

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3. Property located at 1156 Dundas Street (OZ-8053)
 - Kevin Muir, GSP Group, representing Realty Services, City of London – working hand in hand with the potential purchaser, Sierra Construction, in terms of trying to identify and illustrate a vision for their provision for the property once they take ownership; trying to take that and design a design concept for the property ultimately to translate that to the zoning provisions and the Official Plan policies that are in front of the Committee; indicating that the concept itself is without the benefit of a lot of the technical studies that would typically go into an application such as this, they would come at a later stage; outlining that this, essentially, provides the vision and the intent for the property; advising that, over the course of time, as this site plan process goes forward, things may shift, there may be reconfigurations provide the overall intent and the vision of this property is maintained; providing some value added commentary in terms of the process, the vision and intent for the property and basically how they have tried to respond to some of the community concerns and community comments that they heard through the process; pointing out that, as the Planner had indicated, they divided the property up into three different areas from a zoning perspective and really from a character perspective; indicating that Area 1 is the frontage portion along Dundas Street, where the original 1913 portion of the factory is located; noting that the part that would be retained is the part that would be adaptively be reused, rejuvenated in terms of inside and outside, restored to its previous appearance as well as the opportunity for additions over and above the existing four and five storey original factory as a mixed use development; something that likely would contain a principally residential use with a possibility for office uses as well as a number of different non-residential uses that provide activity along the street; advising that the second area, Area 2, is the middle and the largest portion of the property; indicating that the intent, from Sierra's perspective, for this portion is a seniors oriented village, if you want to call it that; indicating that it would include the possibility for a range of different options and housing forms in that continuum of care from very independent to some level of care provided; pointing out that the concept shows some of those options; noting that the options are from townhouses, low rise townhouses up to a low and mid-rise apartment for more independent living as well as that "u" shaped building along Ashland Avenue which is contemplated as more of a continuum of care type facility; outlining that the real theme to take out of that is that this would be an integrated development where a lot of the services, recreation spaces, possibly medical services, commercial spaces could be shared amongst that block; indicating that, as you move up to the north end, really, the principle of this was trying to complete that residential block with single-detached houses which exists all around in the neighbourhood; pointing out that, not to go into the nuts and bolts of the zoning and the Official Plan, what they would like to do is try to say "here is what we heard going through the process", heard from the community, heard from City staff and how they have tried to respond to that in modifying it and justifying the concept as they move forward; outlining that there are really five main themes that they heard through the process; noting that one was commentary and some concerns on the scale and the fit of the development; outlining that, really what they look at is a balancing exercise between a number of different interests and trying to determine unit yield and a density on the property; advising that they are trying to balance what is in the Official Plan in terms of the design direction from there; noting that they are trying to balance a good fit, a compatible fit with the surrounding neighbourhood but they are also trying to balance the understanding that this is a brownfield site with a large heritage building on it and there are some economic realities and financial legalities that go with it; pointing out changes since the original submission that were outlined in the staff report and the presentation was in the north and they are looking away from Dundas Street; noting that Dundas Street is at the top of the photograph shown at the Planning and Environment Committee meeting; indicating that it was originally townhouses in that location and it has been limited down now to detached dwellings to finish that block off; indicating that, on the western end, McCormick Boulevard, it was previously six storeys and so they brought that down

