereafter attracted.

1 *South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis*, p. 6.
On the question of already-existing space, the *South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis* argues that such space is targeted to "serve a more local market than White Oaks Mall" and that

Together, Pond Mills Square, Summerside Shopping Centre, and CCL's Proposed Development would create a larger, new commercial focus for south east London, improving the level of service for local residents and recapturing outflows.³

And that report also asserts that

Growth in the market and the recapture of expenditures due to increased commercial uses in the node will not only support additional retail and service commercial space but could serve to strengthen the performance of existing commercial centres, namely Pond Mills Square.³

Given that Pond Mills Square has had many years to strengthen its performance, it is fair to question whether this project will benefit Pond Mills Square in terms of reducing vacant space. Moreover, strengthening "performance" is not necessarily the same as filling up the existing already-developed vacant space, since one or more existing stores might do better, while the vacancy situation goes unchanged.

Moreover, because neither Zellers nor Food Basics—both housed at Pond Mills Square—are the applicants for this zoning change, neither is under an obligation to state whether they will keep their stores open long into the future. No reliable assumption can be made that such stores will continue at Pond Mills Square, any more than we can assume that Wal-Mart's White Oaks "at risk" facility will be still be operating 10 years from now.

Indeed, the previously noted *Peer Review* suggests a closure situation looms here in noting that while Zellers' sales might recover by a small amount, "Zellers in the Pond Mills Square could see its sales decline to $106 per square foot by 2009, which could put this store at risk."

As for Food Basics, the *Peer Review* document notes that the developer's analysis of market conditions omitted consideration of a Bradley Ave site which is *already zoned* for a food store, that if

---

1 *South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis*, p. ix.
2 *South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis*, p. ix.
3 *South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis*, p. 83
4 *Peer Review: Malone Given Parsons, South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis, November 2007*, pp. 23.
later built, would endanger the Pond Mills Square Food Basics in the context of the competition that would also be in place at the Meadowlily project: "The Food Basics store, which is already a marginal performing store, could be at risk in 2015 with sales levels declining to some $280 per square foot if a third supermarket on Bradley were added in Zone 1 of some 40,000 square feet."

It is wise to distinguish between enterprises that survive by making a good go of it in the face of such developments versus the empty commercial space that may still go unfilled and the businesses that inevitably will not survive. Since the loss of community-grown businesses is a well-established phenomenon when Wal-Mart comes to an area, the potential net loss to the London tax base, the potential net loss of truly meaningful long-run employment, and other such damage still needs to be factored in and balanced against the generally low-paid employment engendered by big box locales.

The possibility of better performance at Pond Mills Square in the shadow of this proposed development is not the same as arguing effectively that vacant space will be fully utilized. The South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis report makes no effective claim that vacant space or already-designated space will be used up by the project at hand, either before or after the proposed Meadowlily development is undertaken. Consequently this report fails to establish the proposed development as being consistent with the provincial policy via the Ontario Policy Statement.

Commerce and development are beyond question good things to encourage in any city; but these activities should go forward in reasoned balance with the need to preserve the livability of a city, green space preservation and creation, public transit efficacy, and other equally important civic priorities. Not to mention conformance with Ontario public policy and the City's Official Plan.

Considering the consequences of allowing the Meadowlily development, it would be as if the Official Plan has little meaningful function, should we continue to create what amount to exemptions and exceptions when convenient for commercial interests.

I had a look at the "EIS" document submitted for this proposal. Considering the geological and heritage significance of the Meadowlily Woods area, we should reasonably be able to expect a more data-infused scientific assessment conducted over a longer period of time, unless we presume that the study is a token formality. In fairness to the public interest and to applicants, perhaps there is a need in the long run to require such studies to be conducted by independent public authorities.

Meadowlily Woods raises a related question as to what we value in our city's landscape and why we value it.

1 Peer Review: Malone Given Parsons, South East City of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis, November 2007, p. 20.
Preserving heritage properties and preserving environmentally important space is just as much about the context of the location involved as it is about the "protected" spaces involved.

One of the things that makes Meadowlily engaging is the quiet rural approaches from both the North and the South along Meadowlily Rd S, and the fact that the area has a wide, comfortable unbuilt boundary around it.

Apart from the defined issue of harmful runoff from this big development that will sit at the top of Meadowlily Woods, (big) boxing in Meadowlily Woods will have the obvious effect of eliminating the currently gracious and elegant open space that is clearly part of the green urban experience we call Meadowlily Woods.

Among many distinctions, Meadowlily is a rare surviving component of the Ingersol moraine, which has been largely obliterated elsewhere by encroaching developments.

It is therefore important that the City of London not step into inconsistency with both its own stated goals and provincial expectations as to land use simply to permit this ill-advised development. Even if there were to be no effect on the Meadowlily landscape, the development by its presence will obliterate much of the surrounding open context of Meadowlily Woods and detract from the livability of the area.

During the past few weeks I had the opportunity to shoot a collection of high-resolution digital images of Meadowlily, and I was struck by the environmental haze already present in some of the images posted at http://tinyurl.com/6d2eul. We should wonder, if congested air around Meadowlily Woods may be a problem now, what will be the effect of endless throngs of car-driven customers to this new facility?

We have zoning classifications that limit such projects as this proposed development for a reason. There are few if any good reasons to alter the present zoning for this rather non-conforming proposal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Keith E. Risler
Ms. Nancy Pasato  
Planning Division, Planning and Development  
City of London  
300 Dufferin Ave. P.O. Box 5035  
London, ON N6A 4L9  


Re: Development Application OZ-7430 - 168 Meadowlily Road South  

Dear Ms. Pasato:  

I am writing as a concerned resident of London and also as a concerned biologist, regarding the development proposed by Commissioners Centres Limited at 168 Meadowlily Woods Road South. My wife and two young boys and I have enjoyed many outings to Meadowlily Woods ESA, as well as the trails on the North side of the Thames River East of the Meadowlily Road footbridge. I work at the University of Western Ontario as a professor of biology and my research area is the impact of disturbance on the diversity of soil fungi. I have a background as a naturalist, nurtured here in London as a young member of the McIlwraith Field Naturalists, which led to a position as a summer naturalist in Algonquin Park, and to my interests in field biology that took me through degrees in Landscape Architecture, a Master of Science in Environmental Biology (both at the University of Guelph), and a PhD in Botany (University of Toronto). For six years at Western, I taught Environmental Biology (Bio 285b), which presents the biological basis of world and regional environmental issues. Therefore, I have considerable background on the intersection of urban and regional planning and biology.

My concern as a London resident is that such a marvelous natural recreation area should not be lost to or threatened by an unnecessary shopping development. London clearly has excess retail capacity, evident to any sensible person, despite what two market strategy reports have to say to the contrary. There is no need for another Walmart in the southeast end of London, since there are already two within easy driving distance — one at White Oaks Mall and one at Argyle Mall. Again, although the market consultants were not concerned at Walmart’s apparent decision to put their existing stores at risk with this new development, I think that the City should be very concerned. There are many opportunities in London for revitalization developments of under-occupied or under-utilized commercial areas — notably the Galleria, the Huron/Highbury mall complex and the nearby Pond Mills Square. These should be developed for commercial retail space ahead of precious green space.
My concern as a biologist is for the well being of the very special natural area designated as the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area. Note that I did not say "protected as the Meadowlily Woods ESA." Many examples worldwide, including the Sifton Bog ESA right here in London, show us that designating a green spot on the map as a conservation reserve of some kind does not provide protection to that area from the development and pollution of the surrounding areas. In the early 1970s, I learned from my geography classes in A.B. Lucas High School that planning in the City of London was backward, and that we had not learned from the lessons of urban sprawl that developed in U.S. cities since the 1940s; it seems we still have not. I learned about "CCB" conceptual planning — cores, corridors, and buffer zones. It does seem that City planners had this in mind when they designated the area affected by this proposal "h-2", with the requirement that any proposed development be appropriate for the adjacent natural area. However, the proposed development at 168 Meadowlily Woods Road is not part of a commercial core, but instead would eat away at a valuable natural buffer zone that currently protects a "natural core" — the ESA — and is not appropriate in this location.

The Environmental Impact Statement (Dillon Consulting Limited, July 18, 2008, hereafter referred to as the EIS) misses this main point. Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area (the ESA) is a natural jewel, currently protected in a buffering green setting. As with a diamond in a ring, the jewel is lost without the setting. Although Dillon Consulting Limited found "no natural features ... on the property with the exception of the two remnant hedgerows that provide minimal habitat for common wildlife species" (EIS, p. 36), the aerial photographs tell a different story. Any school child could detect the difference between an area of agricultural fields and abandoned hedgerows and a massive retail complex and parking lot, and would guess correctly that the former provides greater protection for an adjacent Environmentally Significant Area that lies downhill! Development will eliminate not only the cover of agricultural crops and perimeter vegetation, which reduces overland flow (run-off) during snow-melt and major precipitation events of the spring, summer and fall, but will also wipe out the community of soil organisms (thousands of species and millions of individuals, without even counting the bacteria) that provides multiple ecological services which benefit the site and its neighbours. Trading a green, agricultural landscape for a hard-surfaced commercial landscape will radically alter runoff patterns as well as the quality of water running off the site and into the ESA. This impact is very deceitfully downplayed in the EIS. Dillon Consulting noted that the ESA to the northeast of the proposed development site has been adversely affected by drainage from the City of London sports fields (EIS, p. 3), which is very true: gully-erosion within the hardwood forest site that is the cores of Meadowlily Woods has greatly increased within the past decade. If this impact was created by a sports development with grassed surfaces and engineered storm-water retention pond, what impacts could be expected from a commercial development that is >95% building and hard-surface paving?

Another logical flaw in the EIS is the assumption that edge species have little ecological value, and that the development will have little impact on the more "valuable" species within the interior of the ESA. Without this buffering edge there is less interior, and the effective size and quality of the ESA is reduced. The interior of the hardwood forest to the northeast of the proposed development is a special place indeed, and London is very fortunate to have protected this area when the opportunity when the opportunity was there. There are small patches within this forest that have old-growth characteristics (e.g., very old trees and a lot of large, mossy
fallen logs), and support fungi and invertebrates that are at peril in all of Southwestern Ontario.

This interior habitat is at risk of degradation by invasion (from the edges) of alien plants (e.g., garlic mustard) and invertebrates (e.g., non-native isopods, or "pill-bugs") that have major impacts on the ecological balance. The closer and more disturbed the edge is to the interior, the more easily these invasives reach the interior and begin to degrade it. This pattern is well documented in the Byron ("Sifton") Bog, around which development has been allowed to proceed right to the edges of the protected property. Nutrient-rich runoff from adjacent housing and commercial complexes has altered the plant species composition in the most special part of that property, the sphagnum bog. At Meadowlily Woods, the City of London has the opportunity to learn from these mistakes and prevent them here.

Use of land designated as h-2 Urban Reserve – Community Growth for major commercial development is inappropriate, especially since that holding designation was put into place in order to require agreement on appropriate development in consideration of the adjacent natural features, i.e., the Environmentally Significant Area Meadowlily Woods. Referring to the redevelopments of Masonville, Argyle and Oakridge Malls, Malone Given Parson Ltd. stated that, "These local examples demonstrate how the reinvestment in enclosed shopping centres has the potential to revitalize older shopping areas through redevelopment." (South East City Of London Market Demand and Impact Analysis, November 2007) This, and the commercial development of other vacant developed urban lands, is where the City of London should find the space needed for additional commercial-retail space.

In summary, the City of London should reject the proposed development as inappropriate for the location due to the adjacent ESA. The City should hold out for a proposal that would maintain or create predominantly green space, possibly with residential/commercial uses directly along Commissioners Road where the drainage is away from the ESA and the biological impacts on the ESA are minimized by maintaining an adequate biological buffer zone.

In your response to this letter, I hope you can also provide pages A2, A4, etc., which are missing from both posted and printed versions of the EIS.

Sincerely,

Greg Thorn.

Cc: members of the Planning Committee,
Mayor Anne Marie DeCicco-Best (Ex-officio), Councillor Judy Bryant (Chair), Controller Gina Barber, Controller Bud Polhill, Councillor Roger Caranci, Councillor Nancy Branscombe, Councillor Paul Van Meerbergen
To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of Ward 1, a home owner, and a concerned citizen, I am writing today to express my objection to the application received by the City of London for rezoning of 168 Meadowlily Rd. from the current UR-1 urban reserve designation to designation for commercial development.

I strongly believe that it is in the best interests of the citizens of London for this application to be rejected for a number of reasons, but most importantly, because it is my view that a commercial/retail designation would be an inappropriate use of this parcel of land.

I am fully aware that the applicant had submitted an initial Environmental Impact Study (EIS), which the City of London rejected. I am also aware that the applicant modified the initial development proposal and has submitted a new EIS. Having reviewed the "revised" proposal, I remain convinced that the applicant cannot provide sufficient mitigation of the environmental impact of such a develop and that the revised plan represents nothing more than a "greenwashing" public relations exercise. The "buffer zone" and reduced points of access in the revised plan will do nothing to actually decrease the overall impact of this proposed development, particularly on the neighbouring, sensitive Meadowlily Woods ecosystem.

Commercial developments of the size proposed require significant human traffic in order to supply stock to the retailers, as well as in regard to consumer traffic to make the business venture viable. The proposed development is not in easy walking distance of a population large enough to support such a commercial development without an influx of traffic from the broader community. With extremely limited London Transit access to the location, consumers will only be able to access this development in any significant numbers by private automobile, with all the inherent environmental damage which accompanies such transportation.

Given the low occupancy and number of failing businesses to the west of 168 Meadowlily at the "Pond Mills Centre Square" mall, where walking and transit access is significantly better, it is clear that the neighbourhood in question is unable to support a development of this size in a sustainable, long term manner. It would be irresponsible for the City of London to approve yet another development in such close proximity given this economic reality.

Further, a report (attached to submission) conducted by an outside consultant—urban Metrics Inc—commissioned by the City of London in 2007 reported that the current
commercial inventory in London totals some 17 million square feet. The report also states that current vacant land already designated for commercial use can support upwards of 4.3 sq ft of commercial space. The report indicated this represented a "marginal oversupply", with a "fairly good balance in terms of the distribution". While the report goes on to state that by 2026 there would be a small shortfall, as planning committee members are well aware and have publicly stated on a number of other issues (such as residential water rates), the economic conditions are not as strong as they have been in recent years. Given these factors, the proposed development at 168 Meadowlily should be rejected. Simply put, a surplus of space is already designated for commercial use, fairly distributed across the city. At a time of economic uncertainty, there is no valid argument to be made for designating additional UR-1 land for commercial development, particularly in a location inappropriate for such designation.

As city councillors and staff are aware, 168 Meadowlily abuts the “Meadowlily Woods” which is an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). Further, this ESA is part of the larger Thames River ecosystem on the south branch of the Thames. In recent months, the state of our river and the need for our city to refocus on the value of the river to our community has been one of the top priorities for London. The London Free Press series “A River” is the most obvious indicator of this priority, but by no means the only one.

Included with this submission are recent articles which have appeared on LondonTopic.ca, focused on the good news story of the return of the spiny soft shelled turtle to the Thames habitat, an op-ed on the growing opposition to the proposed development, and an announcement from the federal government in regard to funding for Thames River conservation efforts.

In noting the recent federal funding announcement, planners and councillors should be aware that the Thames River currently has a federal “Canadian Heritage River System” designation. The proposed development would clearly be a violation of the mandate of this designation. Approval of the application for rezoning would seriously jeopardize the CHRS designation and could present significant barriers to any future federal funding requests for Thames River projects.

Having attended the townhall meeting on this matter hosted by MP Irene Mathyssen in July, I was also surprised to learn from Mathyssen’s guest MPP Peter Tabuns (Toronto-Danforth) that this application is also in violation of Ontario government policy statements around development and green space protection.

It would seem to me that the City of London would be making an error in judgement to approve an application which could have serious repercussions in municipal relationships with senior levels of government. Referring again to the Thames River spiny turtle article, the City of London may also be putting itself in a position where a “species at risk” is threatened should this development be approved, as hydrological systems will invariably be altered by the paving over a viable land on the river moraine.
It is clear to anyone with more than a basic understanding of ecological science that the “revised” proposal submitted by the applicant will do nothing to protect Meadowlily Woods from the environmental impact of such a development.

