

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

15. Property located at 96 Ridout Street South (Z-8332)

- D. Stanlake on behalf of Stantec, agents for the applicant, Tricar Developments – indicating that, late Friday, the Stantec team was advised that Site Plan staff is interpreting the Zoning By-law a little bit differently than what had been discussed at great length, which would require an adjustment to the height by 1.1 metres; advising that it would be 73.1, so he will be asking if the Committee will consider that; indicating that, in order to build the building, that is open for public discussion; indicating that the interpretation of the by-law, and he does not know the technical issues, associated with it, but it is the interpretation of the ground levels and the four points of the building; advising that it averages out to be 73.1 metres instead of 72 metres; advising that, with respect to the issue of no notice, standard practice in circulation is that the notices are sent to the property owner, if the property is an apartment building, the responsibility of posting the notice in the apartment building rests with the landlord; speaking with Tricar officials, their practice is that the superintendent gets the notice and the information is either posted in lobby or the mail room to indicate to anyone who is renting in the building, who did not receive a formal notice; reiterating that it is the landlords responsibility to notify people who are renting in the building; expressing appreciation that Ms. Harris was able to attend one of their community meetings; noting that they had a good discussion on what was proposed at the site; indicating that there is going to be a range of housing that is allowed on this site; indicating that the housing that has been proposed will provide an option; advising that Tricar has indicated that the price point that they feel will be within the realm of what is the price point for dwellings within Old South; reiterating that it is a range of housing that is compatible within the area that is being served; indicating that affordable housing, unless the City changes its policies, specifically to deal with the type of housing, they feel that they have met the policies intent in dealing with the range of housing allowed on this site; discussing the previous application, there was some discussion about the site plan, he would like to inform the Committee that they did spend considerable time on this application and the amenities to be built into the property and the building itself; indicating that, with respect to energy efficiency, and the list is quite extensive, and he is not going to go through all of it, but at the end of the day, this building will end up being the equivalent of Leads Silver in terms of the energy efficiency that has gone into the building; reiterating that there is the fourth floor landscape area that was discussed, which will increase the open space to almost 50% on the property if you look at the total amount of landscaped open space and will be in addition to the construction diversion program on the site; advising that all units will be equipped with low flow fixtures for water consumption, there will be all sorts of natural light that will be accommodated in all of the units, additional plantings have been included in the ground floor of the property to establish more urban forest on the site; advising that the site is on significant public transportation routes, pedestrian and cycling networks so those residing in the building will have the opportunity to take advantage of something other than the automobile in order to get around in the City; indicating that, through significant discussions with the community and staff, the original overall application was reduced by 43 units, which is not significant in terms of the impact that it may have had in terms of, if you looked at a lower height, you would have a larger frame of a building; indicating that the decision that is made is do you want a large frame, a large bulk, a large mass, or do you want to keep it slightly slimmer but at the same height; noting that the decision that was made, with staff, was to keep it the same height and not the larger mass of the building; relating to density and building size, the only thing he would add is that 191 single family units, if they were developed as single family dwellings, one would consume about 18.2 hectares of property; putting this in a very viable community that is well served, is one of the better neighbourhoods within our City, we are not looking at consuming an additional 18.2 hectares of farmland; identifying that the design of the site, from the original to the proposal, an additional window wall has been incorporated in the design to provide that increased visual breakdown of the

building mass; advising that, in discussions with the property owner immediately to the north, although there is a fence there at the present time, the property owner indicated that he would be pleased if the fence came down during construction; noting that they will be working with the property owner to determine a suitable delineation of the property lines; and, and, requesting a slight modification to the zoning by-law to increase the height by 1.1 metres.

