

I Jonathan Wild, provide consent for my communication to be included on a public agenda

Hello Council,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for 929 Cheapside Street, which seeks to rezone the subject lands from Residential R1-5 and Convenience Commercial (CC1) to Residential R8-4 in order to permit a six-storey, 105-unit apartment building.

While I acknowledge and support the City of London's objectives related to housing supply, intensification, and efficient use of land, this proposal does not adequately demonstrate conformity with the London Plan's requirements for compatibility, contextual fit, and appropriate transition. Specifically, the proposal appears inconsistent with London Plan Policies 193, 252, and 255, which require that intensification be designed to fit within the existing and planned context.

---

### 1. Inappropriate Zoning Escalation

The proposed transition from R1-5 zoning, which is intended to support low-density, single-detached residential development, to R8-4 zoning, which permits high-density apartment forms, represents a substantial and abrupt escalation in permitted height, density, and built form.

This zoning shift is neither incremental nor transitional in nature and is not supported by the surrounding land-use context. Such a significant jump in zoning intensity undermines the intent of the Zoning By-law to promote compatibility, predictability, and orderly development.

---

### 2. Lack of Compatibility With Immediate Neighbourhood Context

The immediate surrounding area is exclusively characterized by one- and two-storey single-detached dwellings on R1-zoned lands. While three-storey walk-up apartments exist elsewhere in the broader area and represent appropriate, context-sensitive intensification, the proposed six-storey building represents double that height and introduces a fundamentally different building typology.

This distinction is critical. Three-storey buildings allow for reasonable transitions and maintain neighbourhood scale. A six-storey building creates a mid-rise condition that dominates low-rise residential streets. This objection is not to intensification itself, but to intensification that is disproportionate to its immediate context.

---

### 3. Inadequate Height Transition

London Plan Policy 255 requires appropriate transitions between differing building heights. The neighbourhood already demonstrates successful intensification through three-storey walk-up apartments that provide gentle transitions from single-family homes.

This proposal bypasses that established transition pattern by introducing a six-storey building directly adjacent to one-storey homes. A transition from one storey to six storeys cannot reasonably be considered gradual or appropriate.

A more suitable transition would follow the existing neighbourhood pattern: low-rise intensification of three storeys adjacent to R1 lands, with taller buildings directed to major corridors or nodes where such height is contextually appropriate.

---

#### 4. Excessive Density for the Site Context

The proposed density of approximately 310 units per hectare is more than double what typically characterizes three-storey walk-up development and is more appropriate for urban corridors or higher-order transit nodes.

The applicant has not demonstrated why this level of density is necessary at this specific location, particularly given its immediate adjacency to R1 zoning and the availability of lower-density alternatives that would still provide significant housing supply.

---

#### 5. Insufficient Parking and Local Infrastructure Impacts

The proposal provides 46 vehicular parking spaces for 105 residential units, representing approximately 0.44 spaces per unit. This assumption does not reflect existing transportation patterns in this neighbourhood and is likely to result in spillover parking on surrounding residential streets.

This concern is heightened given the site's location within a residential area. The resulting impacts on neighbourhood functionality and safety have not been adequately addressed.

---

#### 6. Cumulative Zoning Relief Indicates Overdevelopment

The proposal requires relief from multiple fundamental zoning standards, including height, density, setbacks, lot coverage, and parking. When relief is required across numerous core metrics simultaneously, it indicates that the development is over-scaled for the site rather than appropriately designed within existing planning controls.

A three-storey building consistent with existing neighbourhood intensification would require substantially less relief and would better demonstrate appropriate fit within established planning controls.

---

#### 7. Scale Inconsistent with Established Neighbourhood Intensification

As noted, the neighbourhood has successfully accommodated three-storey walk-up apartments. These buildings demonstrate that meaningful intensification and increased housing supply can be achieved while maintaining compatibility with low-rise residential context.

At double the height and with 105 units, this proposal represents a fundamentally different building type more appropriate for major corridors or higher-density nodes, not embedded within established low-rise residential blocks.

---

#### 8. More Appropriate Alternatives Not Adequately Considered

The applicant has not demonstrated why a three-storey building—consistent with successful intensification already present in the area would be inadequate for this site. A three-storey walk-up apartment could reasonably provide 35-50 units depending on design, representing substantial housing contribution while respecting neighbourhood scale and demonstrating compatibility with both adjacent R1 lands and existing three-storey buildings nearby. This would achieve genuine intensification without the disproportionate impacts of a six-storey, 105-unit building.

---

#### 9. Inappropriate Precedent

Approval of this rezoning would establish precedent that R8-4 zoning and six-storey buildings are appropriate within low-rise residential neighbourhoods regardless of immediate context. This undermines planning predictability and could encourage similar over-scaled proposals on other R1-adjacent sites throughout the city, contrary to the London Plan's objectives for compatible intensification.

---

#### Conclusion

I support London's need for increased housing supply and recognize that intensification is necessary. The neighbourhood has successfully accommodated three-storey apartment buildings that provide additional housing while maintaining appropriate scale and compatibility. However, this proposal at six storeys and 105 units represents excessive intensification that does not conform with London Plan Policies 193, 252, and 255 regarding compatibility, contextual fit, and appropriate transitions. A three-storey building would better align with established neighbourhood intensification patterns, provide substantial housing (35-50 units), and demonstrate policy conformity.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that City Council refuse the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment or require revisions limiting the building to a maximum of three storeys, consistent with successful intensification already established in the surrounding area.

Please include this letter in the public record for File. I also request written notification of Council's decision on this application.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Wild

