

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

14. Properties located at 100 Fullarton Street, 475-501 Talbot Street and 93-95 Dufferin Avenue (Z-8617)
 - Barry Card, Lawyer for the applicant – indicating that they have three members of the team that have worked on this project for the last couple of years and the first of those is the Project Architect, Mr. Sal Vitiello; noting that Mr. Vitiello has worked on over 800 projects in Canada and internationally and he has also been involved in a number of projects of this nature and would like to speak to you briefly about the attributes of the project which have not been captured by the staff report; expressing support for the staff recommendation; noting that it has, as Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, indicated been the product of an arduous process that has resulted in many changes to the proposal and balancing of the public and private interests; recommending the staff report to the Committee for that reason; stating that given the number of comments that the recommendation has solicited from the public, they felt it appropriate to provide a brief response to some of the concerns, particularly those having to do with the heritage aspects of the building; outlining that, after Mr. Vitiello's presentation, Meagan Rivard, who is a Heritage Consultant at Stantec and then Melissa Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., who will speak briefly to the planning attributes of the site.
 - Sal Vitiello, Architect, Richmond Architects Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – expressing appreciation to the staff for doing such a great presentation; taking the Committee into the building itself because part of this presentation dealt with exactly the same issues that you just heard; pointing out that the way that they are looking at the project now is the Fullarton Street frontage; showing the original thirty-eight storey building that was discussed; showing the second portion, which is nine stories, which is actually the small nine storey portion that was presented when they were here two years ago and there was nothing to the right as they did not own the land; advising that they are now proposing a twenty-nine storey building at this end of it; pointing out that the phasing of the project is different as well because they are looking at the first phase being the center of the block where the townhouses are and the rebuilding of the townhouses and the second phase would be the Fullarton Street façade and eventually the Dufferin Avenue; going through the site, one of the most important things that has been done in terms of the assembly of the site itself, the original site brought cars in right around this point and through and back through this point and what they have tried to do now is take the rear side of the lot and so there is a lane under the building that goes straight through from Dufferin Avenue to Fullarton Street, the ramps down and up are going to be in these areas and showing the area where the loading will be for all three of the phases; noting that the servicing trucks will be coming in and picking up any garbage that they have to here and continuing straight through; showing where there is some surface parking; noting that there is going to be some surface parking on the second and third floors but they are trying to get them to the underground; advising that this cleaned up the site dramatically in terms of the streetscape and allowed us to take a look at how to do a courtyard kind of affair here that pushed the building back from its present location; indicating that the townhouses are almost at the street entrance so they have pushed the façade of the building back about three metres so that they can widen the sidewalk; showing the main lobby on either side by the facades of the townhouses and one in the center; noting that they will probably do the back as well so that it is on both sides; pointing out commercial spaces in blue on all sides so that the streetscape is very active; advising that the balance of the site is pretty much the same and if they can get rid of the parking that they are looking at on the upper levels, some roof decks here, a green roof in the back so that there is amenity space for the residents in this portion of the building; advising that when they worked with City staff, they had tried to look at retaining the townhouses; noting that they have probably gone through about five different versions of this, they tried to look at retaining the townhouses in their entirety at one point, they tried to look at doing a tower in another area and pedestrian walkthroughs, through the site so that it was more open; stating that that went nowhere but it was with City staff that they tried to work on it to try and get that to work; indicating

