

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

9. Properties located at 321 Central Avenue and 581 Waterloo Street - Demolition Requests (OZ-8371)
 - Marcus Coles, 38 Palace Street – advising that, no matter what is said, it is setting a precedent; indicating that it is knocking two valuable heritage sites, effectively doubling the area of this site to make something workable and maximize the income from this site for the current owner; believing that the heritage buildings are being undervalued with their “C” designation; noting that the building on Waterloo Street dates back to 1888, which was a time of boom in the City; further noting that this property was on the outskirts of the City at that time; advising that the three phase development that you see within that building was done within a year; indicating that the building on Central Avenue is a fine example of an Edwardian building for a businessman of some wealth who went ahead and built this building; indicating that neither of these buildings are easily replaced; noting that they cannot be replaced once they are gone and there are no more examples of the same building repeated anywhere in the area; reiterating that, although someone may say it has a value of “C”, which seems to degrade the building, he thinks that there is more value there that people do not realize; reiterating that once it is gone, it is gone; indicating that what is being built is of incredible size and way out of scale for the neighbourhood; advising that, if you take a look at the draft London Plan, which is coming around for comment, this building would never, in his reading of the draft London Plan, be allowed; indicating that Part 5 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* should protect these buildings alongside the empty lot and that is not happening; and, expressing disgust with the direction that this has taken.
 - Paul Woodford, 606 Waterloo Street – advising that when he takes his dog for a walk, he looks right at the parking lot; noting that he calls it a parking lot because that is what it is, an unofficial, unmonitored parking lot; believing he speaks for all of his neighbours in the area who look at that spot and those particular houses every day and they all agree that they do need to come down; noting that they do believe in heritage, but they are a little worried that if they do not do it now and allow this project, which they all consider quite modest, the fear is that someday they will get a fourteen storey one there and it will not be nearly as attractive or as desirable to the neighbourhood; expressing concern that they will be looking at the same house, the Queen Anne design for the next twenty-five years and it will never improve; indicating that, had it been in good shape, looked after and not subject to problems with tenants and so on, it would have been a different story, but it has not had a good history; and, reiterating that all of his neighbours who look at that building would agree with him because they would all like to see this particular project, with the right style, the right size and would attract the right kind of people to the neighbourhood.
 - Kate Rapson, Chair, Woodfield Community Association – indicating that the Community Association presented on this matter in September, 2014, when the zoning change was before the Committee; noting that their position, at that time, was that they were not opposing the proposal for redevelopment of the site but they were very concerned about the demolition; indicating that that is still the case, they had a discussion at the Executive a couple of weeks ago; expressing support for something going in there, but there is deep concern and a general opposition to the demolition of these two buildings as they are two heritage sites and they consider themselves, in some ways, stewards of the heritage streetscape so it is a difficult position for them to be in to approve this so we have to kind of not approve it, so we oppose it; indicating that there are several features to Mr. Woodford's points that they do appreciate, such as the underground parking, the ground floor townhome style units and the high design which the developer put a lot of time into the design; noting that some do not like it, but others do so that has been a positive note; expressing concern with setting a precedent for this; indicating that they do not want it to be an economic case, that every time there is an economic reason, that more buildings could come down; expressing concern with that comment in Mr. Menard's report; advising that they alluded to some of the reasons why this could not

come down, which had to do with the underground parking and the turning circumference; advising that she has had a number of conversations with people, that talked very specifically as to a rationale why the buildings must come down for this development to proceed, which has been considered a positive attribute to the community; indicating that they asked for this at the last public meeting, to get some sort of report filed that talks more specifically to those details rather than a little more of a generality; enquiring as to what were the other options that were considered to save those buildings, was there consideration to save one or two of the buildings or a façade; further enquiring as to how that would that work and why were they rejected; and, requesting answers to the questions.