The land in question is also adjacent to a reasonably sized and well utilized sports and recreation development. This also makes the proposed commercial development inappropriate. London emergency rooms are already dealing with far too many cases of asthma attacks and other air quality related illnesses. Athletes utilizing the playing fields, from small children to grown adults, could be put at additional risk for health problems related to air quality from the afore mentioned traffic. In considering this issue, we should not overlook nor underestimate the quality of life issue of family participation in sporting activities. We create stronger communities when an atmosphere of family involvement is created for recreational participation. Placing a large commercial development between an ESA and sports fields only provides distraction and disincentive for families to participate in activities in this area together, weakening, not enhancing our community.

Although I recognize that planners and committee members cannot make a rezoning decision based on the applicant or possible tenants, I would be remiss if I did not also remind decision makers that the applicant has a very questionable record of environmental and community stewardship.

In opposing the application to rezone 168 Meadowlily for commercial use, I believe it is also incumbent upon me to propose alternatives to planners and committee members. Recognizing that the land is UR-1 zoned currently, at some point in the future it is reasonable to assume that rezoning will occur to allow some utilization of this land in the future. I respectfully submit that the Summerside community is underserviced in various ways, not the least of which is the lack of a public elementary school or community centre. Rezoning the land to allow for either of these uses would be far more appropriate. Expansion of the sports fields to accommodate London’s growing demand for soccer and other athletic uses, or designation as park land would also be acceptable uses for 168 Meadowlily. Given the significant shortfall of tree cover in the “Forest City”, it would also be acceptable to return 168 Meadowlily to woodlot, further enhancing the ESA and the Thames River corridor.

In conclusion, rezoning 168 Meadowlily for commercial use is simply an inappropriate use for this UR-1 designated land. The applicant has a wide selection of existing and vacant commercial designations to pursue opportunities with. The proximity of the Meadowlily Woods ESA, the sporting fields, and the Park farm Heritage property all reinforce the inappropriateness of this rezoning application. I call on members of the planning committee to reject the applicant’s proposal and refuse the rezoning application.

Respectfully,

Shawn Lewis
67 Trapper St.
London ON, N5W 3C9
A species of turtle threatened in Ontario and across Canada is making an apparent comeback along the Thames River thanks to the ongoing efforts of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority’s Turtle Team.

Officials with the UTRCA said the Spiny Soft-shell Turtle eggs for this year are hatching along the Thames, and it is hoped they will survive the many dangers they face, and be able to lay eggs themselves in about 12 to 15 years.

"Recent studies show more and more soft-shell turtles of all ages are being seen along the Thames River. The ongoing work of the UTRCA is having a positive impact on the soft-shell turtle population. This is good news for the Spiny Soft-shell Turtles, which is threatened both provincially and federally," said UTRCA officials in a media release.

The UTRCA began studying the Spiny Soft-shell Turtle’s role in the Thames watershed back in 1994, and since then, Scott Gillingwater, a species-at-risk biologist, has headed up a group of seasonal employees known as the Turtle Team in developing some of the best turtle research techniques in the world.

"This research has provided some of the only data on this species in Canada," UTRCA officials said.

This summer, Gillingwater and the Turtle Team has protected more than 60 soft-shell turtle nests and UTRCA officials report hundreds of baby turtles are now hatching and heading to the Thames River.

Worldwide turtle populations are declining mainly due to habitat loss, road mortality and collection. Spiny Soft-shell Turtles are threatened due to lack of appropriate nesting sites as well as nest predation by foxes and raccoons. Other threats to soft-shell nesting sites include damage and disruption by recreational vehicles along shorelines, and by cattle that have access to the river.
While the Spiny Soft-shell Turtle recovery project is having promising results, officials said the work is vulnerable, due to shifting priorities in funding from government and foundations. As a result, financial help from the public and private sector for the project would be welcomed, officials said.

Funding for 2008 has been provided by the provincial Stewardship Fund, Environment Canada's Habitat Stewardship Fund, the federal Job Creation Program, and the University of Western Ontario.

In 2005, Scott Gillingwater authored the Spiny Soft-shell Turtle Stewardship Guide. The stewardship guide is targeted toward landowners with property next to turtle habitat, and also to anyone with an interest in turtles. The guide is beautifully illustrated with amazing photos from Scott's personal collection. Readers will find a wonderful volume of never before published information about the appearance and behaviour of these turtles, threats to their survival, and actions to help with their recovery. Copies are available from the UTRCA.
Feds announce funding for Thames River habitat projects

Canada's federal government is investing in the Upper Thames River environment with recently announced funding aimed at supporting several projects spearheaded by the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA).

Recently, Minister of Environment John Baird met with UTRCA officials and announced $278,462 for the Thames River Aquatic Ecosystem Stewardship Initiative under the Habitat Stewardship Program.

"Our Government is committed to protecting and preserving our natural environment," said Baird. "I fully support grassroots community initiatives like these that deliver real results for Canadians by improving our environment."

This funding supports 13 projects aimed at habitat improvement, human impact mitigation, monitoring and outreach/education, carrying a total cost of approximately $1.2 million. Additional funding is to be supplemented through collaboration with local partners, UTRCA officials said.

The Thames River Aquatic Ecosystem Stewardship Initiative looks to improve water quality and aquatic habitat by offering incentives to private rural landowners to use recognized best management practices for clean water. The program will also involve community and school groups, as well as aid in the creation of public awareness activities, including a reptile education program. Funding will also help ensure a safe and maintained habitat for spiny soft-shell turtles and queen snakes.

The Habitat Stewardship Program is a partnership-based conservation initiative managed by Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and Parks Canada. It is a major component of the federal government's program to implement the Species at Risk Act.
ECOSPECTIVE: The ongoing plight of Meadowlily

Daniel O'Neal,
LondonTopic.ca
08/19/2008

Sitting down for coffee, Dorothy Stolarski and I discussed what got her involved in community activism. "It's about family first, and our values, our London values. How could I not get involved?" she said.

In 1988 she sat on student council at Catholic Central high school as part of 'Crusaders in action' and was involved in the banning of smoking in the cafe at Brescia College in the mid 90's but her current activity strikes closer to home - across the street from her parents home to be precise.

In November 2007 a letter regarding a zoning change request arrived at her parents house, a request had been made to the city to rezone the urban reserve area across the street into a shopping center development.

Two-hundred and twenty acres of arable land was about to quietly turn into another asphalt desert to match the one across Commissioners Road East.

When a handful of members of the community arrived at the public meeting they were appalled at what was being proposed: a new shopping center with a big box store and a smattering of outbuildings, what is commonly misnamed as a 'Smart center'; a development that would grind against the Meadowlily Environmental Area, and would have placed three busy entrances along this quiet, dead end, almost rural, residential street.

So few people in the community took the time to find out what was about to happen to their neighbourhood that they risked losing everything before they understood the issue. The city councillor for the Ward was quoted as saying "Only nine of you?" as if to dismiss the neighbourhood concerns as frivolous.

What was not taken into account was the fact the residents had only three weeks to respond in writing, and many people don't take the time to be involved in their government, assuming that someone else will handle it, or sure that someone else will fight for them.
One thing we all need to know about city government, the golden rule is numbers matter. You cannot expect a handful of people to properly represent a neighbourhood to council. You need to show council that we are all involved and that we all are concerned.

Development is so sure of community inaction that speculators are already making enquiries to the residents, in the belief that these houses will be razed to make room for even more strip mall parking.

If it had not been for the efforts of Stolarski, the neighbourhood the environmental area could have lost by default.

She chose to do something about the irresponsibility of “maximizing the profits of commercial development and not taking into consideration the people, the residents and the ESA (Environmentally Sensitive Area).”

So when the second meeting was quietly announced in small print in the local paper with 10 days notice she acted. Stolarski contacted the local media, government officials and created a sign that said “Save our Street, Keep it Green” and with help contacted the affected residents.

When almost 200 people showed up for a meeting in July at Summerside Community Church, the city had to notice, as they did when the media showed the community gathering at the sign to get details of what was proposed.

Another rally is scheduled Sept. 6 at the Richmond Street North entrance to Victoria Park, this one hosted by Sustainable Cities to draw attention to the encroachment on Meadowlily and the more people who show up, the more City Hall will take notice.

Only as a group can we express our outrage at this encroachment. Where the trees that grow along this stretch of the Thames, the heritage remains of Meadowlily Mill built in 1856, and the Parkfarm house constructed in 1849, even the walking path across the 1910 Meadowlily bridge will be hidden behind another unimaginative boxy shopping center and another stretch of greedy signs shouting 'SALE' as greeting to people arriving at our city. We might as well change the city moniker from the Forest City to 'London, the parking lot City.'

Only by participation can we change the way we are governed.

For more information visit online (see link).

--- --- ---

Daniel O’Neail is a London political figure, environmentalist, and public speaker. Opinions are those of the author. Contact Daniel by e-mail (see link).
Dear Planning Committee,

The Thames River is one of London's most undervalued resources, and it and the ESA must be protected. I would like to voice my concern about a proposed large commercial development on property adjoining the Meadowlilly Woods Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), located east of Highbury Ave near Commissioners Road, is an inappropriate use of this beautiful wood and meadow land.

Concern for me is best expressed in a poem:

"True Cost: Walmart versus Woodland"

Smart!Centres (Walmart) applies for London zoning by-law changes so they can establish a Complex at the corner of Meadowlilly Road South and Commissioners East right next to Meadowlilly Woods' lovely stand, that environmentally sensitive area close to the Thames. Deep pockets vie against deep wood. Development vs. organic diversity. Tarmac vs. trillium

What do you love? The choice is yours, in season: Nature's long cycle or fake hype selling discounted bargains months before due date. Veracity vs. voracity.

Walmart's pumped buys cost us dear in exorbitant charges never marked down: cheap overseas labour unrecognized, deplorable working conditions ignored.

2008-08-13
Walmart offers low, low prices way beyond what we can humanly afford.

The tag you gleefully pay can’t account for inevitable recompense in lost resource.

And the consequence? Invasive species multiply in a virus of corporation logos that we collect and prize in vain, while native plants die out. Not a good deal.

What we don’t know, we can’t care for. Meadowlilly Woods’ worth is now in flux.

How do you evaluate a loss of habitat tamped down by asphalt, crushed by power complexes where brand names replace the reality of life that feeds us?

Smarten up, Walmart. Organized to oppose development, we won’t shop.

What do we pay for the irreplaceable place if it’s lost? Memories all too soon are boxed in by big stores selling greed. Nostalgia like guilt is a sop to be sold.

“What’s a meadowlilly?” kids will ask, reading a street name, its reality lost.

What do we tell them when simulacra of names replace the fullness of life?

How do we appreciate the natural world, changing, wild, free and our only home?

Ask what lasts. Glacial meltwater carved a spillway through the Ingersoll moraine, floodplain to terraced loam to upland clay, Carolinian and northern Great Lake forest.

Over ten thousand years, so many species found their place, settled and now co-exist.

Native phlox and poppies from an old farm. Willows sun-sparkle green on warbler song.
Beech on the hill slope shelter Spring Beauty. Hemlocks mingle over fern in lacy ravines.

A boy wades into the river, fixing his lure to wait, just as still as nearby Great Blue Heron.

What cost beauty? What value do we place on trail walks through harmonious complexity?

In the woods, you can breathe deeply and be inspired. Here we know we belong, participating in the co-creative process of simply living, sensing continuous wholeness. Drawing on the energy of nature, we emerge renewed in a relationship of respect, understanding what a wood is worth. Stand your ground!

(see http://www.thamesriver.on.ca/Wetlands_and_Natural_Areas/meadowlily.htm)

More of my thoughts on the importance of the river are posted on A River: Toy Boat Tour, pt.12: http://lfpress.ca/specialreports/ariver.html.

Thank you,
Penn

Penn Kemp, Pendas Productions
525 Canterbury Road, London ON N6G 2N5

2008-08-13
Hello Bud,

Thank you for your time in reading my e-mail. I don't know if you are still operating your business in east London as well but am sure you are a busy man.

I have like you had family in the east end of London for a long time and while I appreciate the need for growth, the growth of the city is something that your position was created to administer and control.

I urge you to decline this rezoning on ethical grounds to keep the east end properly maintained. The farm land is adjacent to significant areas and the risk to the space would be expensive. The need for another green area to be devoured while there are large vacant black areas needing to be used is a waste. It would seem that the inclusion of another Walmart with it's grocery, McDonald's, garage, eye care, pharmacy etc. can manage without having to be on a lot that needs to stay green. The east end has a Walmart there is only so much money to spend, I hope we can keep the small community of the east end managed and the green space protected.

Thank you for your time.
Please note you may share my opinion, it is not confidential and I intend for it to be public, I am trusting you will again do the right thing for east London.

Sincerely,
Chery Lake
117 Norlan Ave.
London, ON

CC: rcaranci@london.ca
Sent: 8/10/2008 9:28:43 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time
Subj: RE: Rezoning of Pin # 08477004, 168 Meadowlily Rd. S

Good Day, Mr. Paul Van Meerbergen

I am writing this to you after writing my Ward Councillor Mr. Roger Caranci and because you are on the Planning Committee for looking at the rezoning of #08477004, 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. Please feel free to share this e-mail, it is not confidential and I also intend to make my opinions public knowledge on this topic. Therefore this e-mail will be public record so to speak.

I urge you to decline the rezoning of this farm land to commercial use. As you know the east end of London is full of small business people who appreciate and value conservative business. A commercial development of this type would wipe out generations of family businesses and create a different type of bulk and ritualistic shopping. I enjoy trying to frequent places that are readily available in my surrounding area where one can walk and have a sense of knowing owners. You would wipe out the No Frills and Price Chopper not to mention all the family run variety stores. It also needs lots of parking for God knows how many gas gussling cars.

Personally I do not shop at Walmart. I try to do business with the companies in my area. The east end is a community where one feels they belong and matter. I have lived in the east end and a lot of my family has as well.

I find it disappointing that a small park behind my small home was rezoned so McDonalds could expand, which has resulted in a vacant lot with weeds to sit there looking horrible ever since. If you rezone this farm land what will happen to the McDonalds at Hamilton and Highbury? What will happen to the Walmart at Whiteoaks?
London has a strategic plan and an official plan which in the case of this lot at 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. I feel would allow you to suggest this lot be purchased from Louisa Golf not rezoned. The city purchased the piece of property right beside the river recently on Meadowlily, why not finish the block of property and secure this green space?

The long vision of community and an environmentally healthy area for the east end depends on you doing the area proud by declining the rezoning of this 168 Meadowlily farmland to commercial black top shopping.

I wish you well in your decision and hope you will find it in your heart to let me know your opinion on this rezoning. I appreciate your time.

Also, could you possibly direct me to a provincial department that would also support good business planning in municipalities if our city needs more back up to limit the mass commercialism of the walmarts?

Appreciate your advise, thank you,

Chery Lake
117 Norlan Ave.
London, ON

---

From: LakeDandeno
To: rcaranci@london.ca
Sent: 8/7/2008 8:08:42 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time
Subj: RE: concerns and problems

Mr. Roger Caranci,

I wish to let you know that I am against the rezoning of the lot at 168 Meadowlily Rd. S at the corner of Commissioners Rd and Meadowlily to commercial use. It is farm land now. The lot is neighbors to lovely homes and green space.

In an attempt at brevity I am going to list my concerns in point form:

- There are many other black spaces within a very short distance of the area that could be used for commercial uses and they are vacant.
- The lot is the last parcel in a large block of green space and is adjacent to “Provincially designated” ESA designated Woods.
- The lot is at the “top” of the land grade, the pollution could falter down.
- Below this lot:
  - are Birds
  - many precious Animals,
  - flowers, many protected
and vegetative significant plants,

- wet lands with butterfly's
- and Old Growth Trees!

- The water sewage plant is already to capacity.
- There is flood plane land and the river below this hill.
- I am wondering also if an educated opinion that this lot is at the highest point of London so significant problems will occur as they say stuff goes down hill.
- London has a plan to watch the type of damage rezoning this farmland to commercial business would to this area.

