

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 17. Property located at 50 King Street

- Joanne Vanderheyden, Warden, County of Middlesex – providing the attached presentation.
- Allan Patton - Allan Patton, Patton Cormier and Associates – noting that he is representing residents of 19 King Street and the residents of the Renaissance Centre; noting the Planner has referred to this as a challenging application and advising that it is a critical and fundamental application; noting that the presentation by the Warden of Middlesex was akin to a private developer application; advising that those he is representing have concerns about the multi-residential component, commercial uses and the office uses, but no concerns with the County continuing to use the site for the County of Middlesex offices as this is a public function on publically-owned land; noting that the County has suggested that “this is what the private sector is doing” and suggesting that the City has many policies to encourage private sector development; noting various developments in a variety of stages/phases, due to these policies are working for the private sector; advising that the County’s justification report states the proximity of this project to other public sites, including the Thames River, requires that special attention be paid to the urban design qualities of this redevelopment and presents a unique opportunity to reconnect the Thames River with the downtown; noting that the public has already suggested that the development is not necessary for this reconnection because the opportunity already exists; noting those that he is representing do not object to the County having offices on the site, and this can be accomplished with the existing limitations; referencing the planning report and noting that these can be accomplished building only offices and suggesting that more retail, restaurants or competition with the private sector isn’t necessary; suggesting the City is not in need of a large apartment building in this location; noting that the current Official Plan is sound land-use planning and that there is no flaw in the current Official Plan designation or zoning for the property; and requesting refusal of the application or at the very least a referral back for additional consideration based on the comments made.
- Mike Harris, 330 Ridout Street North – provided the attached presentation.
- John Berry, 901-19 King Street – indicating that he had earlier submitted written objections and comments by way of objections on June 27, 2014 to the Planning Committee, and on September 17th he wrote a letter to all members of Council with some concerns on this matter, those are matters of record so he won’t go over those again but he would like to add a few comments consistent but maybe moving in a little different direction from what Mike Harris has said; further indicating that he sees this as a tremendous opportunity for the City of London, with the Health Unit scheduled to vacate 50 King in 2016 there is a one off opportunity, a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something really dynamic at the Forks at the Thames; expressing that it would make one of the biggest contributions to revitalizing the downtown that will happen in the next decade or two and it will contribute to realizing the transformation project at the Forks that is in the Downtown Master Plan so, it is so important to do it right; noting he would like to thank the Planning Committee for putting together a very comprehensive file that captures not only the concept but the concerns of many people that have been brought forward, we appreciate the comprehensive nature of that documentation; also indicating that the proposal really fails on many counts; expressing that he recently reread the Downtown Master Plan and related Plans, and noting these have all been developed with extensive work by City staff and with input from so many of our citizens, and one is struck with the huge number of departures, too many to mention from the vision of those Plans, one wonders how those Plans relate to what really happens on the ground when the rubber hits the road and money is to be spent; advising that he would like to draw attention to a couple of things from the documentation: the comments from the London Heritage Trust, landscaping raise serious concerns about how this would impact the views to and from the Middlesex County Courthouse, its landmark value, and so on; noting that landscape features raise concerns about the proposed height and the

shadow study on the original proposal and advising he showed it to an architect friend of his and he laughed suggesting it must have been done on June 21st because any competent shadow studies have to be done throughout the year; indicating that the present proposal is really too vague, to allow a responsible decision to be made; noting the proposal has lots of assurances but it doesn't say how and we really don't know what is going to be put up on that space, what the phase 2 or phase 3 will consist of and in other words the zoning approval would provide a blank cheque that would be very difficult to do afterwards; finally he would like to note, on that point of vagueness to the proposal, the comments of the urban design peer review panel identify 14 weaknesses in the proposal, and reading comments aloud; noting that he is concurring with the comments of the review panel, and urging rejection of this application for rezoning; also expressing that any future proposal, and he hopes there is one, for the redevelopment of the Forks, to respect the heritage nature of this most important site, focus on public space, public use with public lands and retain the current height restrictions so as to intergrade the many beautiful features of this area into a consistent visual space that links and anchors downtown to the river.

