

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

12. Property located at 89 York Street (Z-8525)

- Laverne Kirkness, Kirkness Consulting, on behalf of the applicant – advising that the number of studies that one has to go through to develop in the Downtown is very long and they wanted to list them for the Committee to show the Committee that they did pay attention to them all; pointing out that there is no shortage of policy plans and reports for Downtown London, they were addressed; advising that there are several conclusions of which are reflected in the bonusing which is contained in the first page of the report; extending their appreciation for the supportive recommendation from planning staff; hoping that the Committee will adopt the recommendation as was slightly tweaked in terms of some of the design aspects; stating that they held their own public meeting at the Central Public Library in late October; noting that it was attended by six people, four of which were Councillor Park's family; thanking Councillor Park for that; and, indicating that they also had a meeting with Mr. Spriet, who owns a lot of land along the south side of York Street and has been the urban renewer for the last twenty years there and he is in full support of this project in the shape and the design that the Committee is seeing it at the meeting.
- Ed Lui, on behalf of the applicant – indicating that the rationale behind the project is best reflected in the name and the mission of the company, Jing for Jing; advising that the mission is to force the energy to promote vitality; pointing out that the Chinese character for Jing for Jing is located on his presentation; outlining that Jing can stand for energy as well as vitality; hoping that the London Health Global Connection Project will bring healthy energy to promote vitality and wellness to the London Downtown community; advising that he is not your conventional developer; noting that he was born in Hong Kong and educated in Canada so he has both the east and west culture; advising that he was trained professionally as a pharmacologist to understand how drugs and environmental and chemical impacts our bodies and in the middle of his career, he changed direction and applied the scientific principal, studied Chinese medicine and complementary medicine and how it could fit into the main stream health care system; advising that since 2008 he was lucky enough to establish the Ontario Innovation Consortium with a \$20,000,000 budget from the Ontario Government to develop ginseng technology and agriculture; stating that he was also the Editor for the International Journal of Complementary Integrated Medicine as well as working with physicians and complementary alternative medicine practitioners to educate medical students; hoping to bring his expertise and experience to bring some health and wellness to the City of London; outlining that what they are proposing is to develop an innovative and attractive multi-purpose structure that integrates built environment and landscaped spaces with holistic design for health and wellness and they want to integrate commercial and residential units under one roof to allow them to provide synergy to the mixed use of the building itself as well as a networking for the local health related activities in the Downtown region and to engage the community; and, indicating that, most importantly, they want to create third place concepts, which is an urban development idea that would encourage social interaction and would bring health, wellness and vitality to the City; and, stating that, in order to accomplish that he has assembled a team of experts in E. Poletti, Endri Poletti Architect Inc., P. P. Alberghini, Alberghini Architect Inc., who specializes in energy in buildings, J. Thompson, J. Garfield Thompson Landscape Ltd., who won an award for health and wellness design; and, L. Kirkness, Kirkness Consulting Inc. Urban & Rural Planning. (See attached presentation.)
- Endri Poletti, Endri Poletti Architect Inc., on behalf of the applicant – indicating that this building has gone through several iterations, it has been pushed, thanks to Mr. Lui; believing that they have done a great job at establishing a great facility; noting that it will be a great contribution to the Downtown core; advising that the building has six main functions that come together and interplay; indicating that the lower level will be a prep kitchen and it supports the first and second floors as well as maintaining the recycling rooms, the garbage rooms and the inner functions of the building; stating that the first and second floor are for commercial, the third floor is the automated parking, the fourth floor