in terms of scale to four and five and brought down the density in units accordingly; outlining that they also heard quite a bit about green space; noting that at the consultation they heard that there was a lot of a lack of a public park as part of this development; noting that there are pockets of existing mature vegetation, mature trees, particularly at the north end; indicating that they have addressed that through the addition of a public park as indicated at the northwest corner of the new Gleason Street extension and McCormick Boulevard sized as per the recommendation of City staff in terms of the dimensions of that space; advising that, in that northern block area, Area 3, there is now a holding provision for a tree management plan; noting that, before development can proceed, they have to go out and assess the condition of the trees, the species of the trees and opportunities for preserving that as part of the development; advising that they also heard, along Dundas Street, the concept itself shows a residential building with an office extension; noting that those would likely be the predominant uses within the building; indicating that the zoning that is proposed, the BDC 2 zone permits pretty much everything in terms of non-residential; pointing out that it would permit the things that provide the activity along the street, the restaurants, the street retail stores, the convenience stores, institution, community centres and it is really only when the purchaser goes to detailed design and designs that building and identifies the market and what can be supported, they can determine all the uses at grade; advising that they heard, through the consultation, about the industrial chimney that is part of the McCormick property and this is a chimney that is outside, just to the north, part of Area 2; noting that it is north of the portion that would be retained; discussing the original 1913 portion that was added after the fact; essentially the development of the factory has grown up and around it over time; pointing out that they did not show it on the original concept, it was not a designated feature, it was not a reason for designation so that is why it was excluded; advising that, based on the comments that they have heard, they did explore options for relocating the park to incorporate that, there was no desire from the purchasers perspective of maintaining that chimney, the liability associated with it, the operation, the maintenance; noting that they have done it on other sites and they did not wish to repeat that process but they did explore opportunities for public ownership of that; advising that, at the end of the day it came down to the fact that the best location for the park was determined to be up at the northwest corner as they have shown it; indicating that, as you expect through any infill large property redevelopment, there is a lot of technical questions that come out through the consultation, things like what about the traffic, what about the municipal servicing and things like that; advising that where they are at right now is the end of the beginning process for the planning of this site as there is a lot of work that has to be done once Sierra picks up the property and gets into the design of it, technical studies, traffic impact studies, municipal sanitary studies, record of site conditions for the environmental conditions on the site; reiterating that this is really just the first step in terms of approvals; indicating that, for a very complex application, there are certain little technical things that sometimes slip through the cracks; advising that there are two that they are asking for modifications to the zoning that is in front of the Committee; noting that one was identified by staff in terms of those two western apartment buildings where the Official Plan policy allows up to five stories but it was not captured in the zoning; requesting that be bumped up to fifteen metres accordingly; pointing out another technicality that was picked up in one of the definitions; noting that Sierra is intending to develop a seniors oriented product in the Area 2 and the definition in the City of London Zoning by-law for a senior citizen apartment building are only for publicly owned and operated; noting that that is not the intent in this situation; outlining that what they are asking is for a site specific definition for this site in particular that allows it to be privately owned and operated; noting that it does not change the form, it does not change the function of the height, just the ownership of it; advising that that is their submission in support of the application; and, reiterating that they support the application notwithstanding the two slight modifications that they have asked for. *Note: the first modification for the 15 metres height is in the recommendation, the second modification was not included in the staff report because staff needs more time to discuss this matter. Further noting that further discussion with respect to the second modification occurred;* responding to the fortress comment, it appears that way on the Plan but the intent for those buildings is being oriented to the street to have two sides, a side along the public street but also a side along the private street; advising that there is no way that

these would be blank walls or blank featureless walls; noting that it would not go through the site plan process as a blank wall; pointing out that there is the holding provision that has stipulations in terms of meeting the Urban Design Guidelines; indicating that, while the concept appears as big white boxes, there is an exercise that they have to go forward with in terms of articulating these walls; relating to the second modification, the apartment buildings on the west side, as he understands them, would be the care facilities, they would have very little to no care within these, these are more independent living which could access the broader services within the seniors village in terms of recreation facilities or meeting halls or spaces like that. (See attached presentation.)

- Jen Gaudet, Planner and Development Coordinator, Sierra Construction – advising that they are a project management, construction management, civil infrastructure, design build, development and planning and general contracting company; indicating that they have been around for over twenty years; outlining that they are based in Woodstock, Ontario, and they have projects all over Ontario; pointing out that they have a number of certifications ranging from safety, quality management, environmental designations, which provide them with the experience and the expertise to be able to handle projects like McCormick which, as everyone knows, does have significant environmental issues; and, providing a quick overview of some of the projects that they have completed in the past. (See attached presentation.)
- Kristina Greenway Courey, 857 Princess Avenue, President, Old East Village Community Association - speaking on behalf of the Community Association – see attached communication.
- Joe Fontana, representing Bayshore Groups of Kellogg – indicating that Bayshore and Sierra have worked together previously and are working together collaborating on projects and you could not have a better developer than Sierra do this; indicating that the Committee spent the last hour talking about a vision, McCormick District; advising that there is no doubt that this, in fact, starts to implement the vision of where people can work, live and play which is exactly what they intend to do with the Kellogg's reproductions; indicating that it is complimentary and implements what the Committee just did, which was to create an incredible new district in London that he thinks will make it possible for people to live and to work and some of the comments that were made by the Association, he thinks are in keeping in ensuring that Dundas Street does provide those opportunities, commercial opportunities, residential opportunities, recreation and the amenities that are deserved in the area; and, expressing support for this particular application.
- Sandra Miller, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO) London Branch, 32 Upper Avenue – speaking on behalf of the ACO; echoing a lot of the things that we have heard this evening; expressing gratitude for the redevelopment of this whole area and, in particular, the Secondary Plan and the specifics to the McCormick Factory site; loving all of the green aspects, the potential for light rail and transit growth, more activity on the street; indicating that, in many ways, it brings the community back to where it was, a mixed use industrial, commercial, live work, play environment; believing that the people in Old East Village and the whole city will benefit; appreciating the scale of the development with a mid-rise at the front end that steps back to the low-rise single residential homes at the back; reiterating that it is a really nice scaling down into the community; liking the mixed use of seniors and whoever else moves into these buildings and the possibility for office space, studio space, light industrial or small commercial; noting that it has got everything that they have talked about in the big picture London Plan ideas; expressing appreciation at seeing the original sunshine palace preserved; noting that they have their fingers crossed for the condition of the glazed terra cotta; further noting that it is one of only two buildings, in London, still standing that have glazed terra cotta; pointing out that it is a really remarkable building and it still retains most, if not all, of its really original heritage features; indicating that they have no problem with a small addition to the top; noting that it is nicely scaled to the building itself and it will complement and give some good density to an existing building; advising that it is the kind of thing that they would like to see a lot more of, an appropriately scaled mid-rise heritage and new development; noting that they have seen a lot of other examples in other cities, places like Kitchener, Waterloo, Hamilton; indicating that they would like to see a lot more of it here; advising that they have a couple of things that they would like to note that have come up previously; advising that the smoke stack is a particular area of concern; pointing out that this area has been called the Smoke