that they then took a look at the townhouses in a little more depth when they got all of the townhouses and realized that some of the foundation walls along the Talbot Street frontage are actually missing, there are dirt floors in those townhouses, they are derelict in every sense of the word, there is contaminated soil that they have to remove, about ten feet of soil under the townhouses; advising that this led them to the full realization that they could try and keep the Dufferin Avenue home but the townhouses had to come down in some form or other; looking at taking them down; pointing out that the Committee saw schemes where they actually tried to replace them at the facade of the building and they really do not, as architects, there are a lot of different ways to approach this, they can put them on the facades, reconstruct them on the face of the building or the interior, you can argue it all day long of which it is best; advising that the reason that they took them off the face of the building here and moved them to the interior is because he believes that it is more what was here before when it was lanes, maybe two lanes and not horse and buggy but nonetheless way back where you appreciated the houses from either side and this will actually allow you to appreciate it all year round from the street face, from the patios that will be out in front and it will not actually be a blockage to the street façade, to the pedestrian realm; pointing out that when they were looking at it originally, the six townhouses really were kind of ominous when they are in the middle of the block and you are trying to get streetscape and it is animated for the commercial spaces, small windows, the difference in floor heights, trying to get the roof alignments to work, the street slopes, it was just not conducive to putting it on the outside nor does he believe that having it on the outside actually improves the streetscape or the look of the buildings that are here or really pays true homage to the townhouses other than slapping them on the face, where he believes actually putting them inside actually treats them as something that should be there, should be displayed, should be looked at from a distance, outside, inside; indicating that it will be lit up at night, there will be more activity that will be seen inside the building, people will be mingling on what will look like a street inside; reiterating that, for those reasons, they have moved it to the inside; stating that, aside from the items that he has gone through, he believes that staff did a great job in presenting. (See attached presentation.)

- Meaghan Rivard, Senior Heritage Consultant, Stantec Consulting, on behalf of the applicant – (See attached presentation.)
- Melissa Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of the applicant – advising that Rygar has only owned the listed properties for two years, since 2014; indicating that 479 through 485 Talbot Street, four of the six row houses comprising Camden Terrace were purchased in a state of severe disrepair and there were a number of factors which posed a distinct obstacle to retention, these include the conclusions of a structural capacity report prepared by Jablonsky, AST and Partners detailing severe structural deficiencies that necessitate immediate corrective action for public safety; indicating that this was confirmed by the City's Building Department and, as a result, an Order to Make Safe was issued with the remedial action required is demolition or repair; there were also conclusions of an assessment of fungal spore moisture and air quality testing done by JFM Environmental for 479 through 489 Talbot Street, also Camden Terrace, that was included as part of their submission materials to the City but which did not form part of the staff report to the Planning and Environment Committee; outlining that the recommendations of this report indicated that portions of the row house could not be occupied under current conditions based on the occurrence of visible black mold growth that was confirmed by sampling; identifying that this led Rygar to having to vacate the buildings of what tenants remained in addition to Fire Code concerns; stating that JFM Environmental also advised against occupancy based on wood rot and the deterioration of some structural members as well as the presence of damaged and asbestos containing materials; pointing out that there was also correspondence sent from Richmond Architects that dealt with issues of Building Code compliance and how you work to integrate a heritage structure into a new design where there are issues with regards to the combustible materials; advising that Rygar has engaged these experts, as well as experts in the field of Architecture, Heritage and Planning, that the Committee has heard from tonight to understand the limitations of the expanded site area and the decision to retain and integrate certain buildings, unlisted properties into the development and not others was a decision based on these recommendations of these professionals; believing that this led to a balanced approach