- John Palmer, 602-19 King Street – indicating that he would amplify one point that was made by Dr. Berry earlier, noting he looked at the shadows that were done with the shadow study, and the shadow study is one of the most ridiculous things he has ever seen; noting that he doesn't like to be too negative but to project a shadow from a building that is 30 stories tall, maybe even 25 stories tall and to say that is not ever going to touch the old Middlesex County building is just ridiculous; indicating that he took a picture of the Budweiser Centre on September 20th and sent a copy of this picture to Councillor White and you can see the shadow from the Renaissance building half way across the Budweiser Centre, that was on September 20th, if you put that shadow going from the footprint of the proposed building at 50 King it would cover the entire Middlesex County building, that was on September 20th; noting he thinks for heritage purposes we should try to keep the Middlesex County building that shines out there brightly rather than keep it in the dark; and further noting that keep in mind that the shadows from the proposed building would make the proposed pedestrian walkway very dark and probably not very appealing to many people.
- Debra Carpella 19 King Street – indicating that she attended the previous meeting and has listened very closely to the presentations made, including the three presentations from the one individual representing our building; advising that she appreciates the work of the planning committee and acknowledges that this isn't an easy task, however, she would like to note that this issue does not, as others have mentioned, just affect the residents of Renaissance II, that is a limited perspective; advising that they are not against development but need to acknowledge that the circumstances, construction of the building today, the height restriction is one that works for the City; indicating that if we make this change and we impose a 30 storey building, she doesn't understand how it is going to connect the downtown to the river when you put a protrusion like that in our neighbourhood; further indicating that it is going to effect a higher city for the future, we won't be able to turn back the clock, it is going to have a lasting impact; noting that this site as it exists today, is filled with people on a Sunday night, families from all over the city come out to this site, so she hopes that is understood; confirming there are a number of people representing the area this evening, the Renaissance II, but this is not just a decision that affects the Renaissance II.
- Jason Jordon, 60 Blackfriars Street – indicating that he is not from the neighbourhood but he is a cyclist and walker, and this is his gateway to the downtown; noting that he is in favor of this zoning plan; noting that you can't have a design without the zoning so without the zoning you cannot design anything; noting that the holding provisions will help to refine the plan and it will link downtown to the Forks of the Thames; further indicating that right now if you were walking down Dundas Street you would get as far as Talbot Street and you don't want to walk past the Budwieser or the Courthouse because there is nothing there, you can't see anything, this will allow an environment that will attract people up from the downtown; noting he walks the pathway through the parking lot to the Courthouse, he takes that way at least once a week.
- Tim Lowny – 19 King Street – expressing that he wants to reiterate the point that was made in general about the Courthouse, he feels that a 30 storey building will negatively

impact the Courthouse and Goal, as a landmark for London; expressing that a 30 storey building will dwarf that Courthouse, he doesn't want to say that it's a sign of disrespect but when you put a 30 storey building next to a small structure it diminishes the small structure just in terms of size; noting that if you get a chance to go down there in the summer time, there are many weddings that take place there, it is a very nice green space at the Goal, people often take wedding photos down there; advising that he knows that there is a lot of concern of the footprint of the building that you are going to lose a lot of that green space, and noting he knows they are saying that they will basically follow the same footprint the Middlesex Health Unit that is there, but really when you go down to look at it, it is really difficult to see how they are not going to take about half that green space as part of that park that is in front of the Courthouse; reiterating that point, he feels that would be a big loss; indicating that the area is like a crown jewel, it's sort of the heart of London, in terms of a historical standpoint, a lot of people get drawn down there as has been mentioned previously; noting that if you put a large structure next to that area will diminish it, quite a lot.

- Gary Brown, 35A - 59 Ridout Street – indicating he looks straight down Ridout at the Renaissance Centre, and it reminds him of what they built in the 1980's in East Germany; suggesting they don't talk about other buildings; stating he agrees with the design standards of density that when you build tall buildings you should group them together and that's what should be there; stating he doesn't own a car, lives in old south and works downtown and he is an urbanite; stating that when he walks by the Middlesex County Health Unit he can't see the courthouse and couldn't care a less if it was a 200 foot building; suggesting that when we talk about obliterating the courthouse the only people this will cover are the people living on the 20th floor of large concrete slab buildings; expressing concern with using King Street as the entrance for this building as this is the end of the Thames Valley Parkway and the main cycle way into London; indicating that as poor as it is now, and that it is a disaster of a cycle way, this will only make it worse; suggesting the answer is to put in some protected bike lanes on Dundas and run all the bikes down through there, but that is for another time; indicating that once again he doesn't see this as even being taken into consideration; stating this is a dangerous place for cyclists and that he doesn't walk or bike by this place every day without a delivery vehicle parked in the bike lane for either the Middlesex County Health Unit or loading into the apartment buildings across the street; advising these are things that need to be taken into account if we mean what we say that we are going to build a city which is safe for cyclists, pedestrians and cars; suggesting that we need to think about these things; stating that as for the building itself (advising that we have gone through the process in old south recently and that he feels like he sold his soul when they cut the two big trees down on the property there) we need to work with the developers; advising this is the best advice he can give the community not to have an adversarial relationship with them; indicating that generally if you work with them you often get exactly what you want when you are done; stating he supports this project because it's infill; indicating he would feel a little more comfortable if there was a site plan; understanding that is not the general process but that it happens once in a while; indicating that the City's planning staff have been improving dramatically building after building resulting in better looking buildings; suggesting that he doesn't think another Renaissance building will be built this time and that he is trusting that we can be held to that standard this time.
- B. Tomassini, resident of Renaissance II – advising he has been a Londoner for over 40 years and suggesting Middlesex County has the right to maximize the value of their land, the City of London the right to maximize its tax base and current residents the right to retain the beauty of the park and maximize and enjoy the waterfront around it; urging the committee to look at alternative plans such as a performing arts centre, children's museum, Orchestra London venue or new city hall building; suggesting there should be no approval based on a proposed conceptual development submitted by the County, urging the downtown area deserves better; suggesting the proposed building will drastically change the area and replacing a 3 storey to a 28 storey building would destroy the character of the site; suggesting that in addition to the downtown development the land to the waterfront should be opened up, like Chicago; indicating that it's ironic that a local private developer who purchased the old Aboutown taxi site is