Stack District for obvious reasons, as there are a number of historic smoke stacks in the neighbourhood that signal its earlier industrial use; taking down the smoke stack, even one, would be very sad as it is a real landmark; indicating that it is incorporated into the original part of the building; referring to the lovely presentation by Sierra about the work that they have done, the Harvey Woods project was really remarkable; noting that one picture that they did not include was a lovely photograph of the landscape that includes a smoke stack that they retained there; outlining that we have all probably seen a lot of other smoke stacks incorporated into redevelopment projects, certainly the historic Distillery District in Toronto and others all across Canada; watching the news the last couple of days, there was a lot of someone trying to demolish a smoke stack in Alabama and karma came back and nearly took down the poor fellow that was demolishing it; noting that it had to be taken down with a backhoe after the explosives did not work and it crashed on the backhoe; indicating that, overall they just want to give our support to this project, it is a wonderful redevelopment; expressing appreciation to the Planning staff, to all of the parties including Sierra and especially to Old East Village community residents and BIA and the Community Association who have really sort of engaged with their own community and stepped up and participated in the process; indicating that they have been pleased to also participate; and, advising that they really love it and want to see it happen but they want to keep that smoke stack.

- Sarah Merritt, Old East Village Business Improvement Area (BIA) and the sister corporation, the Old East Village Development Corporation – indicating that they have all been very involved in the Secondary Plan for the area and have been included in the discussions and the history of the area and how to get some uses into McCormick's; noting that this is something that they have been aware of since 2009; expressing appreciation that a group that has the skill base and the track record that Sierra has come forward; echoing a lot of what has already been said as they are happy to see the possibilities for new residential development, new neighbours, production, commercial activity and residential activities for seniors; indicating that it is equally important because she has been involved in other kinds of developments is to see that there are site specific design guidelines that will connect the development at this site to the McCormick Area Secondary Plan and she believes that connectivity from the McCormick site and to the rest of the area is something that they are all concerned about; expressing appreciation about seeing, in the zoning guidelines and the Plan, is the recommendation for Main Street commercial zoning and connections to a future rapid transit system; advising that when they viewed the Plan that is being discussed at the meeting, without the request for modifications, they could see that feedback from the community has been taken into account; however, they still have some questions about how and when the commercialization of properties fronting onto Dundas Street will occur; thinking that that is something that is running across all of the groups in the area that have any kind of representation mandate; outlining that connectivity through the property from the east side on Ashland Avenue to McCormick Avenue on the west remains important to them; expecting public pedestrian access to accommodate west of the Osborne Street/Ashland Avenue intersection to connect to the McCormick Avenue; pointing out that avenues for ensuring this connectivity require further clarification so that the facilities for seniors interact with the surrounding area; advising that she was fortunate enough to go to the 20 under 40 London business event and it struck her that she would never get a prize unless they had a 20 under 70 event because she is now in the demographic that is eventually, if she stays in her neighbourhood, may very well end up in this Sierra property; noting that she is speaking personally on that but she is also acknowledging that the design of the campus light facility for the seniors should take into account safety issues for some of our senior populations; nevertheless, they would like to have further opportunity to discuss how these issues might addressed to avoid the campus-like design; advising that this is no offense to the Planners who have been working on the site; indicating that they want to avoid a campus-like design unintentionally assuming fortress-like characteristics; everything that the Community Association talked about, the backs of buildings fronting onto streets and, for them, the lack of walkways on this campus for the community to access it are things that they would like to really look at; pointing out that they really want their neighbours to be part of the community and they also think that if they can open that design up, to put it at its most simple, if we all get to know Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown and they find either of those people