to the development and conservation that they believe that the proposed development presents; pointing out that, from a land use planning perspective, the staff did a wonderful point of presenting all of those aspects so she will not belabor that for too long; advising that the Provincial Policy Statement encourages minimizing land consumption and servicing costs by providing for densities and a mix of land uses which efficiently use land and resources and provide for a range of land uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment; indicating that the City's Official Plan identifies the Downtown area as the location for the greatest heights and densities within the city and supports a balanced approach to preservation and retention and the promotion of continued growth and development of the Downtown; advising that the Downtown is the area where the City policies recognize as the place for intensification and redevelopment; indicating that this proposal would bring forward approximately four hundred and three additional residential units to the Downtown which will add to its viability; indicating that the Downtown Area Zone that currently applies to the subject lands already permits a wide range of land uses and a mix of land uses; identifying that, in terms of height and density, the southerly portion of the site that represents the original land holding in the 2014 proposal is zoned DA-1, with a bonus zone permitting up to one thousand, one hundred fifty five units per hectare and a height of thirty-three storeys; the center portion of the site and the lands along Dufferin Avenue are zoned DA-2 and this will allow for, as of right, thirty storeys or ninety metres of height; stating that there is a density restriction, typically, that is applied to DA-2 or Downtown Area zones that would limit the scale of development to approximately 350 units per hectare; the proposed development and the height requested above the existing zoning, which is thirty-eight storeys to a maximum height of one hundred twenty-nine metres and the density increase to one thousand, two hundred metres per hectare will be facilitated through a site specific bonusing provision in return for a number of services and matters of which staff went through but just briefly to recap, the outstanding building design, the conservation of 93 and 95 Dufferin Avenue, the commemoration of 479 through 489 Talbot Street which is Camden Terrace and the provision of the publicly open space which is that fore court that is intended to be a place from which you could view the commemoration of Camden Terrace and other streetscape improvements such as the planter boxes proposed along Talbot Street, which is another really interesting part of the design of this is the complete screening of any above-ground parking by habitable space, the structured parking would be entirely located to the rear of the property and all of the abounding streets would have views to habitable space or commercial space; pointing out that there is also the public art piece that is another bonusing item; stating that, in terms of longevity and purposeful use of Camden Terrace as more than just an artifact to provide for space that can be occupied without risk to health, it will bring a significant increase in residents to the Downtown which will create further demand for employment, shopping, recreation opportunities and, in the vein of revitalization of the Downtown to provide for a mix of uses, commercial in particular, and built form that engages and activates the streetscape with highly visible interior space and frequent grade related building entrances; believing that, in their opinion, consideration must be paid to the physical and economic challenges with retention of the heritage resources and that the overall community benefit that can result from the proposed development in providing for redevelopment while commemorating the heritage resources in conserving other heritage resources on Dufferin Avenue is an even greater benefit to the community; advising that they are generally satisfied with the proposed amending by-law put forward by staff, however, they would request two minor technical revisions that have been discussed with City staff; the first item would be under number two, high design standards and deals with the building cap on page thirty-nine, item c), they would suggest that part c) be deleted in its entirety as the building cap will consist of habitable spaces with significant amounts of clear glazing will also consist of the enclosed roof top mechanical which will not and should not be described as having significant amounts of clear glazing; reiterating that this is a minor technical revision that they have discussed with staff; advising that the second item is under item four, "Carriage Commemoration", iii) on page forty, the word "roof", where it states that "the uniform roof line", they would suggest that this be replaced with the "eave" line to more correctly identify what is depicted as part of the proposed development; reiterating that this is also a minor technical revision that they are putting forward; *(Mayor M. Brown indicates that he understands that the applicant had some discussions with staff*