planning to open the land to the waterfront for the people to enjoy and the municipality is looking to close up public lands by erecting a building that is not fitting in the area or in the concept of an open waterfront; suggesting this is not in the best interest of the residents or of downtown London; reiterating that the site would benefit with a performing arts centre, children's museum and Orchestra London or a new city hall building; requesting that the waterfront not be destroyed, but enhanced; suggesting there are other areas where a high-rise can be built and recommending the rejection of the proposal.

- Dane Kirilovic – 71 King Street – expressing concern about the elimination of his view; noting the already poor traffic in the area and noting this will make things far worse; expressing concern with inclusion of the proposed 12,000 square feet of commercial space suggesting that London is already not occupying existing commercial space and indicating that there is no need for additional commercial space downtown; suggesting that the addition of a 30 storey building is not what other Cities are doing excluding Toronto; indicating that other Cities are scaling down the buildings as you approach public space such as the river; stating that he is not in support of this application but not in opposition of redevelopment, but not in favour of something of this scale; suggesting that there would not be an issue if the county returned with something that would be beneficial to the residents and the public as a whole.
- Rob O'Dowda, 330 Ridout Street – noting that he has been listening to the comments made, with an open mind; advising that if one walks down at the Forks of the Thames right now and takes a look around from the fountain, there is a plaque addressing the Court House and the addition that was put on it as an obstruction to the view; advising that he has heard the comments about not being able to see the Court House, due to the existing building on the site, but suggesting that this is a mistake made in the past and doesn't need to be repeated; suggesting he is in favour of rejuvenation of the downtown and noting that there are plans in the works already for apartments; suggesting that there should be a careful plan as to where these tall buildings should go, so that the view can be shared by everyone; advising that today, people living in urban centres have pets, and noting that if you watch, you see these people need to take their pets out 2 to 3 times a day, and the simple fact is that these people walk the shortest distance possible and advising that the park area at the Court House will be affected by this; noting there is a lot to think about and suggesting that there are already buildings going up, and care should be exercised with what is done next.
- Doug Doward, 33 Ridout Street – suggesting there has been notation related to the major urban centres that are not taking advantage of the waterfront, and some that are; noting the current activity in Toronto known as the Distillery District where the buildings around the heritage site have been kept very short; suggesting that the area is similar in size, geographically, in Toronto has 1874 apartments, and the same footprint in London currently has 2,317 apartments in the same footprint; advising that the Distillery District is very packed with people and vibrant, and people want to go there, and the apartments immediately outside the area are short; noting that this is a positive experience and should be considered.
- Joe O'Neill, 350 Williams Street – indicating that he has nothing to do with Mr. Patton's group, he is on his own; advising that historically he has a few concerns over this Plan, he know that the Thames Valley Corridor Plan was quoted but he noticed that of all the site views that was put up, he has dozens if not hundreds of historical vista of downtown London, paintings, watercolors, photographs, they are all done from the west side of the Thames looking down and he noticed that not one of the vistas used refer to any of these traditional views of downtown London, which are all public domain and free, easy to get a hold of; secondly, he has a concern with any structure, building, he doesn't care if you are putting up a 30 storey bronze statue of John A. MacDonald, it doesn't belong beside the Courthouse; further advising that you are going to dwarf it no matter what you do; thirdly, there is a wonderful opportunity here, take the north part, you've got Eldon House, the restored Labatt buildings, the Art Gallery, the Courthouse, you've got the Market, Bud Gardens and those two come to an intersection right where the Health Unit is; advising that there is a beautiful opportunity to do a public crown jewel here not a 30 storey building; pointing out that when it says future phases it worries him, not where the current plan is, but he can guarantee you when the future phases start digging you will

