

Tridon Development

2nd Submission – Meeting January 11th, 2016

The following are the major issues that the Kilworth Rate Payers Association have with this second submission from the Tridon Group.

1. First of, it should be noted that the meeting held on May 27th, 2015 should not be considered as an Official, Statutory Public Meeting for the following reasons.
 - i. The meeting was not officially closed in accordance with the Planning Act . Although there was a motion to open the public meeting, there was no information provided as to how Notice was given as required by the Planning Act. ;
 - ii. No correspondence from the Public or agencies were made available at the Public meeting so that Council was aware of the concerns expressed prior to the meeting. It is our understanding that staff normally present this information at the public meeting.

UR1

2. Minimum Lot Frontage:
 - The Zoning By-law requires 15m of minimum lot frontage yet for the exception approximately 10 lots, all 540 plus lots will be well below the 15m.
 - Example – The largest UR1 development in the proposal is calling for 12m frontage or approximately 10 feet less than the by-law.
 - Lots 176-184 is calling for 5m less or approximately 16 ½ feet less.
 - The proposal calls for 40% lot coverage. The norm for Middlesex Centre is 35% lot coverage for the main building within the UR1 zone. Meaning there is universal reductions in lot frontages with very few exceptions.
3. Minimum Front Yard Setback.
 - The Zoning by-law requires a minimum 6m setback. Meaning that the building has to be a minimum of 6m from the property line. This proposal is calling for 2.5m. A reduction of 3.5m or approximately 11 ½ feet. We are concerned that the houses

will be pushed forward on the lots resulting in little to no front yard and adequate green space. This will create a predominance of buildings with little landscaping out front.

- Now driveways need to be a minimum of 6m in length. Based on this proposal, the driveways will be 5.5m from the garage door to the road. To put this in perspective this is the size of most parking spaces on a typical lot. Therefore, a typical SUV or minivan will have its front bumper right at the garage door and the back bumper on the end edge of the property line. Most bylaws require that the garage set back must be of sufficient length to park on the lot without having it encroach onto the town boulevard. We are concerned that the driveways will be inadequate for the parking of cars .

4. Minimum Side Yard Setback

- This proposal is also asking for a change to the By-law for side yard setbacks.
- The By-law calls for minimum of 1.5m on one side of the building and 2.5m on the other side. This proposal is calling for 1.2 m on each side. A further reduction of 2.4m of space which will result in the houses being spaced very close to each other. This will result in the loss of green space and create a very crowded and over built appearance to the subdivision.

5. Parking

Not only will this current proposal grossly reduce the minimum size of the properties in our community but will have a detrimental effect on parking. There are large stretches of townhouses with narrow lot widths. Based on our review it will not be possible to park a vehicle on the street because the driveways will be too close together. Further, since these townhouse units will only have a single garage and small driveways, there will be no place for visitor parking anywhere nearby. With the majority of families owning two cars, and with families comes friends and relatives, these roads will become a nightmare to travel.

UR3

Most of what was mentioned above under UR1 is the same in UR3, same front yard setbacks, minimum lot area calling for 10 m² or 33 feet² PER dwelling unit.

However for UR3, I want to focus on the Maximum Lot Coverage.

- The Middlesex Centre's own by-law for a maximum Main Building coverage is 35%. Your 2nd submission is calling for coverage of 60% an increase of over 70%. To put this in perspective most coverage the City of London has permitted in any type of town house or auxiliary building is 45%.
- Maximum height. Maximum height is 20m or approximately 6 stories. Looking at increasing this by another 8m or 2 more stories. Regardless of the proposal there is no building in Kilworth/Komoka that comes close to even the maximum height.
- Maximum Density. Maximum density is set at 30 units/ha. This proposal although reduced from the 1st proposal is looking for 35 units/ha.

Lastly, it should be noted and recorded that zoning by-law amendments must conform with the Official Plan for the Municipality of Middlesex Centre. This proposal contravenes numerous sections of The Official Plan dated June 24th 2014.

Most importantly, the applicant has not given sufficient consideration to the numerous policies in the Official Plan that speak to the need for new development to :

- Maintain and continue the traditional or historic urban form of existing settlement areas
- To encourage development that is compatible with existing development and the existing character of neighbourhoods
- To preserve the distinctive identity and character of individual settlement areas

Middlesex Centre is distinct from the City of London – people choose to live in the Kilworth because it has a unique small town character. People do NOT want to live in a neighbourhood where houses are jammed onto small lots; where there is little green space for people and where cars are going to be lining the streets because there's inadequate parking spaces on lots.

The proposed development by Tridon does not respect the existing character of our neighbourhood which reflects lots with ample green space, appropriate sized homes for the lots and sufficient parking.

The zoning amendments being requested will result in a development that is out of character for the community and will result in an overdevelopment of the lands.

We are concerned that this proposal does not provide sufficient planning justification for the development and instead relies upon previous studies that were

done on behalf of Don Black Investments. The Tridon application is significantly different than the application submitted by Don Black Investments and yet it is being handled as the same application.

We have not seen any other reports to address traffic concerns and municipal servicing which should be required before any approval is considered. It is our opinion that this application does not provide sufficient rationale to justify the extent of changes being requested to the zoning bylaw.