There was a small park behind my home and the city rezoned this park. The light, noise and garbage pollution behind my home from McDonalds in comparison is a minor compared to the drastic mistake rezoning 168 Meadowilly to commercial would be.

I was also considering purchasing a home on the north side of meadowilly but I would be concerned about the changes you are considering.

I have lived a lot of my life in east london and feel that progress is good, destruction of significant areas is something that can be avoided.

I was wondering if the development out at hamilton and commissioners has caused any water concerns.

I see you are also concerned about water and the management of it.

FYI: this Email will be sent to others, so that I can express my opinion, it is not confidential.

1. Please let me know your opinion via e-mail ASAP on this rezoning, I would appreciate knowing.
2. Also, would you please let me know who else sits on the rezoning committee in London City Hall?

Thank you,
Chery Lake
117 Notlan Ave.
London, On

From: [Name] Sent: Monday, August 11, 2008 2:26 PM
To: Pasato, Nancy
Subject: RE: 168 Meadowilly Rd. S Rezoning
Dear N. Pasato,

I have attached some emails I have sent to Roger Caranci, Bud Polhill and Paul Van Meerbergen regarding the rezoning of 168 Meadowlily Rd. S please include these with your letters in making your decisions on rezoning.

I wish to also state my apology and correction of implying that the development out at Commissioners Rd. and Hamilton Rd.d has affected the water out there, it has not.

Please decline this rezoning and turn 168 into green space since it is so close to significant green space.

Thank you,

Congratulations on all your hard work.

Sincerely,

Chery Lake

117 Norlan Ave.

London, ON
August 7, 2008

Nancy Pasato, MCIP, RPP
Planner II - Implementation
Planning Division, Planning and Development
City of London
300 Dufferin Ave. P.O. Box 5035
London, ON N6A 4L9
npasato@london.ca

Dear Ms. Pasato,

I am writing to express my concerns about the application by Smart Centres to build a retail development on Commissioners' road, adjacent to the Meadowlily Woods.

The Meadowlily Woods is an environmentally sensitive area, and one of the few woodlands left in what we would like to think of as “the Forest City.” A development of this scope will bring increased traffic, light, and litter to the area. Though the Environmental Impact Study commissioned by the developer suggests that these effects can be mitigated, it is significant that the envisaged mitigation is predicated upon customers either not littering, or bringing their own bags to shop—that is, it is predicated upon customers of this shopping centre behaving differently here than they do elsewhere! In the real world, the impact on the woods—both ecological and aesthetic—will be devastating.

This decision should be framed in a larger context. We should think about the sort of city we wish to create, rather than having our urban planning done for us by outside developers. One option would be a compact city, with thriving local businesses downtown, a pedestrian- and cycle-friendly city. Alternatively, we can choose to turn London into a sprawling wasteland of big-box stores, low-density shopping centres, and parking lots. It is this alternative that has been pursued to date. I have lived in London for 11 years. In that time, I have seen it become progressively a less liveable city, as more and more big-box shopping centres are created, pulling business away from the struggling core of the city, which is where the heart and soul of the city lie.

We must also keep in mind the very real possibility that (despite assurances to the contrary), if permitted to open a new, larger store on Commissioners' road, Wal-Mart will move out of the White Oaks mall, leaving an empty retail space that will not easily be filled. This will have the predictable impact on the other businesses at White Oaks. London does not need another "ghost mall."
In my opinion, the decision regarding the proposed development should be an easy one. The development would be bad for the woods, bad for local businesses, bad for quality of life in London. The application should be rejected.

Best regards,

Wayne C. Myrvold
Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy
University of Western Ontario
Dear Ms. Pasato and Councilors,

As you well know, the application process for the construction of a Wal-Mart "big box store" is nearing completion. Judy and I were among the participants at the local neighbourhood fact-finding meeting that was held on Tuesday night, July 22, 2008, at the community church. We would like to submit our concerns with this application at this time. The following are issues that we believe need to be addressed, in order for us to feel comfortable about continuing to live in this community.

Environmental Concerns

The Albedo Effect:

There is little doubt in most residents' minds, that a significant climatic, environmental change will be occurring based upon the transformation of the land use from an agricultural base (irrigated land with trees) to that of an asphalt plain with a large series of wind obstructing buildings. The energy footprint for this land is based upon an "albedo" of approximately 15 – 25% reflection of the sun's radiant energy. The asphalt and buildings will greatly reduce the albedo of the same property to an initial level of 5% reflection and subsequent levels of around 10% for many years to come (see Exhibit A). What this means to this large parcel of land, is that the environmental balance is going to be radically changed as more radiant energy is absorbed into the construction-based materials. In addition, man-made thawing and clearing of snow in
the winter time will continue to alter the moisture-laden makeup of the surrounding properties.

No where in this second effort, EIS document, has irrigation been fully addressed (the first EIS document failed to approve construction of the big box store). The profound change to the natural irrigation of the land to the North of the applicant's property hasn't been addressed properly with some kind of commitment, on the applicant's part, to maintain what is in existence today. In fact, the flow of rain water is to be greatly altered to the North/West portion of the Meadowlily land. If the asphalt and buildings are to play the role of "capture and dissipation" of rain flow, how will the existing land to the North continue to be replenished as we know and accept is occurring today?

Trees have high albedos and reflect the sun's rays at a higher level; well within the stratus of free flowing air stream(s), for better cooling. The retardation of free air flow will continue into the winter months as well, as the applicant site will be cleared in all cases, but will include massive buildings to dampen air circulation. Further, there is no mention of the function of the principles of conduction, evaporation and rain on the large span of asphalt. To put it simply, what you are promoting with this approval is yet another "heat island" for the city of London.

Here is a brief definition of the cause and effect of a heat island:

"Most cities have temperatures that average 5 to 10° F (3 to 6° C) higher than surrounding rural areas. This urban heat island is caused by many factors that are concentrated in cities. Asphalt roads and parking lots, tar rooftops, buildings, and cement surfaces all absorb sunlight and then reradiate heat. This contrasts with rural areas, where trees, shady plants, and grass use..." (1)

In addition to the effect of heat islands on what was once farmland we have the loss associated with the removal of pollutants in our neigbourhood:
“Specifically, the U.S. Department of Forestry calculated in a study published in 1994, concerning “Air Pollution Removal by Chicago’s Urban Forest” that a single tree with a caliper of nine inches removes two pounds of sulfur dioxide, 1.1 pounds of ozone, 200 pounds of CO₂ and two pounds each of particulates and nitrogen dioxide annually. It is well documented that urban temperatures exceed rural temperatures. Houston’s summer urban temperatures exceed the surrounding rural temperatures by approximately 8 degrees. Trees reduce urban temperatures through shade and transpiration. It is estimated that for each degree Fahrenheit reduction in urban temperatures, peak load electricity demand decreases 1.5 – 2 %.” (2)

In reference to the climatic changes that I have mentioned during the cold months:

“The classic example of albedo effect is the snow-temperature feedback. If a snow covered area warms and the snow melts, the albedo decreases, more sunlight is absorbed, and the temperature tends to increase. The converse is true: if snow forms, a cooling cycle happens. The intensity of the albedo effect depends on the size of the change in albedo ....” (3)

What we are trying to point out here is the fact that this EIS report is nothing more than a narrative, a story of the “probable” environmental conditions for the land in question. It does not address any specific scientific, academic or responsible issues when it comes to environmental impact due to change. Nor does this report consider wildlife outside of a cursory review. Apparently, the “research team” failed to find the fecal droppings of the large population of wild turkeys that inhabit the land. They failed to quantify the size of the whitetail deer population as well. What else did they miss, dismiss or choose to ignore in order to pass/bypass the EIS perimeters? We can only speculate as to why the first report failed, it is of course not available, so we have heard.
I could go on about how the noise and pollution from over 1,000,000 cars stopping at the store annually will destroy the neighbourhood for tax-paying residents. I could mention the traffic congestion that will occur for everyone concerned. I could also mention the more obvious loss of farmland that our children enjoy seeing every day now. We could talk about those dozens of wild turkeys out in the field or the countless white-tailed deer who call this land their home. I could also provide scientific data to back up the reasons why we do not want to go down the expansionary road, but isn’t that the responsibility of the EIS report? Aren’t they accountable for indentifying ALL of the issues? Must those with the most to lose have to step up and do the work for them?

The Solution:

I’m not an expert in environmental analysis, but I do know that it would be far more prudent of us to entrust our future in those who are not only experts, but unbiased experts without questionable connections to change agents. I do know that scientific data and academic analysis are the only why we are going to get a clearer picture of the pending effects of the transformation of this land. With several degrees in business and engineering, and as a person who has successfully developed both Greenfield and Brownfield operations, it makes no sense to entertain the present proposal for this site without the due consideration of other locations.

There is an abandoned site available now, located on the West side of Highbury that is economically rotting away. To think that a piece of property exists that contains the demographics of a dense, “able to walk to the location” population bordering three sides of the property, makes much more sense to me. Furthermore, we have two Wal-Marts within driving distance, Argyle Mall @ 4.33 kms and White Oaks Mall @ 5.17 kms. Do we truly need three Wal-Marts in the south east end of the city? Here is a simple exercise for you to do, draw a circle with a 6 km. radius around each current Wal-Mart and the proposed site, look at the area or customer base that will be served; does it make sense to forego 75% of the City of London to achieve such density in our area? The Summerside community will not be supporting the big box store on the basis
of demographics alone. Nor are they able to support the Rona Store located next to them. That operation is already in trouble today, in less than one year of service. Who do we sue when this all goes wrong? Is it the EIS "experts" who we already know have failed to produce anything scientific in their narrative of a changing land? Will they return this land back to its former glory? Will the applicants return the land back to its original state when they admit failure? Who is going to return the alternative site across Highbury back to a forest or park-like setting when the applicant site renders the final two occupants bankrupt? Let's not keep making the same mistakes over again. This is our opportunity to take a stand for future generations who will be seeing urban waste and hearing stories of what occupied that land. A community center would tie the land to the North in the most fluid way. A revitalization of the barren mall on the West side of Highbury could possibly reverse a blight of the past. Just as cities today are trying to revitalize their downtown urban/retail areas, so should they revisit their past mistakes with urban malls by reverting them back to economically viable centers.

Let's vote to demand more time to review this application. During this time, let's toss out the EIS narrative of the "History of Meadowlily" with all of its warts, misinformation and lack of detail and have an independent report done that contains real scientific research. There are top-notch schools that would be willing to develop a report with some teeth. Then you could say you have served the current tax-payers well.

There are many individuals and families that bicycle down Meadowlily Road, not to mention joggers, walkers, pet owners and nature lovers! It would be very disappointing to see this beautiful area destroyed by cars, buildings and asphalt.

Respectfully Yours,
Dave Burgman and Judy Scott
239 South Leaksdale Circle,
London, Ontario,
N6M 1K3
Terrestrial albedo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Typical Albedo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresh asphalt</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conifer forest (Summer)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worn asphalt</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare soil</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green grass</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert sand</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New concrete</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh snow</td>
<td>0.80-0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Albedos of typical materials in visible light range from up to 90% for fresh snow, to about 4% for charcoal, one of the darkest substances. Deeply shadowed cavities can achieve an effective albedo approaching the zero of a blackbody. When seen from a distance, the ocean surface has a low albedo, as do most forests, while desert areas have some of the highest albedos among landforms. Most land areas are in an albedo range of 0.1 to 0.4. The average albedo of the Earth is about 30%. This is far higher than for the ocean primarily because of the contribution of clouds. (4)
References:

(1) http://student.britannica.com/comptons/article-234539/city


(3) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albedo

(4) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albedo
INAPPROPRIATE USE OF THIS LAND!

This proposal continues a pattern of development in London that damages neighbourhoods, natural systems and the overall livability of London.

* It destroys the economic and environmental value of land
* It encourages an inefficient land-use pattern that is very expensive to serve.
* It fosters redundant competition between local governments, an economic war of tax incentives.
* It forces costly infrastructure development at the edge of towns.
* It causes disinvestment from established core commercial areas.
* It requires the use of public tax support for revitalizing rundown core areas.
* It degrades the visual, aesthetic character of local communities.
* It lowers the value of other commercial and residential property, reducing public revenues.
* It weakens the sense of place and community cohesiveness.
* It masquerades as a form of economic development.

I AM AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL.

2008-08-11
Dear Mayor Dicicco-Best, Dear Councillor Bryant, and other members of the Planning Committee,

I am writing to you to express my personal opposition as a London resident and taxpayer to the proposal to rezone the plot of land at 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. to become a commercial retail development. Such a proposal is inappropriate given the adjacent Environmental Significant Area at Meadowlily Woods: the city has a duty to protect and enhance such an area, rather than allow a development which would endanger this natural gem.

London currently has no shortage of commercial retail space: there is simply no need for another "big box" centre in our city. On the contrary, there is a large amount of unused commercial retail space in London which need revitalisation and intensification before any major new developments are even considered. Choosing such a cost-efficient urban renewal route rather than privileging new "power centre" retailers (with inherent infrastructure costs borne by us all) will not only help preserve our natural heritage, it will existing strengthen local business areas and neighbourhoods, thus ensuring a sustainable municipal tax base for decades to come. Another power centre retailer is definitely not a fiscally prudent route for our city to be considering at this time.

With the potential Real Canadian Super Store on the south side of Commissioners (a brownfield site across from the proposed rezoning -- providing the SmartCentre application does not go forward), the immediate area will be well-served with retail outlets. What the area could really use, however, would be a community centre which enhances the natural and cultural heritage of the Meadowlily Woods area by creating a natural focus for residents to enjoy this unique spot in our city.

Such a bold, forward-thinking move -- developing a green community space rather than yet another retail mall with yet more asphalt parking lots -- would distinguish this area as a desirable one for families and others who value the environment and neighborhood more than shopping and driving. This would in turn build a stronger and more livable community for all of us.

The choice should an obvious one: please reject the rezoning application for this site. Thank you for your time and consideration.
in this matter. Sincerely,

David Heap
85 Forward Ave.
London
N6 H 1B8

CC: Ms. L Fisher, Clerk to the Planning Committee, lfisher@london.ca
Dear Councillor Miller,

As a constituent of Ward 14, I want to express my opposition to the proposed zoning changes for the area next to the Meadowlily Woods, specifically the lot where Smart Centres/Walmart are planning a shopping complex. As you are no doubt aware, the City of London had commissioned a series of studies concerning the Thames River back in 1995. The first of these Studies, released in 2007, entitled “Thames Valley Corridor Plan - Phase 1: Scope and Background Study” addresses the very important issue of what the City will do in terms of protecting and promoting the Thames River as an entire corridor/ecosystem within the city boundaries.

As the study itself states (p 9):

The Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) developed the following working vision for the corridor:

*The Thames Valley Corridor is London’s most important natural, cultural, recreational and aesthetic resource. The City and community partners will preserve and enhance the natural environment, river health, vistas, beauty and cultural heritage while accommodating compatible infrastructure, accessibility and recreation.*

This vision is consistent with the Official Plan’s Vision, which states that City Council will “protect and enhance natural features and attributes that are significant to the maintenance of ecosystem health in the Thames River and Kettle Creek watersheds;” and that “an expanded and enhanced system of parklands, natural areas and trails along the valleys and ravines of the Thames River and Kettle Creek watersheds will provide continuous corridors for recreation, wildlife habitat and refuge from urban life.”

The working vision for the Corridor also reflects the value that the community places on the Corridor’s beauty, vistas and cultural heritage features as well as the need to balance all of the
Corridor’s functions.

Given the City’s own views on the importance of the River system, and the fact that the boundaries of the corridor have not yet been set, (but, according to the study, should extend at least 100 m from water’s edge, and even further for ecologically sensitive areas) it seems to me that no zoning changes at the proposed site should be considered until the final two reports of the Thames Valley Corridor Plan have been completed, reviewed by council, and finally voted on. I worry that given past rates of activity on proper planning around the Thames River, it may take a decade or more before the rezoning of the proposed site should even come before council. However, I’m sure that during that time SmartCentres/Walmart will have found a more suitable site among the numerous ‘gray fields’ in the city which have already been developed, then abandoned.