lost in their slippers, they know where to take them back to because that is what they would like to see for the community; supporting Sierra and what they are doing because they have such a great track record; noting that, for as much as this is designed, there are going to be institutional characteristics in some of the buildings; outlining that the biggest focus for them is to ensure that it is always community characteristics that drives the activities in those buildings and on the streets; indicating that they really want their neighbours to become part of the community so the Old East Village BIA and the Old East Village Development Corporation are respectfully requesting that the Municipal Council supports the staff recommendation h-5 for a public site review so that the community can effectively contribute to the evolution of these and other matters of detailed design during that stage of development review, including the lists of issues that the File Planner outlined in terms of feedback from the last public meeting; advising that the Old East Village BIA and its sister organization the Old East Village Development Corporation are expressing support for the application for an amendment to the Official Plan; looking forward to opportunities to working with all of the players on the development of this important site; pointing out that, subsequent to her writing her letter (attached), she would like to raise a number of questions; noting that she will pass them on later; pointing out that what would be helpful, understanding that this is a zoning amendment tonight, but what would be really useful for them, as a community, is to understand what the time frames are for this incremental development of this property is including what phases; advising that they would also like to know what kind of checks would be put in place to ensure that what is being proposed will be actualized; pointing out that we all know that if you have got an old house, if you think you have one job to do and you take one wall down, you get five jobs; indicating that the history that they have seen in the area is at times that people come in with very great intentions for how they are going to develop and then they find issues and problems and the time scale for how the development should evolve, or what should actually happen changes; recognizing that this is a zoning issue that they are dealing with tonight but it is a question that they would like to ask; enquiring if Municipal Council does agree to the h-5 provision, at what point in the process for the public site plan review would the Urban Design Review Panel have the opportunity to provide input into what is being proposed for site plan; expressing support for the amendment in principle; advising that they are absolutely delighted to see the opportunities for development on this site; indicating that they really want the site to be part of who they are; thinking that the site plan process will give everyone an opportunity to understand the constraints that the City has and they do understand and appreciate the liability that the City took on when it vested that site in its maintenance; understanding that developers have a bottom line as well; and, believing that if they can all get together around the issues that are identified through the site plan process, that they will be able to come up with something that works for everyone.

- Michael Kaye, 1187 Albany Street – indicating that he has been living in this neighbourhood for the past twenty years; advising that he has been asked by a number of neighbours to represent their concerns about the McCormick development; pointing out that most of the residents in the area are long-term; indicating that they love their neighbourhood and they are deeply invested in what happens in their community; being long-term residents allows them to have a unique and important viewpoint to this development and what is actually going on in their neighbourhood; outlining that they are major stakeholders in this development because they live there now; indicating that that is why these infill developments are so important to be done correctly and need extra care and time to get it right, they need to be the right fit to integrate into the surrounding established neighbourhood that they already have; advising that they are in no way opposed to development on this property; indicating that, on the contrary, they, more than anyone else in the city believe in this much needed revitalization because they live there; pointing out that there are aspects of this proposal, like the repurposing of the McCormick Factory, in Area 1, the Area 1 Plan in general, that will add a unique character and desirability to this area; expressing concern with the other aspects of the development in Areas 2 and 3; indicating that these concerns are focused on the high density of the proposal and what that means to flow and the functionality of the area, also the improper fit to the corresponding established neighbourhood and the loss of significant green space and mature woodlot that the residents have been using as their adopted park because