- Gary Brown, 35A-59 Ridout Street – expressing appreciation to the Civic Administration and Tricar Developments for a great working relationship; advising that he is generally supportive of infill intensification; indicating that there have been a lot of comments from the community about the impacts of increased traffic; advising that if you look at the numbers, the effects are so negligible that you can hardly measure them; indicating that you have to measure it against building 200 single family homes out in the corner of one of our cities and what affect that would have on traffic and the infrastructure required to support a development of that kind; noting that developments like this are much better for the future of London; realizing that this is not exactly the kind of transit node that is looked at in The London Plan, but it is just a different kind of one; noting that we already have three apartment buildings right around where this is going to be and there is another large apartment building across the street; advising that he would normally not support a tall building in Old South, but this is what we want to see, we want to see our tall buildings clustered together as opposed to stuck up like thumbs around our City; expressing a concern, which he has expressed before relating to applications in Old South and other parts of the City, is that we always have to be concerned with gentrification; noting that this has nothing to do with the developer itself, they are playing by the rules that we set for them; indicating that everything that he is seeing coming into his community is very high end development, whereas he would like to see a requirement for affordable housing with all developments across the City; believing that we build better communities that way; believing that both of the exit driveways should have large speed humps in front of the sidewalk to slow vehicles down to a snail's pace when they cross that sidewalk and signage alerting that there is a busy bike path right there; recommending that the way setbacks are done should be rethought as the setback by-laws seem to assume that we are already going to put large parking lots in front of the buildings; indicating that everyone is needing to get variances to move the buildings up level with the street; recommending a review of the general guidelines and making it a first option to bring the buildings level with the street; expressing support that all of the parking is enclosed in the building; expressing support for the design of the third or fourth floor roof community area; indicating that people talk about the lot coverage, but to him, if you look at the building next door to this, it is full lot coverage because it is all surface parking lot and he often thinks we should think about that when we talk about lot coverage; reiterating that, on this building, the public space is really the third floor and it is a different design; noting that there are going to be community barbeques, community gardens all on this space and he would much rather that as a design principle as opposed to large surface parking lots in our City; and, expressing appreciation for wanting to be part of their community.
- S. O'Connell, 66 Newton Crescent – indicating that, from his perspective, the building looks fabulous; enquiring as to, with all the high rises and other residential uses that are being built in the area, how is the area going to be serviceable if you want to put in an upscale light rail way or increase the bus routes; expressing concern with respect to transportation; and, indicating that it is all well and good to build these places, but we have to make sure that they are serviceable.
- Wanita Harris, 100 Ridout Street South – indicating that she was amazingly shocked, being a renter in one of Homestead's buildings, the Gartshore, which they recently become owners of in last year, as well as the individuals from Homestead in the building that she lives in; advising that she is shocked because she did not receive any advanced notification of any of the proposals, nor did she receive any kind of notification from the Homestead landowners who are the owners of the property; advising that, one of the suggestions that was made, was about no future input being required; requesting that the Committee to please reconsider; indicating that there are many elderly people, disabled people, in her building alone, there are people who multiple sclerosis; advising that her father has Alzheimer's and this type of adjustment is going to be a drastic shock

to them; indicating that it is going to affect the people who use the apartment building balconies more directly than any other homeowner in the neighbourhood; advising that they are also going to be directly impacted with the actual usage of up and down Ridout Street because they actually live there and they will be inconvenienced for approximately two to three years; advising that one of the key things that she has noticed that is lacking in London is affordable housing; expressing agreement with Mr. Brown's comments relating to affordable housing; indicating that there is a lot of high density and high cost housing and because of the neighbourhood that we have in Old South, of which she is a community member, she would like to see a little bit more affordable housing for those who are elderly, people like her father who are on fixed incomes and particularly for the people who live in the community, who may be between 50 and 60 years old, who will be on fixed incomes sometime in the next 10, 15 to 20 years; expressing concern with the proposal for the cost of the condo units with representatives of the condo committee, that those people's voices are not going to be adequately heard; indicating that she has been both a home owner and a condo owner, and from that perspective, she does have those experiences which is why she felt so compelled to come to the meeting tonight; reiterating that she was shocked that she did not receive any advanced notice despite the fact that she has an MPAC roll number; and, indicating that, as a citizen, she does not have an equal voice to the homeowners.

- Jens Schoenrank, 17 Marley Place – expressing concern with the height of the proposed building; advising that his concerns with the previous, lower storey building, is, in this case, exacerbated by the elevations involved; and, indicating that, this building, if constructed as illustrated, would be the thumb in the whole neighbourhood.