relating to the two technical changes and he is looking for staff comment before considering that); M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, indicating that they have no concerns with the proposed changes and he will provide a written copy to the City Clerk's staff; (Councillor Park requesting clarification of the Architect that when he talked about the commemorative piece, is that the entire footprint of the building or just the façade; indicating that she heard him say something about the rear also so if he could clear that up for her); Mr. Vitiello indicating that they are relocating the facades only of the townhouses into it, but he believes that because there is a large open space commercial out into the street, out to Talbot Street, but there is also a very large corridor in the back and he would like to do the back sides of them with more of the same brick; referring to the backs of the fronts of the townhouses inside of the building; (Councillor Park indicates that it is fair to say that it would be a replica of the footprint at this point judging by what he said; understanding that the back of that is not necessarily tied into the zoning through the bonusing and asking staff if they can clarify that); Mr. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responding that the term "replica" is not the right term to use here; as has been pointed out, this is an interpretation, this is a commemoration and what they are talking about is providing a visual reference to the heritage resource and commemorating what is there and he thinks that it was pointed out by the Heritage Planner for the applicant, talking about education and information, inspiration; wanting to be very transparent that this is not what he would suggest is happening on the Dufferin Avenue properties, which is conservation in his view; (Councillor Turner enquires about the future assessed value of the project is and what the cost on the Downtown CIP Reserve would be for development charges); P. Yeoman, Manager, Business Process Planning, responds that he cannot speak to the assessed value but he can speak to the Downtown CIP amount; stating that it is difficult to give precise development charge amounts, there are a lot of unknowns here, they do not know the phasing timing of construction, they need some information on the amount of space and timing of conversion demolition credits that impact it as well; speaking in gross development charges amounts without credits applied, they would be looking at \$10,000,000 in total based on 2016 development charge values for the project; (Councillor Helmer enquires about page 227 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda having to do with the heritage commemoration piece around Camden Terrace, item four, is the use of the original building materials salvaged; of course it is possible when trying to undertake something like this that you find out more about the materials and as you try to take them down, they disintegrate and you do not have as many as you thought and there is a pretty high risk that what is articulated here in terms of using the original yellow brick to do the commemoration you might have a shortage of supply once you actually get into the project; realizing that we are talking about commemorating the proportions of the building, not even sure as to the scale of that, but how confident is the applicant based on what they have looked into around the building that they can actually adhere to this condition in the zoning); Mr. Vitiello responds that there is ample brick because the sides of the houses are obviously still there and they have done this before, they have probably done half a dozen projects doing this type of thing, sometimes the building is rebuilt on the face of it, sometimes it has been done on the façade, it certainly has been done in Toronto numerous times including one of the oldest structures in Toronto which was the Westminster Hotel and he believes that the architectural firm, Stern, did that, from the University of New York; that building was completely taken down and rebuilt; there is damage, the joints have to be scraped down and taken apart and then they try to use as many of the materials as they can, whether it is pieces of cornice to rebuild it, anything that they can use to rebuild to show proper reconstruction of the façade, they would, the windows have already been ripped out at some point in time so there isn't much there other than the brick and the cornice and bits of the eaves that they can salvage and there is certainly enough to salvage there and redo it; (Councillor van Holst indicates that they were given the impression that the nature of the foundation of Camden Terrace has to be taken down and rebuilt in some form; is that staff's evaluation as well, that it cannot stay up); Mr. P. Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official, responds that the Building Division did receive a structural engineers report, Jablonsky, AST and Partners, was the consultant for the applicant, there were identified cracked sections of walls, foundations, settlement in some of the walls, believing the Councillors question was would they consider it demolition due to the severity and, if you

look at the order that the Building Division has issued, they have asked for repair or demolition, which is standard wording, they have not indicated that the buildings must be demolished, we have asked for repair or demolition; M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that the contamination that is underneath the existing townhouses, they heard that the contamination is at a depth of ten feet worth of contamination that needs to be removed from the site directly underneath the houses.