that is all that they have in the area right now; touching on concerns quickly and individually starting with the high density; advising that these concerns are based around the ability of the area roads and amenities to sustain and carry the amount of new residents while maintaining the high livability that we now have in the neighbourhood; believing that the current density proposal may be above the carrying capacity of what the area can hold that will degrade the quality of life of the old residents and will deter new residents from moving there; indicating that the second proposal is an improvement and does slightly decrease the density but the core elements from the first proposal remain; indicating that the roads and infrastructure in this area have never had to deal with the kind of density and traffic that this proposal would create and would need work and investment; outlining that the other issue that is related to density is the apparent lack of parking for the new residents in the area and they are worried about congestion on their streets that they have now; understanding that the site will require a lot of work to prepare it for development and this is expensive for the developer and they were told that it requires the higher density to make this project feasibility; noting that they certainly do not expect the developer to enter into a project that is not cost effective, that is not their role; however, they do hope that the City will not enter into a situation that will create problems that will cost more to fix than if that investment would have been applied in the beginning of the project to keep the density to a level that the area can sustain; expressing concern with the correct fit with the established neighbourhood, they are definitely happy that the new proposal included the addition of single-detached dwellings that match the rest of the neighbourhood but, unfortunately, these dwellings were placed in Area 3 which is the prime mature woodlot and one of the best places to put a city park; believing that, to more closely match the surrounding neighbourhood, more singles and townhouses developed in Area 2 would be a better match than some of the apartments that are going in now and would better preserve the integrity of the existing neighbourhood; expressing concern about the lack of meaningful city park space in the proposal; noting that, once again, they are happy to see some recognition of the need for park space in the new proposal; believing, however, that there is a deficit of park space in the area and the included parkland is insufficient and is in an area that is right now an asphalt pad and does not have a single tree on it; indicating that, luckily, they have, at hand, readily available park space and parts of Areas 2 and 3 that has mature trees and that is currently being enjoyed, appreciated and maintained by the current neighbours and they are sure that the new neighbours will appreciate just as much as they do and can be a major draw for this development; indicating that they have a rare opportunity of preserving a mature urban green space that is more people move here and as time moves on will become more and more precious; believing that it makes little sense to create a small, inadequate parkette out of an asphalt pad that will take years to mature when they have a meaningful, existing mature park space available now; hoping that the City will work with and help the developer find a way to preserve the current mature green space; and, concluding that they hope for, and envision for the area, as a community that will attract people like ourselves that will love their neighbourhood and will invest in their community; advising that these new residents will chose to live here over other parts of the city because of the unique combination of the quality of life, livability, green space and of a well-functioning infrastructure and roads; and, knowing that addressing these concerns will require more time and more investment from the other two stakeholders in this proposal but that this investment will pay dividends long-term and will result in a wonderful community that people will love.

- Benjamin Vasquez, Vice-President, Old East Village Community Association, Board Member, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and Chair, speaking on behalf of the London East Historical Society, #11 – 416 English Street - echoing a lot of the comments made tonight; indicating that this is really a very excellent plan and, when they first saw it, they were quite happy; expressing appreciation that Sierra is taking it on as they have seen the work that has been done with the Harvey Woods project and they feel that Sierra has a lot to be proud of; noting that they have taken on industrial projects before and they have done an excellent job of it; expressing satisfaction with the density on the site and they are happy that the site is becoming very urban and is going to fit nicely into the rapid transit corridor; expressing appreciation that the heritage is being taken care of; expressing concern with the terra cotta on the front of the building but they are fairly confident that if it proves necessary to be replaced, it will be replaced with something

visually similar that maintains the character of the structure; expressing concern about the lack of retail in the front space but they understand that this will be dealt with at a later stage; also expressing concern about the fortress, campus like nature of the Plan but, again, this is something that they feel can be dealt with at a later stage when the site plan comes up; indicating that what they want to speak about most is the smoke stack which is an area of deep concern; advising that the smoke stack is a crucial landmark in the neighbourhood and tells a very clear story about what the neighbourhood was and about what the neighbourhood can be; indicating that we preserve old buildings in order to remind us what we have been in the past and in order to allow people a century from now, two centuries from now, to reflect upon how we built the communities that we live in today and why those communities are important to them; identifying that, as this neighbourhood undergoes layers upon layers of development over the coming decades and centuries, it is important that it retain elements of each of its history; advising that it is moving into a very interesting phase of this history that he hopes to see elements of retained into the twenty-second century; pointing out that it is a unique item, it is an identifier of the district and retaining it would not be unprecedented at all; pointing out that some of Sierra's previous projects have retained it; noting that smoke stacks being retained have been a crucial element of the Distillery District and Liberty Village in Toronto and of dozens of other industrial projects across the country; outlining that they would like to stress the possibility that this is, in many ways, a preferable location for a public park on the northeast corner of the site as currently proposed; and, advising that they really do want to see the City and the developer and the community work together to look for some innovative way in which the smoke stack can be retained for future generations.

- Michael Courey, 857 Princess Avenue - enquiring whether the Committee is making a decision on item two in the amended proposal tonight; hoping that the Committee will not make a decision on that tonight and that the Committee will allow it to go for further discussion because it sounds like moving seniors care from public sector to private sector has pretty big implications.