is the community activity including the integrated health centre; commenting that floors five through nine are the residential units, with hydroponics, exercise rooms and storage areas disbursed throughout; indicating that there is a roof patio with a teaching facility, conference areas, receptions, etc; discussing the design features, security and convenience for the facility was one of the key issues; stating that they have attempted to segregate the main entrances for the residents and the public user; advising that they have elevators in the building which serves only the private residents and one serves only the public, the two do not mix which enhances the security; talking about the number of public spaces and the landscaped areas; pointing out that one of the big issues that they tried to incorporate into it was the melding of the feng shui designs as well as the biogeometric energy which was a challenge; showing a diagram of the proposed building looking towards the west; advising that there were several discussions about all of the various activities that are going on at this very narrow frontage; noting that it is sixty feet wide; indicating that they have an egress, a service elevator which comes out of the ground to service the lower level, the main entrance for the public, the main entrance for the tenants as well as the parking lift system; commenting that what they have tried to do is to keep them completely separate; advising that, with the cars they have kept it close to the adjacent property which has vehicular movement in and out and they have tried to keep that together; indicating that the other one potential concern that was raised was the service elevator that comes in and out of ground; noting that it does not run by itself, somebody has to man it, they go out, open it up and it has got security; pointing out that once the public enters the building, the main focal point is the interior of the building; talking about landscaping, talking about the feel of the building; showing a living wall which is glass, a water fountain and the complete west side is glass; indicating that the third floor is the parking deck, the fourth floor, which is for the non-profit, they have a very large central space for the public with a skylight over the landscaped seating area; moving up to the fifth floor, this is the outdoor landscaped area allowing the tenants to utilize this space; noting that, although the fifth floor may have more direct access, all of the other floors get to enjoy the landscaped area; pointing out that on the fourth floor you can see that there are three elevators, one is strictly for the residential units, which goes from the first floor to the fifth floor to the ninth floor; another elevator goes to the commercial which goes from the first to the fourth; they have added a third elevator which takes them directly from the fourth floor to the tenth floor which allows the public to not interact with the residential units so that each one of them can function independently; stating that, on the roof level, these are the amenity spaces, the outdoor gardens, the use of that and the large open areas that can then either function independently or open up into one large area; indicating that, with the front entrance, the whole idea of the podium is so that the massing is broken up so that on the street level, what you have is a canopy and a second canopy making that interaction much more amenable as opposed to having a large façade; indicating that the rest of the building is broken up into striations; identifying the functions that separate the living from the street; showing the Ryerson building to show the concept of what they mean by having this building, lighting it up, the whole front is glass so that, in the evening, the issue of security was taken care of in that the whole front of the street is lit; advising that there was a concern that this is a dark corner; pointing out that they are on the edge of the Downtown but they are trying to lighten it up; outlining the look of the material that they are intending to use is earth tones using natural materials with the stone; providing an example of the glass that was at the University of Waterloo and the cladding along the side of the building with the Spandau glass; responding to a question from Councillor S. Turner relating to fire suppression in the vehicular parking area; indicating that the system is designed to handle fire suppression systems, it would be fully sprinklered; noting that the system has been around for thirty years, they have been through this process and they have got it figured out; reiterating that it is fully sprinklered; indicating that it is a two level system, it is a storey and a half high and there are sprinklers on both levels so that the cars are fully covered; responding to an enquiry from Councillor S. Turner with respect to the setback, noise and vibration from the CN Rail lines; advising that they have had a study completed by Development Engineering; noting that the building has gone through various growth and a study was completed when the building was nine stories; stating that they have added a tenth storey to it and Development Engineering has reviewed the study again based on their slight change and

their conclusion is that there is no impact; indicating that it does meet all the requirements, both noise and vibration; and, following up with the company that did the wind and snow study, there has been no impact on adding the additional storey.

- Gary Brown, 35A-59 Ridout Street – indicating that this is a very exciting building; advising that he lives in Old South and works Downtown; noting that he does not own a car, he either walks or bikes through what he considers a wasteland between Horton Street and York Street every day; commenting that the last few weeks he has been walking by and seeing the changes in the Captain John and Susie Wong building and now he sees this building going into that space; expressing that he is getting excited the more and more the Committee is talking about what they want to do in this location; hoping that this will spur development on this corridor of our city that is a real potential space, right Downtown, near the residential neighbourhoods of SOHO and Old South; bridging that gap all the way to the River as was talked about earlier in the meeting; indicating that this is an exciting concept, he likes the indoor parking, the bicycle parking and the environmental considerations; reiterating that this looks like a really interesting structure and building to be putting in what is an underutilized space in the Downtown core; and, expressing support for the staff recommendation.
- Mohamed Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue – expressing support for the staff recommendation; clarifying this by indicating that the listed property across the road is owned by him through a Corporation; indicating that Dr. Louie was a professor of his in University; noting that he serendipitously bumped into him five years ago and he has gone the extra mile in gaging all of the residents and property owners concerns for what he and his consultants have been proposing; noticing that in the staff report storm and sanitary sewers have not been separated and he was at the Committee approximately eight months ago talking about this; stating that there were some really good presentations about the Thames River; noting that there will be discussions on intensification and infill coming up later in the meeting; commenting that there are ten members of Council at the Committee meeting; driving the point home that York Street needs new sewers, new water lines and they are at the nidus right here of where storm and sanitary is separated and not and that forty inch sanitary system services all of Richmond Street; commenting that we need to put the horse ahead of the cart this time and get this done before more of these developments come up; advising that his property is a listed property and, in reviewing this, the Committee saw pictures of the adjoining buildings; thinking the Committee should be looking at this project as to how it fits in with the stucco, concrete and other glass buildings around more so than one out landing building which may not be there for very long. *Note: The Director, Environmental and Engineering Services Administration, responded to the comments relating to the storm and sanitary sewers.*