I would greatly appreciate hearing your views regarding the proposed zoning changes.

Best regards,

Peter L Ferguson, PhD
46 Compton Crescent
London, ON N6C 4G1
Hello Nancy,

Please include my comments below on the proposed Meadowlilly Development Application OZ-7430 in your report. Thanks.

Dave

There are many valid social and financial arguments for denying the proposed intensive development adjacent to Meadowlilly Woods Environmentally Significant Area but I will leave those for others to make. Instead I will speak to environmental issues and what I see as failures of the environmental study carried out by the proponent.

Environmentally significant areas are just what the name implies, significant. They do not remain significant by chance; thoughtful planning and hard economic decisions must be made if the long-term integrity of an ESA is to be assured.

Buffer zones are critical to such an end. Urban development always causes adverse impacts to natural areas. It is impossible to mitigate all impacts resulting from commercial development. A much more appropriate use for the land adjoining Meadowlilly Woods, if it is necessary to change the current agricultural use, would be parkland. Parkland would preserve current infiltration rates and provide a buffer from the negative impacts of paved surfaces, intensive automobile use and increased traffic that come with commercial development.

Stormwater impacts from development negatively impact watersheds and natural areas. Natural areas evolve in response to natural precipitation and runoff. Everything about the stormwater management plan provided by the proponent is unnatural. Rather than percolate into the surface to be filtered naturally by the soil, runoff will be collected from impervious surfaces and will be stored to reduce the erosional impacts of increased flows.

The ravines in the Meadowlilly Woods ESA were formed and continue to evolve from natural runoff flows. The functional servicing report proposes to redirect 30% of the normal runoff for the area away from its normal flows towards the north and east and instead direct all runoff to the northwest corner. Neither the environmental study nor the functional servicing report provide any discussion on potential impacts to the Meadowlilly Woods ESA from the proposed artificial reconfiguration of historical natural runoff channels.

Figures provided in the proponent's functional servicing report also indicate that artificial water storage
will reduce the natural rate of discharge for events that occur every two years from 0.16 cubic metres per second to 0.07 cubic metres per second. Peak discharge for 100-year events will also be reduced from 0.75 cubic metres per second pre-development to 0.15 cubic metres per second. No explanation as to the potential impact of these changes on the natural geological evolution of the adjacent Meadowlilly Woods ESA has been provided in either the environmental study or the functional servicing report.

Neither has the issue of stormwater quality been addressed adequately in the public documents provided by the proponent. Little provision has been made to prevent contaminants such as nutrients, pesticides, petroleum products (from automobile leaks), road salts or other common contaminants that come with such development from negatively impacting the watershed. Grassed swales and a stormceptor are mentioned as a means of partially removing suspended solids but there is no discussion on or mitigation provided for dissolved pollutants such as road salt. If the proponent were serious about mitigating the adverse effects of development and achieving a reasonable measure of stormwater quality, the design would incorporate at least some best management practices, such as onsite constructed wetlands, porous pavement or sand filters to reduce stormwater pollutant loads on the watershed.

A serious shortfall of the applicant's documents is the absence of any plan or physical means to isolate contaminated runoff in the event of a toxic spill in the parking lot, on loading docks or within buildings on the site. Development, with parking lots full of vehicles containing chemical brews and toxic substances that leak, and a retail building that could contain materials toxic to natural organisms brings the potential for catastrophe should toxic materials be flushed into the swale along Meadowlilly Road and from there into the Thames River. Contingency plans, processes and physical mechanisms should be provided by the proponent to contain contaminated stormwater and prevent assaults upon the watershed or adjacent ESA in the event of spills.

The environmental study report at Page 26 concludes that "no rare or uncommon natural communities exist" on the CCL site because it has been cultivated. It is unsettling that city staff agreed in writing with this conclusion. Not all of the CCL site has been cultivated; the area in the vicinity of the abandoned residence especially could very well contain rare or endangered plants. Because of its proximity to the ESA the possibility exists that rare or endangered plants could be found therefore the entire CCL site should be surveyed and discussion should be provided in the report of all vegetation found.

Several species, while designated exotic, have been identified in the plant list at Appendix A as being imperiled in Ontario (SE2). Discussion should at least be provided on the reasons for not preventing the destruction of these plant communities through development.

The environmental study report does not list one mushroom species or bryophyte leading me to conclude that plant surveys were not carried out with any degree of diligence.

Monarch butterflies (Danaus plexippus) were observed by DCL in the course of the environmental study. The monarch butterfly is a species of special concern both provincially and nationally. One of the key management strategies for the monarch is to protect and encourage native wildflower habitat, a source of nectar for the species. Efforts are also underway to remove milkweed from the noxious weeds list as it is a larval foodplant for monarchs. The proponent should indicate precisely where the surveys observed monarch butterflies and the locations of milkweed and wildflowers found during the survey and should also discuss mitigation strategies to prevent harm to the butterfly or degradation of its habitat through the proposed development.

The environmental report provides little discussion of the potential long-term degradation of Meadowlilly Woods from close proximity to the development during future operations. The long term negative impacts of stormwater changes, greatly increased human and vehicular traffic and ongoing
commercial activities upon geology, plants and animals within the ESA boundary should be discussed truthfully, in detail, and effective mitigation strategies -- if such are possible -- should be provided. If not, the proponent should provide arguments as to why this commercial development should be allowed to have a long term negative impact upon the Meadowlilly Woods ESA.

At the very least, I suggest that approval be withheld until the proponent conducts a more diligent environmental study that fills in missing information. Better yet would be to designate the entire CCL site as parkland which would provide a far better transition to Meadowlilly Woods and enable lower impact use for this land that would be more compatible with current uses on other lands abutting the site.

Dave Burkhart
147 Briscoe Street East
London, Ontario

2008-08-11
Dear Nancy,

Thank you for your explanation on the process of public participation at the Town Hall meeting held at Summerside Church Hall. It helped many of us to more clearly understand how to communicate with the Planning Department and City of London government.

This letter (via e-mail and also a "snail mail" copy which will be delivered to the Planning Dept., London City Hall, on Monday, 11 August, with Appendices attached) - is to express objection to the above application with proposed changes to the London Official Plan and the designation of 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. as Commercial zoning, or Associated Commercial zoning.

We own property at 25 Meadowlily Rd. directly across from the Meadowlily Woods ESA. Our property is zoned Open Space. We are members of the Thames Talbot Land Trust, and seriously interested in the City of London's quality of life. We contribute to the City as its citizens as much as we are able. The concept of the "Double-Decker Bus" was initiated by our company, and we donated the first double decker bus to the City of London. We are members of the London Community Foundation. We believe in a balanced approach to development.

Some of our concerns are as follows:

1) RUNOFF INTO THE THAMES RIVER - Spring runoff is almost unmanageable at the property we own near the pedestrian bridge on the west side of Meadowlily road. Every year, the water runs from the northwest corner of the land mentioned in the rezoning application, part way down the east side of Meadowlily Rd. South; and then overflows across the road where it washes down the west side and ultimately into the Thames River. The gravel which we put at the end of our driveway is washed out every Spring. The City of London Works Department has a record of our phone calls regarding this issue -- now there are permanent patches of gravel on the grass, and each year there is less recovery of grass in those areas. We expressed this concern long before we heard the top of the hill might be paved over.

This runoff will now increase due to hardtop rather than the farmer's field; and the salt and/or chemicals used during winter and early March will wash down and into our property and into the Thames River.

As you may be aware, studies are underway involving the Eastern spiny soft-shelled turtle nesting sites along the banks of the Thames River in this specific location. Will the salt and chemicals used harm these nesting sites? In reading over the Environmental Impact Study submitted to support this re-zoning, it would appear this species is not listed. The London Free Press recently provided an in-depth article on how researchers are trying to restore this species. It would seem this issue needs to be explored, not ignored.

2) LIGHTING - In the EIS, it is mentioned that there is already lighting at the Sports Fields, sometimes until 10:00 p.m. To add to this lighting (which the report admits does disturb the animals to some degree) would not seem to be a positive choice. Mentioning existing lighting that is already impacting the animals is really not a very good argument for increasing the lighting even more - and with security involved, some of the lighting would be on all through the night. (One of these stores in London is already open 24 hours a day, so the potential for extensive and invasive lighting all night is very real.)

3) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT - To even consider having a paved parking lot directly butting up against the ESA with only a 10-metre "buffer" is to disrespect the green belt Thames River corridor which is used regularly.
by the Fairmont area (by crossing the pedestrian bridge) and by the young people from Glen Cairn area (it is pretty well the only green space available to them). Summerside neighbourhood also use this green space to a significant degree, as well as some of the Pond Mills residents. These surrounding neighbourhoods consider this green belt “their Springbank Park”, and it is a source of pride for them to be able to claim it as theirs. Naturalists from all over the city use this area for birdwatching, hiking, and nature studies.

There is currently a researcher from U.W.O. studying the butterfly population along that corridor. There are 2 lists of butterfly population available through this source (one from 2006 and the current study from this year - see Appendices C & D). By my count, there are over 20 additional types of butterfly listed beyond the ones mentioned in the engineering EIS from the applicant. And beyond that, the current Postdoctoral Fellow researcher mentions in correspondence with me that “Many of these insects have very specific flight times and we may have easily missed some of them. This list is likely not extensive.” If exact dates for when these butterflies were observed are required, the research team is willing to provide that information upon request.

4) LAND FOR THE PROMISED SCHOOL FOR SUMMERSIDE - Where is the land for the school for Summerside and Pond Mills? It is my understanding the children from Summerside are being bussed to Princess Elizabeth School on Adelaide St. A school on this land would be an appropriate use. There would be the sports fields directly next to it (a savings to the taxpayers in not having to create separate school sports facilities) - and once outside, the students would have immediate access to amazing Nature Studies.

5) NATURALIZATION OF SCHOOLGROUNDS - As you may be aware, a number of London schools have undertaken “naturalization” of their schoolgrounds. As co-coordinator of the Tecumseh Elementary School Naturalization Project, I can assure you the results are many and diverse. Not only does it provide a natural area for the children when they go outside to play (including an outdoor teaching garden), but the involvement of youth on Green Teams has proved to be an observable personal growth experience for many of the children. We have children eager to be on Green Teams who have never been on any sports team - they often stay beyond our stated one-hour-after-school limit and we have to encourage them to go home. The planting of larger trees at Tecumseh School (with the assistance of Reforest London) resulted in every single classroom and teacher participating in the process. Any school built on this land would be a “natural” for “naturalization” - and could provide yet another model of ecological education, construction methods, and environmental responsibility - truly an appropriate addition to London under the umbrella of its designation as a Creative City.

6) COMMUNITY CULTURE - Any other use of this land for a Shopping Centre would be to disrespect the London Community and the hard work put into Vision 96 by so many people. People from all over the city of London have signed the Petition against this change to the Official Plan. People who do not live in the immediate area take the time to travel there to enjoy the green space it provides. Many Londoners are appalled at the thought that this corner would be re-zoned for Commercial use when there must be a more appropriate location for this suggested Mall. This open space could be a legacy we leave to the City - which is the better legacy - a school building or a Mall?

7) PROVINCIAL GUIDELINES - The Province of Ontario recommends using existing commercial space that has been boarded up and sits unused. Included in the “email mail version” of this letter are some photographs of the Zellers/Food Basics area, where the whole centre of this Mall has been closed and unused for some length of time. (Appendix A photo) - Also less than a kilometre further along Commissioners Rd. (going West) more stores are boarded up in the strip Mall (Appendix B Photo). There is now a fourth store empty and closed in that strip mall since these photos were taken. Surely, we can help bring at least part of this area back to life by re-using it, rather than causing even more closures and paving over our green space. These empty areas are still serviced by the taxpayers of London (e.g. fire and police protection services, roads and sewers) without any return of tax dollars which an ongoing business would provide.

8) TRANSPORTATION - Having traffic constantly turning in and out of a busy Mall on the North side of Commissioners Rd. would not be the best idea directly next to the Sports Field with parents and children using that facility. There is already a lot of traffic with the existing big-box shopping centre across from Meadowlily Rd. on the South side of Commissioners Rd. Adding to that only increases the risk of an accident.

Please consider these objections when discussing the proposed Application for a change to the Official Plan and re-zoning to Commercial or Associated Commercial of the above-noted property. Thank you for your consideration.

sincerely, Rick and Carol Richardson

2008-08-11
Dear Ms. Pasato,

I write to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning of the land at 168 Meadowlily Road South from Urban Reserve to Commercial.

As a resident of east London who has spent many hours at the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area, I have several reasons for opposing this change.

The proximity to the ESA renders the proposition of an adjacent big-box shopping centre untenable. Engineered mitigation measures cannot guarantee the integrity of the ESA. By their very nature they are subject to technical failure through inadequate maintenance, overloading, fouling by litter or other foreign material, and human error. Engineered mitigation of this sort may reduce the probability of a destructive stormwater event related to surface hardening, but it cannot ever eliminate the risk of such an event. It would take only a single failure to do significant, irreparable harm to the ESA. Meadowlily Woods has been designated an ESA and that very act should serve to protect it from any development and intrusion whether within the boundaries of the ESA or elsewhere that may damage or destroy its very special contribution to the city and residents.

The EIS as submitted, provides little reassurance that a comprehensive evaluation of the current environmental and ecological situation has been completed. For example, the ornithological evaluation occurred on one day in mid-May. The spring songbird migration was late in 2008 and is only just beginning in mid-May in the average year. This evaluation will have missed the bulk of migratory birds that pass through later in the spring as well as resident birds that had not yet returned. In any given spring, my children and I have identified a dozen or so species of warbler at that part of the Thames valley.

I am particularly concerned about the references in the EIS to trees along the perimeter of the ESA that are “in poor condition”. Any ecological system will have vegetation in different stages of the life cycle; all stages – from early growth to dead and decaying are necessary for a healthy ecosystem. The idea that some trees are “in poor condition” is an appeal to aesthetic prejudice in a document that is supposed to be about environmental impact.

To those of us in the neighbourhood, Meadowlily Woods is a place of peace, exercise, learning, wellness and connection with the natural world. Having such a place in this part of London makes it a livable, living city.

The Park Farm heritage site is located in the ESA. This 1848 Regency building is a treasure in London’s heritage inventory and also needs to be afforded appropriate protection. Large scale commercial development with all of its resultant pollution, traffic, noise and trash is not in keeping with the intent of heritage designation or with the city’s long-term plan for Park Farm. Should the city choose to rejuvenate...
that plan to open Park Farm to the public as a heritage site and horticultural display, the area would only benefit.

As well, I understand that there is likely archaeological significance to the ESA and possibly to 168 Meadowlily Road South that is yet to be determined. Until this is evaluated, it is irresponsible to consider any development in this area.

There is a big picture. Do we want London to be just another city with monotonous tract after tract of uninspired concrete commercial development and parking lots? Or do we want a creative and inspirational city that is truly livable? A place that celebrates its heritage on the waterway and acknowledges its important role in ensuring that which is unique to southwestern Ontario - be it the Carolinian forest or the Thames River is embraced in all of its planning.

Please recommend against this proposed rezoning and let the preservation of Meadowlily Woods and Park Farm as the “Springbank of the East” be part of our city’s legacy.

I would be interested in discussing this further with you at any time. Furthermore, I would like this letter to be considered.

Sincerely,

Michele Girash
127 Hale Street
London ON N5W 1E5

Now with a new friend-happy design! Try the new Yahoo! Canada Messenger
August 10, 2008

Nancy Pasato, MCIP, RPP
Planner, Implementation
Planning Division, Planning and Development
City of London
City Hall
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, Ontario N6A 4L9

Cc: Mayor Anne Marie De-Cicco-Best
    Councillor Judy Bryant
    Controller Gina Barber
    Controller Bud Polhill
    Councillor Roger Caranci
    Councillor Nancy Branscombe
    Councillor Paul Van Meerbergen
    Councillor Susan Eagle

Dear Ms. Pasato:

RE: Smart Centres Proposal for new Wal-Mart

On July 29, 2008 I attended a Town Hall Meeting to learn more about the proposed development by Smart Centres of a new Wal-Mart store in London’s east end. Apparently, Smart Centres has asked London’s City Council to rezone a parcel of land next to Meadowlily woods, situated east of Highbury between Commissioners Road and the Thames River. This area is currently designated as an environmentally sensitive area (ESA) in the City’s Official Plan.