be disturbing graves of prisoners that are buried there, the man who actually dug up Peg Leg Brown and is my employee, get a can of paint and go down to the parking lot and someday he could put an x and show you exactly where they are, so when it comes to future phases just before warrant; pointing out that from a historical point of view there is a giant 800 lb. gorilla sitting in the room that everybody is dancing around; indicating back in the late 1960's early 70's, 45 years ago give or take, when you are shutting down the Courthouse and moving it over, City Council then had the opportunity to buy this land, all of it and take it over, they didn't, they blew it, one of our darkest periods in history, that is why some of us in heritage get so apey on this stuff, it is because most people won't admit or won't realize we came close to losing the Courthouse back then; further noting that County tax money stepped in and the County has never let the City forget about that, so image the social dynamic of the County and the City over the years; indicating that you now have after a mistake over 45 years ago an opportunity to do something again, please do not repeat history and make the same mistake you did 45 years ago.

- Hazel Elmslie, 42 Palace Street – indicating that she takes exception to the County saying the building is tired and old, its less than 45 years old, she worked in the previous building, and both the assessment department and the Middlesex County library, and she remembers when they moved because she went with them, so what have they been doing with this building for 45 years; noting that traffic was touched on very briefly by only one other person; indicating she drives down Ridout Street every other Friday night to go to South London for a meeting and it is bad down there and when there is a Knights game it's worse, and if somebody wants to cross over Ridout Street to get in to the Renaissance it is difficult; indicating that she doesn't know why they ever put the Renaissance building with no adequate access to their parking; advising not to make another mistake; further noting that there is only two street access to that building, Ridout Street is one way and King Street is just narrow, what happens if there is a major problem, a fire, or a gas leak, or a flood, there have been no comments on that.
- George Bradfitz – 330 Ridout Street, owner/resident – supports all the previous negative comments made; asking if the adoption of this application would set a precedent for downtown and the area and expressing concern about this; noting that it is the end of an election period, and requesting this application be referred to the new Council.
- Don Dejon, 598 Upper Queen Street, London – stating that change is difficult, advising he feels there is a great opportunity to work with what the County is looking for and what some of the community is looking for; suggesting that for some of the affected community the change can be difficult but for the larger good he believes that there is a lot of opportunity to bring in the forks to bring in something that they can work with in the City; suggesting a need for this downtown; indicating that he believes they have a really good vision to develop an integrated public site connecting to the Thames and all those features and a good opportunity in respecting that connection to public use.
- Jim Donnelly, 19 King Street – advising that he is a 26-year veteran of living in downtown London and is a huge fan of living in high-rises; stating he is concerned about the retail portion of this application, noting there is enough vacant retail downtown already; noting the lack of retail success with the Renaissance buildings, with only one small convenience store 'hanging on' – don't need any more blank glass walls downtown; suggesting that the concept of 'reconnecting' is baffling because the Forks of the Thames is very well connected to downtown already, from both a pedestrian and a bicycle point of view; suggesting a lot of additional potential development already in progress through private development in the immediate area; noting there seems to be a lot of good intentions, suggesting the application is paper thin and questioning the land value of the subject property in the market place and suggesting that the area be used to develop an entertainment centre and should be kept for public use.
- Hazel Booker, 330 Ridout Street – advising she has recently moved back to London from Montreal; suggesting that she is very passionate about London and there shouldn't be any consideration to mess with the Forks of the Thames; proposing that the Forks should be left as it currently is, and the County should not put anything else in the area so as to keep the area and the view as it currently is.
- Linda Leverton, 765 Killarney Road – indicating that she is new to London but chose to invest in London by buying a unit at the Renaissance II; expressing that she loves

London and thinks that the City can do better than building a tall highrise in the heart of London and encourages you to do so.

- Durk Vanderwerff, Manager of Planning, County of Middlesex – expressing exception to the comments related to the “blank cheque”; noting that this is different than a private development and that the County is looking for a 2-step process; advising that the County is looking to first gain support for a development concept and envelop, and then at a later date, with more detailed design, ultimately the redevelopment at that time with City approval; restating that the Committee is not being asked to consider a specific proposal today; and noting that the holding and bonus provisions put forward by the City of London staff would be sufficient to ensure matters such as shade studies and wind studies, and other good planning principles that the County supports, are addressed in that more detailed design prior to development.