- Paul Downs, R. R. #1, Glencoe – indicating that he owned the most northerly two townhouses from 1977 to 2015, approximately thirty-eight years; pointing out that they were the bane of his existence most of the time because of the condition of the buildings, the foundations leaked from the time he bought the buildings in 1977, they endured many floods in the basement and he is not sure that it was ever dry there; advising that there was always lots of moisture and he believes that there is a serious mold problem in the basement of 487 and 489 Talbot Street; advising that he breathes a lot easier since he moved into a building that is only 125 years old; stating that this particular building on Talbot Street, he had to carry out extensive wall repairs to the north wall of that building, having brick replaced twenty-five years ago and then about three years ago and there was a lot of other brickwork that needed attention to the addition at the back end and at the back of the building that he never did get around to doing; thinking that every window in that building was replaced during his ownership, except perhaps two windows; indicating that all of the flooring has been replaced and none of the original floors would be there in their condition; starting in 1977, he started replacing the flooring and replaced it to tile and carpet, none of the original floors were refinished for example; starting in 1977, he gutted most of the building, there was not much left that you would say has any heritage value inside the building; advising that they also joined the two buildings at the basement level, the first floor, second floor and third floor and tore out staircases to make the buildings work better for them; indicating that in the last few years it became more difficult to rent the buildings because, just by virtue of the declining nature of the neighbourhood, people would call and make an appointment to come and see the apartment and he thinks that the problem was that once they arrived at the address, they kept on going so there were many, many times when people would not even bother going inside; thinking that the proposal to commemorate the building as the way it has been suggested is the best possible way to deal with this property as his view is that it is in such poor condition that it should be demolished; referring to the other four units, he was in them many times over the years and it appears that very little money was ever spent in renovating the other four units; identifying that some most renovations were done to 479 Talbot Street where there were law offices but very minor and the other three units, as he recollects, there was probably no work done on the first, second or third floors of those buildings; indicating that these buildings cry out to be demolished and the commemorative proposal appears to him to be the best way to deal with the heritage aspect of the property.
- Benjamin Vasquez, 416 English Street – seeing a lot of people in the room that he recognizes as heritage advocates so he is going to hold off on talking about the heritage attributes of the building as he is sure you are going to hear it a lot tonight; speaking about a couple of parts of the project that he is concerned about; indicating that there are some things that he likes; thinking that this is a better design than the one that they saw earlier but he still does not think that it is good enough; thinking that more work needs to be done to ensure that the heritage aspects of the project are better integrated; thinking that the extra density Downtown is incredible, that we need it and it is going to be wonderful for Downtown again and the competing interests here can be balanced better; believing that getting the extra density Downtown is not necessarily epithetical in retaining the heritage in the case of Camden Terrace; pointing out that the two things that he wants to express particular concern about, first of all there is precedent in London for buildings being torn down with the intention of a development somewhere down the road which never comes; advising that he lives directly across the street from a site that has been empty, a large field on the corner of Dundas Street and English Street, for seven years; indicating that a very similar thing happened in the case of the site that the Budweiser Gardens is on, it was empty for a very long time, there are a number of sites in the Downtown and the immediate vicinity and particularly in the case of a phased project if they are going to see demolition happen, he would like to be more confident that he can be assured that development will follow it; stating that he does not see how those assurances can be

made; expressing concern with the diversity of the streetscape, what is being proposed here is better than the buildings across the street but still fundamentally very similar to the buildings across the street and the block down; expressing concern that as that stretch of Talbot Street coalesces into a particular sort of building there is going to be a degree of monotony to the streetscape and a degree of similarity and he would love to see a building that is a more unique element of the streetscape and better contributes to a diverse Downtown environment.

- Kate Braxton, Chair, Woodfield Community Association – apologizing for not following this as closely; discussing demolition by neglect, she has listened to the plans and some of them sound quite interesting and there are a lot of things that are notable about this proposal; however, she is concerned because she would walk by that building for years and it would be empty and basically falling apart in front of your eyes and there is a number of such buildings within a number of heritage districts in the area that are basically left empty and are in terrible condition; indicating that the reports are going to be in favour of demolition because the foundations are cracked or they found contamination; noting that they have seen this in their heritage district; imagining that a fair bit of that damage would have happened over the years while it is derelict, while it is neglected; addressing for the record that demolition by neglect, hoping that as a Council and a community, this is something that we can address.
- Alec Aiken, 500 Talbot Street – indicating that he has had several conversations with Mr. M. Davis, Planner II, with respect to this project; advising that there are two things that have not been mentioned tonight and one is a traffic study; these buildings that we are talking about tonight have over 700 parking spaces; pointing out that 505 Talbot Street, which is currently under construction, there are 280 parking spaces and that is almost 1,000 vehicles that could be dumped onto local streets; reiterating that he has not heard any mention about this at all; expressing concern that nothing has been mentioned about a wind study; advising that he lives on the 7th floor of 500 Talbot Street and sometimes on a windy day he has seen the rain go upwards; expressing concern about what is going to happen with these towers that are adjacent to the one that he lives in; indicating that the height of these buildings is going to block any sunlight from their building; admitting that sometimes in July and August it gets too hot when you live on the west side of those buildings; advising that there has been no mention whether or not the current water supply and sewage system is adequate; M. Elmadhoon, Traffic Planning Engineer, responds that there was a Traffic Impact Study submitted and staff was not fully satisfied with it because it was not complete as per the guidelines; however, they have asked that a Transportation Study be submitted through the site plan and this should not preclude the approval of the zoning by-law; pointing out that normally during the site plan, they will review the Transportation Study and if there are any requirements for road infrastructure it will be dealt with then; M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that it is pretty common, in these types of environments, for them to ask for a shadow study as well as a wind study as part of a complete application; indicating that the existing zoning has a holding provision requiring the submission of a wind study which was provided to staff and the design features of the building are such that they mitigate some of those impacts of wind and they are satisfied with what they have seen in the review of those reports; relating to the water and sewer, as with every application, these are circulated to our Engineering colleagues and they have received no concern about the inability to service this with water or sewer; pointing out that if they did, it would be a show stopper if they could not get water to it, both for drinking and fire suppression so they are satisfied that it works; advising that there will be some impacts on shadowing but part of the building design is that point tower that 1,000 square metres of floor area so you provide a really thin tower which minimizes the impact of shadowing throughout the day.
- Bob Usher, CEO and General Manager, Covent Garden Market and the Treasurer, Downtown London – indicating that he has been around this community for a long time and in the past we all talked about “feet on the street” and one of the former Councillors, Judy Bryant, drilled into his head that feet on the street make this city work; imagining an opportunity, we know the opportunities that they have had and they recognize that with the development of other towers here in the city certainly have aided their business and many of the businesses here in the Downtown; asking if you can give up \$10,000,000 worth of taxation money; stating, on behalf of their tenants and other constituents here in