The overwhelming majority of those who attended the meeting expressed opposition to proposal and presented various economic, environmental and social arguments to justify their objection. I too am opposed to the City re-zoning this parcel of land to build a Wal-Mart store, and in this letter, I will outline the reasons why.

First, siting a large retail store, with all its customer and goods traffic, noise, light pollution and waste is not sound environmental management, particularly when the site in question is next to a designated ESA. The Thames River has been the focus of considerable debate recently, including feature coverage in the London Free Press. The Thames River has been designated a “Canadian Heritage River System” (CHRHS) and building a ‘big box’ development so close to the south bank of the Thames does not seem in keeping with the CHRS mandate “to ensure long-term and conservation of their natural, cultural and recreational values”. In addition, the Environment and Ecology Planning Advisory Committee and Reforest London are concerned about the area.

Apart from the environmental concerns, there are concerns about how this development will affect the quality of life and property values for London residents, particularly those living near the site. At the July 29th Town Hall meeting, nearby residents spoke of how having a “big box” store in this location will downgrade the visual and aesthetic character of the area. Others spoke of the potential loss of community cohesiveness.

The most compelling arguments against siting a Wal-Mart store sited in this location are economic. Like SUV’s, power centres, such as the one proposed, face an uncertain future, as they depend on cheap fuel to be profitable and functional. With oil prices trending higher these days, many power centres across North America are failing. For example, at the Town Hall meeting, one individual spoke of having recently visited the newly-built Rona store (in the same
area where the Wal-Mart is being proposed), which had been in up and running for only six months. The store’s manager told him of plans to start laying off staff because the outlet is not bringing in enough business. This is a clear indicator that the area the proponent has in mind is unproductive. Another attendee at the meeting, a bus driver, commented that there is virtually no public transit accessibility to this site. Has the City taken this into consideration and does it have a plan to deal with it? From what I hear and read, all indicators suggest this project could be a dismal failure. If that turns out to be the case, will the proponent agree to dismantle the project and remediate the land at its own expense? Past experience shows this is rarely the case. The cost would likely be paid by the local taxpayers.

This brings me to my next point. An article which ran in the London Free Press on July 16, 2008 reported that developers are paying less than half the actual cost to submit development applications – the citizens are paying the rest through their tax bills. We taxpayers are getting tired of subsidizing development applications and projects of which we may disapprove or from which we are often excluded in the planning process.

The City of London has allowed itself to adopt a land-use pattern over the past few years which may be referred to as urban sprawl. In addition to being very inefficient, urban sprawl is also difficult and costly to serve. Sprawl forces costly infrastructure development at the edge of towns, away from the core, where the investment is badly needed. The City needs to go in a different direction vis-à-vis development and take cues from what other municipalities are doing. Many cities are now concentrating on rejuvenating and intensifying within a city’s core. Mississauga, for example, has invested heavily in brownfields redevelopment with great success.

Finally, there is already a plethora of existing retail space in our City, much of which sits empty. Among the key findings of the Commercial Market and Supply Analysis, which the City of London commissioned was that the “Downtown and Downtown Fringe are suffering from excessive vacancies which must be abated”. My question, then, is why are we continuing to look at building in an inefficient and costly way, when there is plenty of retail space within the city that is suitable for retail/commercial use?

To conclude, I would say that this proposal is not in keeping with the City’s stated priorities of its 2007-2010 Strategic Plan. If the City is indeed committed to economic prosperity, infrastructure renewal and environmental leadership, our City Council should make the judicious decision to overturn this request and keep the area as it currently is – a designated ESA. As one of the attendees at the Town Hall meeting said, “this is the Forest City, not the Asphalt City”. I mirror this sentiment.

Thank you for considering my remarks,

Yours truly,

Anne Papmehl, MA
London, Ontario

1 Urbanmetrics inc., in association with Meridian Planning Consultants Inc. and bmi/pace (2007), page 3.
To the Members of the Planning Committee:

As a citizen concerned with the continued urbanization of our “forest city” I, along with the Geography Department of Catholic Central High School, am strongly opposed to the proposed development of the area adjacent to the natural gem that is Meadowlily Woods.

I have worked on the “Turf to Trees” initiative of Reforest London in Meadowlily Woods and know first hand of the beauty that this Environmentally Significant Area possesses. As a runner, the quiet of Meadowlily Road provides a perfect, well appreciated place to do my hill workouts. It’s bad enough that our city limits are expanding in the south end of the city for housing, but adding more unnecessary commercial development, especially so close to an Environmentally Significant Area would be morally reprehensible. The natural habitat of so many unique species is well worth protecting, especially from an ecological nightmare like Wal-Mart.

I think we have the responsibility to stand up for our local assets, such as locally owned businesses and beautiful sites like Meadowlily Woods instead of trampling them under the massive footprint of the Walton family. This is more than an environmental issue; it is a reflection on the value system of our city and begs the question of the legacy we want to leave for future generations. Shopping mall, or surrounded by the best nature has to offer, an undisturbed, beautiful site like Meadowlily Woods?

Thank you for taking these issues into consideration,

Patricia Mockler
Hi Nancy

Thanks for sending me the above noted notice. The only concern that I have deals with the access points as I saw them shown on the plans at the Public Info meeting that was held a few weeks ago.

If indeed a Wal-Mart store is the major retail outlet the main access point should really be off an extended Meadowgate Blvd. north of Commissioners Rd. I hesitate to recommend this because it would make this intersection even busier than it is now especially during the sporting events at the sports park, however if the whole layout is done properly that is where the main entrance should be located (off busy Commissioners Rd.) with perhaps a couple of egress points onto Commissioners Rd.

I realize that this may require a complete revamping of the building layout on the site and the parking area for the sports park but if it is to be done right this is the time to do it. With regards to the impact on Meadowlily woods I believe that the developer is making a good effort to minimize the effects but it would be up to the city to ensure that all possible mitigation efforts are employed now and in the future.

I would much rather see a retail outlet go on this site who is able, financially, to respond to environmental effects in the future than an organization who cannot or will not respond to these kinds of concerns in the future.

My thoughts

Fred Lukianow
146-2025 Meadowgate Blvd
London ON
N6M 1K9
Hello Nancy

I hope that the City of London will take all necessary steps to insure the protection of the Meadowlily Woods immediately to the north of these lands proposed for development.

Would you please advise of the steps that could and would be taken by the City to protect these woods.

Also would you please let me know the results of this application as to whether it is approved or refused.

Fred Lukianow
146-2025 Meadowgate Blvd.
London ON N6M 1K9
Dear Nancy,

Thank you for your explanation on the process of public participation at the Town Hall meeting held at Summerside Church Hall. It helped many of us to more clearly understand how to communicate with the Planning Department and City of London government.

This letter (via e-mail and also a “snail mail” copy which will be delivered to the Planning Dept., London City Hall, on Monday, 11 August, with Appendices attached) - is to express objection to the above application with proposed changes to the London Official Plan and the designation of 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. as Commercial zoning, or Associated Commercial zoning.

We own property at 25 Meadowlily Rd. directly across from the Meadowlily Woods ESA. Our property is zoned Open Space. We are members of the Thames Talbot Land Trust, and seriously interested in the City of London's quality of life. We contribute to the City as its citizens as much as we are able. The concept of the “Double-Decker Bus” was initiated by our company, and we donated the first double decker bus to the City of London. We are members of the London Community Foundation. We believe in a balanced approach to development.

Some of our concerns are as follows:

1) RUNOFF INTO THE THAMES RIVER - Spring runoff is almost unmanageable at the property we own near the pedestrian bridge on the west side of Meadowlily road. Every year, the water runs from the northwest corner of the land mentioned in the rezoning application, part way down the east side of Meadowlily Rd. South; and then overflows across the road where it washes down the west side and ultimately into the Thames River. The gravel which we put at the end of our driveway is washed out every Spring. The City of London Works Department has a record of our phone calls regarding this issue - now there are permanent patches of gravel on the grass, and each year there is less recovery of grass in those areas. We expressed this concern long before we heard the top of the hill might be paved over.

This runoff will now increase due to hardtop rather than the farmer's field; and the salt and/or chemicals used during winter and early March will wash down and into our property and into the Thames River.

As you may be aware, studies are underway involving the Eastern spiny soft-shelled turtle nesting sites along the banks of the Thames River in this specific location. Will the salt and chemicals used harm these nesting sites? In reading over the Environmental Impact Study submitted to support this re-zoning, it would appear this species is not listed. The London Free Press recently provided an in-depth article on how researchers are trying to restore this species. It would seem this issue needs to be explored, not ignored.

2) LIGHTING - in the EIS, it is mentioned that there is already lighting at the Sports Fields, sometimes until 10:00 p.m. To add to this lighting (which the report admits does disturb the animals to some degree) would not seem to be a positive choice. Mentioning existing lighting that is already impacting the animals is really not a very good argument for increasing the lighting even more - and with security involved, some of the lighting would be on all through the night. (One of these stores in London is already open 24 hours a day, so the potential for extensive and invasive lighting all night is very real.)

3) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT - To even consider having a paved parking lot directly butting up against the ESA with only a 10-metre “buffer” is to disrespect the green belt Thames River corridor which is used regularly by the Fairmont area (by crossing the pedestrian bridge) and by the young people from Glen Cairn area (it is pretty well the only green space available to them). Summerside neighbourhood also use this green space to a significant degree, as well as some of the Pond Mills residents. These surrounding neighbourhoods consider this green belt “their Springbank Park”, and it is a source of pride for them to be able to claim it as theirs. Naturalists from all over the city use this area for birdwatching, hiking, and nature studies.
Stan’s list:
Insects of Meadowlilly Nature Preserve
(based on two visits, 6 Jun 06 and 28 June 06)

**Lepidoptera**

*Butterflies*
- Hobomok Skipper
- European Skipper
- Mulberrywing Skipper
- Tawny-edged Skipper

- Cabbage White
- Northern Crescent
- Inornate Ringlet
- Viceroy
- Milbert’s Tortoiseshell
- Eastern Comma
- Eastern Tailed Blue
- Meadow Satyr
- Summer Azure

**Lepidoptera**

*moths*
- Slender Clearwing Moth
- Nyssus Sphinx

**Odonata**

*Dragonflies*
- Clubtail (Gomphus)
- Common Whitetail
- White-faced meadowhawk
- Widow Skimmer

- Blue-fronted Darners
- Familiar Bluet
- Ebony jewelwing

*Others:*
- Six-spotted Tiger Beetle
Our list:
**Butterflies of Meadowlily Nature Preserve (2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Butterfly Type</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Skipper</td>
<td>Thymelicus lineola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maybe Dunn Skipper?</td>
<td>Euphyes vestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spotted Skipper</td>
<td>Epargyreus clarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant Swallowtail</td>
<td>Papilio cresphontes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Swallowtail</td>
<td>Papilio polyxenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Tiger Swallowtail</td>
<td>Papilio glaucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage White</td>
<td>Pieris rapae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Sulphur</td>
<td>Collia eurytheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banded Hairstreak</td>
<td>Satyrium calanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Tailed Blue</td>
<td>Everes comyntas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Azure</td>
<td>Celastrina ladon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Spangled Fritillary</td>
<td>Speyeria cybela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Crescent</td>
<td>Phyciodes cocyla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Mark</td>
<td>Polygonia interrogationis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Admiral</td>
<td>Vanessa atalanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning Cloak</td>
<td>Nymphalis antiopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viceroy</td>
<td>Limenitis archippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch</td>
<td>Danaus plexippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawny Emperor</td>
<td>Asterocampa cyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Wood-Nymph</td>
<td>Cercyonis pegala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Wood-Satyr</td>
<td>Megisto cymela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inornate Ringlet</td>
<td>Coenonympha tullia inornata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: [Name]
Date: Monday, May 26, 2008 2:58 PM
To: <lfisher@london.ca>
Subject: no more Walmarts please!

Good afternoon Ms Fisher,

I am letting you know that I am very much against Walmart building in the Summerside area.

My home is just east of Deveron Crescent and north of Commissioners Road not far from Zellers therefore I live quite close to the area that Walmart wants to build. Already the noise of traffic along Highbury Avenue and Commissioners Road is quite audible from a distance.

This proposed land is close to the Thames River which is very beautiful to walk along to enjoy the wonderful environment. I am a member of The Thames Valley Trail Association which is a popular walking group and this particular area is exactly where we walk.

Many trees were cut down to accommodate the clearing of land for Z Group to build townhouses and for the new Rona and soon to be grocery store. I do not want to see any more trees cut down. It is crazy to have the city plant trees within the city and then in another area the trees are destroyed.

I do not want to see this end of the city ie the SE part of London become a retail nightmare as seen in Hyde Park with much farm land erased forever.

With many ambulances driving along Commissioners toward the London Health Science Centre as well as Number 5 fire hall at the corner of Commissioners Road and Deveron Crescent, the extra traffic will hinder movement of these emergency vehicles. Also there will be the need to build another fire hall at taxpayers expense in order to service these new buildings.

The large sports field on the north side of Commissioners is also enjoyed by many. The smell of gasoline in the air is not want Londoners need any more of, there will be enough with the current new buildings and volume of traffic. NB stop drive-through Tim Hortons!

The amount of traffic is increasing with the new Rona, strip mall and housing and proposed Great Canadian Superstore.

Next will be Swiss Chalet building in the area as well as Blockbuster. I stress that Walmart is not needed in this area.

From Summerside, it is a short drive to the existing Walmart stores at the Argyll Mall (which has longer hours) and White Oaks. I understand that another Walmart is being built by Wonderland Road and Southdale Road. Londoners do not need fourth Walmart.

Enough is enough. I want to be able to enjoy our charming country scenery and not have this particular area or any other area spoiled.

The two lane Commissioners Road from Summerside to the Airport Road can not take any more traffic.

Walmart suffocates other businesses.
The empty Pond Mills Mall which is between the Food Basics and next to the Zellers is completely empty with exception of the veterinarian. This was completely renovated surely this must also be taken into consideration as well as a nearly empty strip mall that has Pizza Pizza in it west of Deveron on Southdale. The Blockbuster will soon be moving to its new location in Summerside. 

While I am writing this, I am suggesting the City of London purchase the area of land that is presently for sale south of 401 along Highbury on the west side where the flashing light is. This land could be used for the city to hold their annual Balloon Fest. Near the 401 would draw thousands of folk to London. Without hydro lines and not many residences in the area. It is farmland for sale that can be kept clear until it is needed for a balloon fest or any other large venue. It would not need to have services extended to it as if it were bought for homes. 

Nowadays, the farmers have a difficult time keeping their farms and making any kind of income, this will be even more so now especially with the added expense of gasoline and diesel for their farm equipment. Hence farmers selling off their land. 

Please print this letter and share it with the Councillor from Ward 1. I will be attending the meeting at City Hall on June 17th. I will encourage other residents to do the same to make it known we are are against losing city land to any more big box stores or strip malls.

As for tonight’s meeting, May 26th, at City Hall, I sincerely hope the council votes against changing zoning laws to accommodate building any more Walmart stores.

Yours truly,
Lynda Holmes
6 Eula White Place
London ON N5Z 5C2

5/28/2008
Andrew StoIarski
1140 Pond View Road
London, ON

December 18, 2007

City of London
c/o Ward 1 Councillor, Roger Caranci
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON N6A 4L9

Dear Roger Caranci:

I am writing to you as a concerned citizen regarding the application 02-7430 to change the official plan from “Urban Reserve-Community Growth” to “Associated Shopping Area Commercial” on Meadowlily Road South, London, Ontario. The current Planning and Design Report that was submitted by GSP Group Inc. for Commissioners Centres Ltd. regarding 168 Meadowlily Road South, page 15 and 16, includes altered landscape photos for the proposed shopping centre. The photos depict a parking lot with an 8-10 feet buffer area with small immature trees bordering Meadowlily Road South across from the low density residential area of Meadowlily Road South. However, figure 3, Preliminary Site Concept (between pages 4 and 5), by Petroff Partnership Architects, show a green belt area much larger with three adjacent buildings on the side of the shopping area to Meadowlily Road South and two entrances off of Meadowlily Road South. As a concerned citizen I am not supporting this report and the design of the shopping area.

I would like to submit an amended proposal that addresses the landscape and traffic concerns for pedestrians, especially children and youth.

First, I propose that a green space donation from Commissioners Centres Ltd. (Smart Centres), to Meadowlily Woods (Environmentally Significant Area) bordering Meadowlily Road South (70 metres) to include planting of evergreen trees, a sidewalk and another strip of green space with evergreen trees on a 20 ft buffer. The donated green space would become a parkway, “Fraser-White Memorial Parkway”.

Second that sewer installation and hook-up by Commissioners Centres Ltd. be completed prior to building the shopping area and will be at no cost to the six residents of Meadowlily Road South (171,165,155,147,141 and 135).
Subject: Application OZ-7430- Re-zoning 168 Meadowlily Road South

Thirdly that no commercial buildings be adjacent to Meadowlily Road South.

Lastly, there will be no adjacent access roads on Meadowlily Road South to the commercial developments and the only access road to the shopping centre will be Commissioners Road.

I believe that commercial development should be planned responsibly and preserve the landscape elements and the integrity of Meadowlily Road South.

The Planning and Design document from the GSP Group Inc. has a mission statement on the front cover, "Shaping Great Communities". If this mission statement is true, then there should be no problem with working with the residents of Meadowlily Road South to create a commercial area that is prosperous and liveable for everyone.

The story of London is made up of many chapters, and each chapter describes the neighbourhood, landscape and the people of its time. The rapid commercial development in London is on the rise and the landscape is changing so rapidly that it is barely recognizable. I ask that the city council and the developers leave a few pages of the original story of London and its landscape.

Preserve and keep the integrity of the original story of Meadowlily Road South.

Sincerely,

Andrew Stolarski

cc: Mayor Anne-Marie DeCicco-Best
    Nancy Pascato, MCIP, RPP Planner II- Implementation
    City Councillors and Controllers
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Submitted
Nancy:

would you please send me information on the application at 168 Meadowlily Rd S? Thank you,
Joshua
To Nancy Pasato

1. I am writing as a concerned resident of 155 Meadow Lily Rd. S.
2. I oppose the opening of the Meadow Lily Rd. for a shopping Centre grateful there has been an application from Urban Reserve Community Council to a Shopping Area Commercial. I oppose it also.
3. This application will destroy conservation green there is quite a few deer in the area as well as fox etc. Meadow Lily is used by members of M.C.A. runners, bikers, walkers, and even possible cross country skiers. We all have a lovely road here that many people enjoy. I do not think there is many of these left in the city.
4. The shopping mall on the side of Highlilly Ave. did not do well. All the strip mall at Pond Mills Kent town office a Medical Centre has moved. Some of the stores are standing empty.
5. The opening of Meadow Lily Rd. for a service entrance for the stores day might deliver to the commercial area.
You would not like it if we are facing this as we will be doing. You have a major road that could do the Com Rd. Have all entrance off this one. This will also decrease the value of our homes on the road.

This is just north London, what has been done to the land with the big box.

I hope you will pay no to a big box store & no to changing the land use from Urban Reserve - Community to Associated Shopping Area Commercial. This side of Com R east has some lovely land & it would hate to see it become Commercial.

Leave Meadowly Sincerely, alone.

Doretha Allingham 155 Meadowly Rd S.
Heather Lokko  
135 Meadowlily Rd. S.  
London, ON  
N6M 1C3

Nancy Pasato  
Planning Division, City Hall  
300 Dufferin Ave.  
London, ON  
N6A 4L9

January 18th, 2008

Re: Application to Amend the Official Plan & Zoning By-law

Subject Site: 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. Unit N/S  
File Number: OZ-7430  
Applicant: Ivan and Ann Kovac, and Louisa Golf

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for informing us of the above-mentioned application to amend the official plan and zoning by-law. In addition, we appreciate that Nancy Pasato extended the deadline for response to this notice.

We would like it to be known that we are opposed to this proposed amendment. When we moved to Meadowlily Road just over two years ago, it was because of the more peaceful, “country-like” atmosphere that exists here. The natural environment (including both plant and wildlife) is a key asset of this area of London, and is enjoyed by many people. It was our understanding from the former occupant and from the employee whom we contacted at the planning office prior to purchasing this home, that it was unlikely that there would be development on the land currently under discussion, as it is adjacent to land designated as “environmentally significant”. As you may understand, we are bitterly disappointed that our primary purpose for purchasing this home is being threatened. We also are cognizant that the other residents on our street are experiencing similar feelings. While medium to high density housing often faces moderate to large-sized commercial areas, it is not common for single-family homes to directly face these commercial areas. It could significantly alter the atmosphere of the neighbourhood. Therefore, our strongest preference would be for this proposed amendment to be denied.

While we are bitterly disappointed and desire that this amendment be denied, we are also realistic. We know that an environmental scan has been done, which we appreciate, but we do recognize that many decisions are based primarily on economics and expect that this situation will be no exception. In view of this, if this proposed amendment is accepted, we would very strongly recommend that the following be considered:
Safety:
Meadowlily Rd. S. currently has limited vehicular traffic. There is, however, extensive pedestrian traffic throughout the spring, summer and fall. This includes people of all ages, from young children with their parents to senior citizens, engaged in physical activity, such as walking, biking, and rollerblading. Some people use "the hill" for training in running and cycling, including a high school that sends their cross-country team to train on "the hill". Many of those pedestrians who use Meadowlily Road and Meadowlily Woods comment on how wonderful it is to have a safe place to enjoy a natural environment.

We are very concerned about having an entrance into the proposed commercial area off of Meadowlily Road. Even if this entrance is close to the south end of Meadowlily, it will very significantly increase vehicular traffic, and will increase the risk to the many pedestrians using the road. Meadowlily Road is a narrow street, with no bike paths or sidewalks. Increasing vehicular traffic could create a serious safety issue for the many pedestrians utilizing the road to access Meadowlily Woods, the bike paths and the dog park, and Hamilton/Commissioners Road.

Therefore, it is our recommendation that, if the proposed amendment is accepted, all entrances/exits to the commercial area be located on Commissioners Road.

Natural Environment:
As previously mentioned, Meadowlily Road is extensively used by those who enjoy engaging in physical activity in a natural environment. In addition, we regularly observe a variety of small and large wildlife that rely on Meadowlily Woods and its adjacent lands for their survival.

We are very concerned about the potential impact that the increased amount of traffic and number of people accessing the commercial area could have (i.e., garbage, noise, etc.). This could impact animals in the area and, particularly on this west side of the land under consideration, will definitely have an impact on pedestrians and single-family home residents. We are aware that a Meadowlily resident has proposed a buffer park-like area between the proposed shopping area and Meadowlily Road, of 70 metres.

Therefore, it is our recommendation that, if the proposed amendment is accepted, a buffer park-like area, extend eastwards a minimum of 100 metres from Meadowlily Rd. S., and northwards from Commissioners Road to Meadowlily Woods.

Thank you for taking our recommendations into consideration. We trust that you will use integrity in making your decisions regarding this area of London.

Sincerely,

Heather Lokko
(on behalf of the Lokko family)
December 19, 2007

The Corporation of the City of London
Planning Division
6th Floor, City Hall
300 Dufferin Avenue
P.O. Box 5036
London, Ontario
N6A 4L9

Attention: Nancy Pasato

Dear Sirs:

Re: OZ-7430 – Ian and Ann Kovac
168 Meadowlily Road South, London, Ontario

We are writing to you as concerned residents of 171 Meadowlily Road South, London regarding the Application to Amend the Official Plan & Zoning By-Law of 168 Meadowlily Road South, London which is directly across the road from our home.

We object strongly to any amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw.

Changing the Official Plan land use designation to Associated Shopping Area Commercial from Urban Reserve – Community Growth is NOT the most appropriate designation for this area. This is prime agricultural land and has a significant natural feature being the abundance of wildlife due to the proximity to Meadowlily Woods (directly behind this area) and the Thames River which runs through the woods. Wildlife, especially deer, are in the field at 168 Meadowlily regularly.

Meadowlily Woods is an environmentally significant area, bequeathed to the City of London specifically to remain as park land for the citizens of London to enjoy and the wildlife of London to have a home and we believe the environment will be drastically changed with a Commercial Shopping area abutting the Meadowlily Woods.

The existing designation of community growth would be the more sensible designation in that the community would be able to enjoy the proximity of the woods, nature, wildlife via biking, walking, sightseeing, etc. Many many families, young and elderly now walk or ride bikes down our quiet “no exit” road and enjoy the trails through the Meadowlily Woods. In fact 14.5 acres at the end of our street on the West side of Meadowlily Road South, across the street from the Meadowlily Woods was donated five years ago by Rick and Carol Richardson to the Thames Talbot Land Trust as a nature preserve to protect the lands of ecological value for the public to enjoy for years to come.
Behind our home on the East side of Highbury is the Highbury Woods which collectively with the Thames Talbot Land Trust lands and the Meadowlily Woods makes a sanctuary for wildlife.

Putting a WAL-MART in the midst of all this would undo all that has been done to help preserve this natural, beautiful area.

When the Community Shopping Area on the south side of Commissioners Road at Meadowlily was built, wildlife lost their homes. They came to our place. I could look out the window and see 10 ground hogs at one time in our back yard and rabbits, raccoons, possum, deer, ducks (a swampy area was covered over with fill when that ‘Community Shopping Area’ was built.)

Since moving to our home 13 years ago, we have mowed the grass on both sides of Meadowlily Road South from our home to the corner of Meadowlily and Commissioners Road. NOW we have to pick up a bag of garbage weekly before we can cut the grass thanks to the new Community Shopping Centre built there which includes Starbucks Coffee Shop and the recently built Tim Hortons at Commissioners and Deveron. People just toss the drinking cups and garbage from both establishments.

We enjoy the peace, quietness and splendor of our area and an Associated Shopping Area will bring more garbage, lights, traffic, noise, pollution, and decrease the property value of the homes that exist on that street.

We don't want more garbage and we don't need more shopping. The Southside Shopping Centre at 1200 Commissioners Road East (corner of Commissioners and Deveron Crescent) is virtually empty except for the Zellers and Food Basics stores. Within one block further down the street at the corner of Commissioners and Pond Mills the “strip” plaza there is half vacant. Why are the majority of the stores in both these shopping areas closed if there is such a demand for shopping?

We reiterate that the proposed amendments to the Official Plan & Zoning By-law are unfitting, that the existing designation should remain as is and sincerely anticipate the Municipal Council for the City of London to reflect on the foregoing and deny the application for amendment. It is not appropriate in any neighbourhood to have a development of the nature of a Walmart Superstore in such close proximity to a residential area or to a conservation area.

Yours truly,

Yours truly,

Lynn Melvin

878883_1.DOC
127 Hale St.
London, Ontario
N5W 1E5

11 August 2008

Nancy Pasato
Planning Division
Planning and Development
City of London
300 Dufferin Ave. P.O. Box 5035
London, ON N6A 4L9

Re: Development Application OZ-7430 - 168 Meadowlily Road South

Dear Ms. Pasato

I will make clear at the outset that, in my view, the proposed rezoning of 168 Meadowlily Road South should not be approved.

The Environmental Impact Study and other documents submitted by the applicant are deficient in a number of respects, but the reasons for refusing this application go beyond the technical merits of the supporting documentation for the applicants proposed development. For the sake of completeness, I will address both technical shortcomings of the proposed development and the inappropriateness of the proposed zoning.

The EIS, as submitted, gives the impression of a cursory examination premised on assumptions about what is or is not significant. For example, on page 14 we are told "...it is very likely that that the birds found within the "Park Farm" area are "edge" species". The consultants cite studies published 15 and 20 years ago in support of this conclusion, with no contemporary primary observations whatsoever. Two-and-a-half hours of directed observation on a date when many species will not have yet returned for the summer are the only direct observation of birds in the study. Other technical consultants apparently collected information on the presence of birds while on site for other studies, but there is no evaluation of habitat use for nesting by resident species. There is nothing about these studies to indicate that the potential impact in this regard or the proposed zoning change and accompanying development on the ESA was taken very seriously at all.

Similarly, the consultants note, in response to direction from the City, that they are "aware of the growing importance of including butterfly observations" but conducted no directed study of butterflies. They report that they looked for, but did not find, one group of plants "that provide food resources for some rare butterflies". This is not adequate to
demonstrate that the proposed development will have no detrimental effects on butterfly populations.

The discussion of stormwater runoff, infiltration and surface hardening is superficial and inadequate. The Functional Servicing Report (FSR) describes a profound increase in the fraction of stormwater leaving the property as runoff, especially in the case of low to moderate volume events. This presumably translates into a proportionately substantial reduction in infiltration of precipitation into the soil. This may have implications for vegetation in the ESA, but is unaddressed. The proximity of the site to the slope of the Thames River valley suggests that a significant reduction of infiltration could have significant effects on vegetation down grade. Infiltration of parking lot runoff would, of course, need to be assessed in light of the hydrocarbon and salt loads that the water could carry. In other contexts, the solution might be to shift the runoff into a treated stormwater retention system. Next to an important ESA and Heritage Property this is far from obviously adequate.

Some aspects of the report are confusing and in places it contradicts itself.

It is not entirely clear what Table 7 presents. The text on page 20 indicates that "Table 7 provides a summary of the direct and indirect impacts that could be experienced by the Meadowlily Woods ESA..." However, Table 7 indicates that there will be direct impact on land use designation, which appears to be limited to the proponents' site, and not relevant to Meadowlily Woods. Its content and context suggest that Table 7 is, in fact, relevant to the proponent's site, not Meadowlily.

It is difficult, therefore, to know how the consultants justify the Table 7 entry for LU5 (increased hard surface/decrease in infiltration). This would seem to suggest that there will be no impact on surface hardness or infiltration from paving over a field. This is not corroborated by the relevant section on page 25, which states, "As the CCL site will have a large area of hard surfaces including asphalt and concrete, there will be a decrease in infiltration." It may be that Table 7 is meant to convey the putative post-mitigation impact, but this is not borne out by examination of what appears to be proposed. The table and report concede effects to corridors, but the text indicates that mitigation will ultimately create a net increase in corridor quality. It should not be too much to ask that reports meant to satisfy regulatory and policy requirements in consideration of a change of zoning be free of false statements, internally consistent and clear.

The property in question is immediately adjacent to important natural and cultural heritage sites. Meadowlily Woods is an outstanding natural area on the slope of the Thames River valley that includes old growth forest values, regenerating forest at a variety of successional stages, provincially significant wetlands and other habitats. For these reasons it was afforded designation as an ESA, a designation that is supposed to protect it from damage to the values that make it worth designating. Park Farm was designated as a Heritage Property for several reasons, including the context in which it sits. If these designations are to remain credible, then proposed changes in zoning to
adjacent properties must be examined in light of their implications for the integrity of the designations.

It is easy to get lost in the technical details of the particular development proposal driving the application process. Ultimately, however, this decision is about how the City of London wants the land in question to be used, not about the merits of any particular application. It comes down to a basic question: does this city believe that a commercial centre and all that goes with it is the proper use of land next to one of the city’s most important natural and cultural heritage features? I very much doubt it, but I am willing to put it to the test through a full, public, municipally-administered planning consultation that examines a range of options. Defaulting to a zoning designation because that is the first thing tabled by a land-owner is not the proper way to plan much, if anything, and it is certainly no way to allocate land abutting important, sensitive public assets.

It is easy to lose sight of the fact that zoning is not about the merits of a particular project or a matter of finding mitigation measures to address the specific problems attending an individual project. Zoning this land for commercial use opens up a universe of possibilities that will include many options unanticipated by any of the documents tabled by the current proponents. Business environments change, properties become disused and are sold, shifting economies dictate different practices. The city is obliged to consider the long-term implications of a zoning change and to consider what it would potentially permit, not just what is proposed at the moment.

The city should also be looking at the whether the proposed change is necessary in the short to medium term. There does not appear to be any shortage of commercially zoned space in London at the moment, or for the foreseeable future. Certainly it does not appear to be in short supply in the immediate neighbourhood of the application. It may be the applicants preference that they be permitted to build at this location and not at one with the appropriate zoning already in place, but that does not mean it is in the city’s interests.

I respectfully submit that on weighing the balance of interests, this rezoning application clearly deserves to be rejected. There is no need, it places important public assets at risk and it is being proposed without a proper, public process examining appropriate uses for the land.

I would be pleased to discuss this further at your convenience.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Peter Meisenheimer M.Sc.
Dear Bernie MacDonald,

My name is Daniel Hammond and I live at 671 Ridgeview Drive. I am writing to you in regards to the current planning issue regarding the proposed Smartcentre development adjacent to London’s unique and irreplaceable Medowlily Woods. I was born and raised here in London and have enjoyed our city my entire life. Throughout my childhood and adolescence I have made very regular use of the beautiful green areas in and around London. I have felt privileged to have access to so many diverse living ecosystems right here in my backyard. Within the past few years though, I have been utterly disgusted with our city’s urban development and commercial planning.

For example, my mother was so attracted to a house at the end of Estevan Road (north of Grenfell west of the intersection of Fanshawe Park Rd. and Adelaide) in 2000 because it had a beautiful forest full of native species right at it’s north end. To our utter dismay, by the time we moved into our new house, the key selling point and our main attraction to the neighborhood had already started to be cut down and developed into the infamous single family homes that are constantly sprawling further and further from the core of London. Eight years later, our quiet little trail leading to the natural forest of North East London has become a highway to a modern eye sore - the poorly planned suburban extension of Sunningdale. The farmers’ fields in the surrounding areas (i.e. Fanshawe and Highbury N/W), where we used to enjoy the vast extents of natural grazing land, are presently being destroyed by Smartcentres to serve the large communities sprawling to the north and northeast.

Instead of growing local produce on the precious farmland we have left, Smartcentres will invade this land with their architecturally catastrophic big box developments which will solely accommodate people in vehicles to sell them the cheapest goods possible – in quality and price – as they outsource their costs to maximize profit. These centres are environmentally devastating; not only do they promote our society’s dependence on the automobile; they invade the immediate environment around them and have serious repercussions. The light, sound, and air pollution disturbs the surrounding ecosystems; the solid waste they produce is rarely correctly disposed of; the huge area of concrete disrupts the hydrological cycle, and in the near future our energy scarce society will not be able to conveniently access these centres making them obsolete. Our farmers’ fields will forever be the foundation of the concrete jungle that we have created out of our forest city.

Although I do not live in the Medowlily community, I can perfectly relate to their situation. I was thrilled to see this vibrant community rise in the face of this potential catastrophe and speak out on the 29th of July at Summerside Church. I am advocating for their rights as citizens and feel it is necessary to help them be heard. Although it is too late to preserve the beautiful green space that has been raped in the North end of town (as mentioned above), it is not too late to save Medowlily Woods.

As an elected official, you have the ability and duty to stand up for the rights of the people of London, you’re input is crucial to building a sustainable future for the city of London, our decision should not reflect the interest of multinational corporations such as Walmart whose sole interest is profit. If neglecting to consider our future is not called poor planning, then what is? I find it ironic that this corporation calls themselves SmartCentres, the way I see it, these developments lack any glimpse of intelligence because they completely neglect any consideration of the environmental, social, or economic problems that they cause.

You can make a difference, you can plan intelligently, you can oppose this multinational corporation, and

2008-08-11
you can make this neighbourhood liveable for years to come. This is why you occupy your fulltime position with the City of London. In the name of the dedicated citizens who clearly do NOT want their natural land to be invaded and exploited, please help us save Medowilly Woods.
August 5, 2008

Ms Nancy Pasato
Planning and Development Department
City of London
London, ON

Dear Ms Pasato:

Re: Development Application 02-7430, 168 Meadowlily Road South

The McIlwraith Field Naturalists of London (MFN) do not support the application by Ivan and Anna Kovac and Louisa Golf to have the zoning of land at 168 Meadowlily Road South changed from Urban Reserve – Community Growth to Associated Shopping Area Commercial. The MFN would prefer to see this parcel of land at the northeast corner of Commissioners Road and Meadowlily Road rezoned as Open Space in order to give maximum protection to the sensitive natural heritage features of the Meadowlily Woods ESA. The MFN do not consider this land to be an appropriate site for a retail commercial development of 25,500 square metres by Smart Centres, and especially one that could see development of a huge Walmart store there.

The MFN’s reasons are the following:

1. The property in question lies immediately south of an Environmentally Significant Area, Meadowlily Woods, and the Park Farm property. Buffer zones are essential around ESAs to protect them from such adverse impacts as construction noise, alteration of existing drainage patterns that could affect vegetation in the ESA, contaminated and excessive water run-off, garbage, abuse by humans, heavy traffic, noise and light pollution that disturbs wildlife, and other detrimental effects of large commercial developments. A large retail commercial development would not permit a large enough buffer zone to truly protect the ESA from these impacts.

2. The slope of the land towards the Thames River is of concern, because it would be hard to control contaminating water run-off into the ESA from a large commercial development during and after heavy rains and major snowfalls.

3. Schedule B1 of London’s Official Plan Review, 2007, defines the conceptual areas of “Big Picture” Meta-Cores and Meta-Corridors with cross-hatching, and the property in question falls partly within a Meta-Corridor of the South Thames River. Although the “Big Picture”
concept is not a component of London’s Natural Heritage System, and policies for land use and development will be guided by the designations on Schedule A (Land Use), the MFN would like to see the City adhering to the statement in the Official Plan Review (15.4.12 Carolinian Canada Big Picture Concept) that “naturalization projects and landowner stewardship initiatives that support the “Big Picture” system of core natural areas and corridor connections will be encouraged by the City of London.” A large retail commercial development adjacent to an ESA and Meta-Corridor can hardly be considered environmentally acceptable.

4. If there is to be any development under the current zoning of Urban Reserve – Community Growth, it should be restricted to small buildings, such as clinics, that have a small environmental footprint and would not threaten the ecological integrity of Meadowlily Woods ESA.

5. A more thorough Environmental Impact Study, carried out by a consultant who is independent of London’s developers, is required before any land use is permitted.

Yours truly,

Anita Caveney.
President
Attn: Nancy Pasato – Planner II, City of London
Re: OZ-7430 – Ian and Ann Kovac (Meadowlilly and Commissioners)

August 10, 2008

Ms. Pasato,

I am writing on behalf of the Urban League of London to express concern regarding the development application for the site at Meadowlilly Rd South and Commissioners Rd East. While currently zoned ‘Urban Reserve – Community Growth’, we do not believe the Associated Shopping Area designation is an appropriate use for this site.

While the Urban League recognizes that some form of development will most likely occur on this site in the future, the scale of the proposed development would have adverse impacts on residential, traffic and ecological features in direct proximity to the site. Additionally, background documents on market analysis for commercial development demonstrate a vulnerability of existing proximal commercial centres (specifically the Pond Mills Centre) to the proposed development. Planning staff have repeatedly indicated that there is a surplus of available commercial / retail space in London and the proponent has not adequately indicated why the use of such space is not acceptable for this development.

A review of the Environmental Impact Study prepared for the site indicates marked pressures and impacts due to litter, parking lot lighting, and stormwater management, for example, would be placed on the adjacent Meadowlilly ESA as a result of the scale of the proposed development.

Ultimately, it is our opinion that a smaller scale, perhaps residential development, might be better suited for the site in question, having lower impact commercially and environmentally within the region. We would therefore request that the application for rezoning and amendment of the Official Plan not be granted for land use in the proposed context.
As an additional matter of administration, the Urban League is also concerned about the timing of the request for public input on this file. Being such a potentially contentious application, it would have been more appropriate for the City to follow its convention of not seeking public input during the summer months but rather wait until autumn when public participation and engagement are more successful and robust.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephen Turner
Chair
Nancy:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed commercial development located at Meadowlily Road South and Commissioners Avenue East.

I travel on Meadowlily every day throughout the spring, summer, and fall on my bicycle commute to work which is on Oxford Street East. Meadowlily Road is the only safe, low traffic access for pedestrians to cross the Thames River on the East end of London and this road should not be used for anything but low volume traffic and pedestrians. Even the bridge that crosses the river has been constructed (modified) to permit pedestrian traffic only. I represent one less vehicle on our city roads during rush hour and I am not the only one who commutes on this road.

The City of London has begun to realize the importance of providing bicycle commuters appropriate access points and right of ways but much more is needed. Allowing high volume traffic onto Meadowlily is contradictory to moving our City forward into the future in an appropriate environmental manner.

I also wonder if any trees would be cut down to facilitate this commercial development and what the impact of noise, light, and smog pollution will be on the environmentally protected area immediately south of this property.

London Tourism promotes "discovering Our Spirit". The following is an excerpt from London Tourism's website that specifically lists Meadowlily Woods.

## London Tourism Quote

"Londoners are part natural wonder. Belmont Park is one of the main natural and recreational areas. The meadows and woodlands provide a natural habitat for a variety of wildlife, including birds and small mammals. The lake offers opportunities for water sports and picnics. The park is a perfect place to unwind and enjoy the beauty of nature. The pathways through the woods are a wonderful escape from the hustle and bustle of the city. Meadowlily Woods is one of the many parks and conservation areas in London, offering a slice of nature in the heart of the city."

2008-07-10
Since Meadowlily Woods is a protected area, how can we ever consider commercial development that borders these areas?

Let our Spirit be a stand against new commercial development that negatively impacts what we believe our City should be: The Forest City!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Michael G. Peck, P.Eng.
1396 Reardon Boulevard
London, Ontario
N6M 1J9

This is an e-mail from General Dynamics Land Systems. It is for the intended recipient only and may contain confidential and privileged information. No one else may read, print, store, copy, forward or act in reliance on it or its attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, please return this message to the sender and delete the message and any attachments from your computer. Your cooperation is appreciated.
Pasato, Nancy

From: Gary Smith

Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2008 11:27 AM

To: Pasato, Nancy

Subject: Meadowlily Road, South and Smart Centres Development

Ms. Pasato,

As a result of your presentation last night at the town hall meeting at Summerside Community Church, I am emailing you regarding my concerns about development in the Meadowlily Road, South corridor and about Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area adjacent to Smart Centre's application to put a large commercial development at the site of Meadowlily, South and Commissioner's Road, East. Initially I must admit that as a resident of Meadowlily Road, South my concerns were mainly about not wanting such a large commercial development as at front-door neighbour. However in the time that I've gone to meetings and talked to people my concern has widened in a number of respects.

First of all, about Meadowlily Woods as an even more immediate "neighbour" to the Smart Centres development and the effect that 18-22 acres of asphalt. I have not seen or heard any real clear explanation about the amount of run-off water that is going to be to the old-growth area immediately north of the development along the ravine and creek in that area. Old growth is rare in the Forest City anymore and as a person who loves and grows trees I know that changes in water levels can have profound effects on old growth trees. I have not heard any real science yet as to the effect that this development will have on these natural treasures because effecting the ground water levels with too great an increase in moisture will drown those roots and kill those trees and the same can be said for too much diversion of water and then lowering the ground water level and thus the opposite effect: starving those trees of their source of moisture. Too great an increase or decrease of ground water means that those old growth trees are being put at risk or more likely going to die. I have not heard an adequate explanation as to how that problem is going to be addressed. Thus I would recommend that an independent environmental impact study be made as to the effect this development will have on the natural forest area immediately north of the Smart Centres proposed site.

Secondly, as I am sure you are aware there is a heritage treasure also immediately North of the proposed site: the 1848 Regency Villa house that was a part of Park Farm, part of the ESA, which as I am sure you are aware is designated as a heritage site in the city of London back in 1994. The history of sites like the old house being vandalized (Alma College, St. Thomas) by increased traffic and unlimited access via the proposed parking lots and buildings is not a good one. It does not seem to be a compatible combination, this sort of development being just a few metres away from such an incredible historic treasure as Park Farm. The statement of significance for Park Farm passed by city council, February 20, 1995, states that the rural setting of Park Farm is an important part of maintaining its Heritage value. Thus Meadowlily Woods and Park Farm are an essential combination of assets to be considered as a part of why the house and the area are deemed to be of significant value as a heritage site. This does not even take into account the number of times that archaeological excavations in Meadowlily have also shown signs of earlier habitation by aboriginal and native peoples. Park Farm and Meadowlily Woods both deserve to be protected from such a large commercial encroachment (the ravine I wrote about above and the farm house are just a very few metres away from what will be concrete and asphalt in just a few months if this proposal is approved).

Lastly, in studies done in Meadowlily Woods in 1987-88, David E. Stephenson suggests in a
Topographical mapping, vegetation analysis and life science inventory of the woods that endangered and protected species of plant and animal life that have lived in the old forest for some time are often affected when development encroaches upon natural areas. One only needs to look at the effect that even residential development has on the Sifton Bog even to this day. What greater effect will hard development like buildings and parking lots have on the wildlife and habitat of Meadowlily Woods. Mr. Stephenson’s study is available in the London Public Library. More recent studies of the Thames river valley and its natural areas also have shown that development close to natural areas has a negative affect on plant and wildlife.

I was concerned too that two members of council were questioned after recent meeting about the effect that this development would have on the Meadowlily Woods ESA and the proximity issue was dismissed in spite of the fact that hundreds of people are appalled that the proposal is even being considered. What does it take to get these issues taken seriously? So far the record is loss of green spaces, historic sites like Locust Mount, wildlife and natural habitats. A few metres is nothing in the life of a deer, fox, a red-tail hawk, not to mention bulldozers, environmental pollutants inadvertently making their way from a parking lot or a dumpster to the soil and environment of the woods/forest.

I ask that an independent analysis of the environmental effect that such a development would have on such a natural and historic treasure as Meadowlily Woods before any application be allowed to proceed regarding development at Meadowlily Road, South and Commissioners Road, East. Once these natural areas begin to degrade it is impossible to replace them and after the fire in St. Thomas at Alma College I can’t imagine why anyone would consider producing high traffic and volume so close to Park Farm.

I ask further that the application for rezoning the land in question be denied or delayed until such time as these concerns are addressed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gary Smith
141 Meadowlily Road, South
London, Ontario

Yahoo! Canada Toolbar: Search from anywhere on the web and bookmark your favourite sites. Download it now!
Grow
Have a second thought about application 02-7438

Respect

Environment

Ecology

OW!
I like going for walks with my grandma because it's clean, safe and quiet on Meadowlily Road South.

-M. Stolar斯基 Age: 11
Keep meadowlily Road South clean, safe and quiet. I like walking the family dog with my grandma.
The journey begins on Meadowlily Rd S.
Preserve Meadowlily Rd S.

He that loses hope, may part with anything.
Congreve.
I CALL THIS "THE FOREST CITY LOGO TREE" LOCATION (168 MEADOWLILY RD 3 - SMART CENTRE'S SITE)
DON'T LET THIS TREE DIE FOR THE WRONG REASONS.
ANDREW STOJANOSKI
I WILLINGLY CONFESSION TO SOME GREAT PARTIALITY FOR TREES AS TEMPTS ME TO RESPECT A MAN IN EXACT PROPORTION TO HIS RESPECT FOR THEM.
JAMES RUSSEL LOWELL

LONDON HAS BEEN KNOWN AS THE FOREST CITY SINCE 1856. LONDONERS HAVE "EMBRACED" THE FOREST CITY AS ITS BRAND AND HAVE ADOPTED THE TREE AS ITS LOGO. THE TREE AND COMMITMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP ECONOMIC PROSPERITY AND HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE.

2007.5-6
CITY HALL SHAYNE WARDEN

A GREEN SPACE ON MEADOWLILY RD S WOULD BE A COMMITMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP ECONOMIC PROSPERITY AND HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE.

STOJANOSKI

I CALL THIS "THE FOREST CITY LOGO TREE"
WE NEED THAT GREEN SPACE
BUFFET WITH NO ENTRANCES OR
EXIT FROM MEADOWLILY RD'S
EVERYONE WINS WITH THIS
PROPOSAL. THE DEVELOPER
HAS TO UNDERSTAND THIS
GROWING
SUSTAINABLY
ENVIRONMENTALLY
E ECOLOGICALLY
3 CITY
OF
LONDON
"Between every two pines is a doorway to a new world."

John Muir.

possibly the proposed shopping center can be a retro farmers market look from the 1890's and a permanent green space on Meadowlily Rd S.

168 Meadowlily Rd S.
168 MEADOWLICY RD S. (SMART CENTERS PROPOSAL)

MAN'S RICH WITH LITTLE WERE HIS
JUDGMENT TRUE;
NATURE IS FRUGAL, AND HER WANTS
ARE FEW; THESE FEW WANTS ANSWER
BEING SINCERE DELIGHTS;
BUT FOOLS CREATE THEMSELVES
NEW APPETITES YOUNG.
WE MAINTAIN THE GRASS SPACE ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STREET FROM OUR HOMES.
MR. MELVIN DOES A LOT OF THE WORK.
RESIDENTS TRY TO CUT THEIR LAWNS BY THE MAIL BOXES.
WE HAVE BEEN DOING THIS FOR OVER 25 YEARS. WE DON'T ASK THE CITY TO PAY FOR OUR LAWN CARS AND MOWERS.
WE LOVE THIS AREA. IT IS PEACEFUL.
THE FRASER WIGHT AVENUE
WITH NO ENTRANCES OR EXITS
FROM THE SHOPPING CENTRE.

A PERFECT ENTRANCE WAY
TO MEADOWLILY WOODS. SOUTH
SIDE RESIDENTE HAVE A PARK
THEY JUST HAVE TO DISCOVER IT.
ALL CONDO Dwellers CAN WALK, BIKE
AND ENJOY THIS AREA. A
PERFECT GETAWAY.
SMART CENTRES MUST ONLY HAVE ENTRANCES AND EXITS ON COMMISSIONERS RD.
THE RIGHT ROAD.

WE ALL WANT PROGRESS, BUT IF YOU'RE ON THE WRONG ROAD, PROGRESS MEANS DOING AN ABOUT-TURN AND WALKING BACK TO THE RIGHT ROAD; IN THAT CASE, THE MAN WHO TURNS BACK SOONEST IS THE MOST PROGRESSIVE.
C.S. LEWIS.
PROPOSED SITE FOR SMART CREATIVE MARY RESIDENTIAL UNIT.

A SUBDIVISION WOULD BE BUILT.
I WALKED THESE WOODS AS A CHILD. I DID NOT REALIZE HOW IMPORTANT THEY ARE NOT JUST FOR ME BUT FOR ALL LONDONERS AND VISITORS TO ENJOY.

ANDREW STOLARSKI
120 MEADOWLILY RD S

The Park Final Entrance has not
changed in 85 years. Its beauty
and splendor is to be enjoyed
by everyone.

120 MEADOWLILY RD S
THE FRASER COTTAGE

SOME PEOPLE SAY IT IS "HAUNTED"

THERE HAVE BEEN STRANGE HAPPENINGS OCCURRING AT THE COTTAGE.
I reach a clearing. I see a young green wheat field. Now I know why some people say gods green earth.

A. St. John
"The path of development (economics) and the path of environment (ecology) must join and proceed together."

Preserving our world
by Wrenkle Traylor
Guide to Household Repower

"Ecology" and "Economics" spring from the same Greek root "Eko". "Eko" described either a house or the management and stewardship of a household. We need total understanding of both ecology and economics to meet the challenge.

Preserving our world
Chapter 2
Development we can live with.
COUNCIL SUPPORTED
NEW POLICIES TO BETTER
PROTECT EXISTING
WOODLANDS AND SUPPORT
THE GOAL OF INCREASED
FOREST COVER IN THE CITY.
2006 CORE INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT

EARTH... THE EARTH, THAT'S
NATURE'S MOTHER, IS HEALING.
SHAKESPEARE

SMART CENTRES WILL SCRAP THE TOP SOIL AND REMOVE IT TO ANOTHER SITE. WHAT WILL BE LEFT IS SUB SOIL WHICH THEY WILL BUILD ON AND LAY ASPHALT. THIS WILL CREATE MORE HEAT IN THE AREA AND MEANtown WOODS WILL HAVE TO WORK HARDER TO COOL THE AREA.
MEADOWLILY ROAD IS DESERVING OF HERITAGE STATUS

1) PARK FARM 1849
2) MEADOWLILY MILLS 1856
3) MEADOWLILY BRIDGE 1910

TAKEN FROM THE BOOK
LONDON STREETNAMES
EDITED BY ANGELICA BAKER WITH HILARY BATES WILKES

MEADOWLILY BRIDGE

Meadowlily Road

Southeast. Runs north/south from Hamilton Road to Commissioners Road, east of Highbury Avenue.

Meadowlily Road brought farmers to the Meadow Lily Mills, the ruin of which can still be seen on the north side of the Thames River, east of the road. It is unknown when the first mill was constructed on the site, but a grist mill and sawmill called Shepherd's Mills occupied the 20-acre property by 1849. The operation was renamed Meadow Lily Mills in 1856. The mill's machinery was powered by river water. Twice the mills were rebuilt after serious fires, in 1865 and 1891. A mill continued to operate on this site until 1901, when it was again destroyed by fire and never restored.

A visitor today can see the old foundation stones and remains of the mill race. Look carefully and you will find the inscriptions of the mill pond and some structural remnants of the mill damn. The present-day Meadowlily Bridge was built in 1910. It was closed to traffic in 1967 and is now used only by pedestrians and cyclists.

Glen Corner
WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF THERE WAS A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A SHOPPING CENTRE IN FRONT OF YOUR HOME?
A green space with burm makes sense. The residents want to preserve and keep the integrity of the original story of Meadowlily Rd South.
December 18, 2007

City of London

c/o Ward 1 Councillor, Roger Carnaci
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON N6A 4L9

Dear Roger Carnaci:

I am writing to you as a concerned citizen regarding the application 02-7430 to change the official plan from “Urban Reserve-Community Growth” to “Associated Shopping Area Commercial” on Meadowlily Road South, London, Ontario. The current Planning and Design Report that was submitted by GSP Group Inc. for Commissioners Centres Ltd. regarding 168 Meadowlily Road South, page 15 and 16, includes altered landscape photos for the proposed shopping centre. The photos depict a parking lot with an 8-10 feet buffer area with small immature trees bordering Meadowlily Road South across from the low density residential area of Meadowlily Road South. However, Figure 3, Preliminary Site Concept (between pages 4 and 5), by Petroff Partnership Architects, show a green belt area much larger with three adjacent buildings on the side of the shopping area to Meadowlily Road South and two entrances off of Meadowlily Road South. As a concerned citizen I am not supporting this report and the design of the shopping area.

I would like to submit an amended proposal that addresses the landscape and traffic concerns for pedestrians, especially children and youth.

First, I propose that a green space donation from Commissioners Centres Ltd. (Smart Centres), to Meadowlily Woods (Environmentally Significant Area) bordering Meadowlily Road South (70 metres) to include planting of evergreen trees, a sidewalk and another strip of green space with evergreen trees on a 20 ft. strip. The donated green space would become a pathway, “Prasit-White Memorial Pathway”.

Second that sewer installation and hook-up by Commissioners Centres Ltd. be completed prior to the building the shopping area and will be at no cost to the six residents of Meadowlily Road South (171, 165, 155, 147, 141 and 133).
Thirdly that no commercial buildings be adjacent to Meadowlily Road South.

Lastly, there will be no adjacent access roads on Meadowlily Road South to the commercial developments and the only access road to the shopping centre will be Commissioners Road.

I believe that commercial development should be planned responsibly and preserve the landscape and the integrity of Meadowlily Road South.

The Planning and Design document from the GSP Group Inc. has a mission statement on the cover, "Shaping Great Communities". If this mission statement is true, then there should be no problem with working with the residents of Meadowlily Road South to create a commercial area that is prosperous and liveable for everyone.

The story of London is made up of many chapters, and each chapter describes the neighbourhood, landscape and the people of its time. The rapid commercial development in London is on the rise and the landscape is changing so rapidly that it is barely recognizable. I ask that the city council and the developers leave a few pages of the original story of London and its landscape.

Preserve and keep the integrity of the original story of Meadowlily Road South.

Sincerely,

Andrew Stolarski

cc: Mayor Anne-Marie DeCicco-Best
    Nancy Pascale, MCIIP, RPP Planner II- Implementation
    City Councillors and Constellars
LONDON
GROWING
RESPONSIBLY
ENVIRONMENTALLY
COLOGICALLY
NOW!
Neighbours urged to fight rezoning for shopping centre

A public meeting was advertised May 16 to inform the public of a proposal to change the zoning of 168 Meadowlily Rd. S. to a commercial shopping centre. This is an area that is in the middle of a low-density residential area, an environmentally significant area and a species park.

Steps counteracting the carbon footprint by rezoning this area as a commercial shopping area. Make your voice heard on May 19 at city hall.

Dorothy Stolaraki
Contact

- D. Stolaraki, 11 Kincaid Crescent - relating to the property located at 65-179 and 168 Meadowlily Road South - noting that she understands the zoning change is only a "clean-up" but requesting confirmation that there are no other amendments required, and whether an environmental impact study is required for this site.

- M. Girash, 127 Hale Street - relating to the property located at 65-179 and 168 Meadowlily Road South - requesting confirmation that all residents will be notified of future applications for this site.

- P. Merschheimer, 127 Hale Street - relating to the property located at 65-179 and 168 Meadowlily Road South - requesting clarification as to what steps would follow the holding U:\ zone for this large parcel of land given there will soon be a specific application at this site.

- S. Porter, 736 Dewdon Avenue - relating to the property located at 65-179 and 168 Meadowlily Road South - expressing concerns about notice procedures and inquiring as to whether an environmental impact study will be done prior to any further zoning changes on this site.
I like walking the family dog with my grandmother.

Keep meadowlily good safe and quiet.
I like going for walks with my grandma because it's clean, safe, and quiet on Meadowlily Road South.

-M. Stalaski, Age 11
PARKS AND GREENSPACE SYSTEMS
PROMOTE HEALTHY LIFESTYLES
AND PROTECT THE NATURAL
ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE
DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVE
PARKLAND AND AMENITIES
A CONNECTED GREENSPACE
AND PATHWAY SYSTEM AND
IMPROVED RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
“AGREEMENT TO PRIORITIZE
A GREEN SPACE PATH ON MEADOWLAKES
AVENUE”
Less than 1 km away from the proposed site exist two "grey areas." Pond Mills Square has not been at full occupancy since being built. Even "Blockbuster" is moving to Summerside Shopping Centre. Redevelopment is needed here; no more "grey areas!"
168 MEADOWLILY RD'S

The Site is both designated and zoned Urban Reserve.

The Site is designated Urban Reserve – Community Growth in the London Official Plan. The London Official Plan states:

"Community Growth" areas will be composed of predominantly residential uses but will include commercial, institutional, and open space uses that are supportive of the community as well as provide employment opportunities in a community setting. Notwithstanding this general intent, lands within the Urban Reserve designation may be redesignated by Council for any use through the community planning process and resulting amendment to this Plan.

City of London Official Plan Section 9.1.3

DEFINITION: PREDOMINATELY
- BE IN MAJORITY: TO BE THE MOST COMMON OR GREATEST IN NUMBER OR AMOUNT
- BE MORE IMPORTANT: TO HAVE GREATER IMPORTANCE: POWER OR INFLUENCE THAN OTHERS
- DOMINATE SOMEBODY OR SOMETHING
SCHEDULE 'A'.
To By-law No. L.S.P.-3253-58

Part Lot 15 in Broken Front Concession "B" of the geographic Township of Westminster in the City of London and County of Middlesex designated as Part 1 on Reference Plan 33R-11947 being part of PIN 86477 0002.

SCHEDULE 'B'
To By-law No. L.S.P.-3253-58

Historical Reasons

Park Farm is one of the finest examples of a Regency villa in London. The house illustrates the evolution of a Regency cottage from when it was built in the 1840's until the present day. The building retains most of its Regency features and is beautifully situated in a rural setting, on a hill with a panoramic view to the northwest. The property is associated with two families. The earliest residents were William Bell and his family. Bell was a farmer from England who arrived in Canada in the mid-1830's. Bell called his residence "Park Farm" and lived there until his death in 1877. The subsequent owners were the Fraser family, specifically Harrison Fraser, who used Park Farm as his summer residence until the 1970's. Harrison Fraser was a prominent barrister and solicitor in the family firm of Fraser and Fraser.
Bill No. 80
1995

By-law No. L.S.P.-3253-58

A by-law to designate 120 Meadowlily Road
South (Park Farm) to be of architectural,
historical and contextual value.

WHEREAS pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. 0.13, the
Council of a municipality may by by-law designate a property including buildings and
structures thereon to be of historic or architectural value or interest;

AND WHEREAS notice of intention to so designate the property known as
has been duly published and served and no notice of objection to such designation has been
received;
The Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. There is designated as being of architectural, historical and contextual value or interest, the real property at 120 Meadowlily Road South (Park Farm), more particularly described in Schedule "A" hereto, for the reasons set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

2. The City Clerk is authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be registered upon the title to the property described in Schedule "A" hereto in the proper Land Registry Office.

3. The City Clerk is authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be served upon the owner of the aforesaid property and upon the Ontario Heritage Foundation and to cause notice of this by-law to be published in the London Free Press, and to enter the description of the aforesaid property, the name and address of its registered owner, and short reasons for its designation in the Register of all properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990.

4. This by-law comes into force on the day it is passed.


Dianne Haskett
Mayor

K. W. Sadler
City Clerk

First reading - February 20, 1995
Second reading - February 20, 1995
Third reading - February 20, 1995
A NEW SUMMERSIDE SHOPPING CENTRE BUILT IN 2007.

THE "DOLLOR BLITZ" WAS NOT SUSTAINABLE AND CLOSED IN EARLY 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>med</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>avg/yr</th>
<th>avg low/yr</th>
<th>avg med/yr</th>
<th>avg high/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-1996</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>6888</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2001</td>
<td>4493</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>7322</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>6801</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>3443</td>
<td>12418</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1996</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2001</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 25, 1990

Mrs. Dorothy Allingham
R. R. # 8
London, Ontario
N6A 4C3

Dear Mrs. Allingham:

Re: Meadowlily Bridge

As discussed during our telephone conversation of June 24, I am enclosing ten copies of the Consultant's Report on the Meadowlily Bridge, which has been presented to the Environment and Transportation Committee of City Council.

I am also enclosing ten copies of the covering Report from the Environment and Transportation Committee agenda, in which you will note that the City Engineer is recommending deferral of any further consideration of the matter.
MEADOWLILY ROAD BRIDGE
JUNE 19, 1989

RECOMMENDATION: IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF MEADOWLILY ROAD BRIDGE BE REFERRED TO 1991 CAPITAL BUDGET.
INFO SIGN IN FRONT OF PARKWAY

ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT AREA

FRASER WHITE PARKWAY

HISTORICAL INFO

ENVIRONMENTAL INFO

PRESENTATION INFO

LAND DONATED IN TRUST BY SHINNING CENTRE

CITY OF LONDON
"FUTURE PATH TO THE HISTORIC PARK FARM"

HERE IS A PROPOSAL TO CONSIDER:

- CREATE A HIKING PATH TO THE HISTORIC PARK FARM COTTAGE
- CONVERT THE COTTAGE INTO A MUSEUM
- BUILD AN ADDITIONAL BUILDING ON SITE WITH AN 19TH CENTURY DESIGN TO BE USED AS A CONFERENCE CENTRE FOR BUSINESS AND PUBLIC USE (I.E. HOSTING SPECIAL MEETINGS, ENVIRONMENTAL CONFERENCES, CITY CONFERENCES), WELCOMING FUTURE CORPORATE LEADERS, AND RECEPTION AREA FOR THE PUBLIC TO USE FOR FAMILY GATHERINGS (I.E. WEDDINGS)
- BUILD AN OUTDOOR COURTYARD WHICH INCLUDES 19TH CENTURY STYLE GARDEN.

THANK-YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION

SINCERELY,

STOLARSKI FAMILY