Downtown, the business community, make a very simple comment; commenting that if you look at their business, Covent Garden Market, in 2004, they were doing \$4.4 million in retail sales and they are now at \$16,750,000 and growing and they are up approximately five percent year to date; asking why is that happening, because of previous Councils and this Council allowing development to continue; indicating that you cannot stop development and he has never seen an application as well done as this one; preserving heritage in the way that they have tried; taking an old building that is falling apart; pointing out that you have heard from an owner of the properties, previous owner, and what he saw; thinking that this is an opportunity to continue the growth here in Downtown, feet on the street, how many more people; indicating that it makes Downtown a place to be, there are more people looking to move Downtown because it is a happening place and it is the place to be; asking you to imagine that ten or fifteen years ago, it is different today, allow this to happen; expressing appreciation to the developer and the architects for doing what you have done to possibly and hopefully allow this to move forward.

- Jeanette McDonald, CEO and General Manager, Downtown London – indicating that their organization agrees with Mr. Usher's comments; advising that Downtown is underserved for residential units; indicating that the CMHC Report that came out recently showed their affordability being the second best in the Country and with that they have almost zero vacancy in the Downtown; reiterating that they are underserved and they need development; pointing out that residential development has always been a key factor in Downtown revitalization, they always say that they need residents, residents and residents and this is a great opportunity for that; commending the staff, Mr. Rogers and the architects for really working this through, what she does not want to see is that they push it so hard that we take away a viable development; thinking that what they are getting is a really great compromise; saying a few things for her Board Chair who could not be here tonight; indicating that he is an architect, he is a partner with Nicholson, Sheffield, who have serviced the city really well with their expertise; reading his comments that this would be a great compromise and the developer is in the business of making money not in the heritage preservation business but he is doing a really good job of showing us that he can do that; advising that the location of Camden Terrace, as much as we love history, is in the middle of a block and it is very, very difficult to go underneath it and build around it; having the commemoration within the building is very good; pointing out that Mr. Rogers did not buy the building in a good state, he got it in a deteriorating state and he truly wishes that we had a way to talk to people who own these buildings; noting that Mr. Downs owned it for a long time and this is a challenge; believing that we have to look pragmatically and realistically about how we can conserve our heritage and Downtown London has over \$2,000,000 in heritage preservation so they put their money where their mouth is to this as well; thinking that we need to look at heritage preservation in a more proactive manner and decide what it is that we want to keep and try to put some money together to talk to people who own buildings that we want to save and help them do so; indicating that they have incentives in the Downtown to work with people through upgrades to Building Code loans, façade loans, façade grants, the development charges, the rehabilitation grants and she thinks that we could use those to better advantage; talking to people all the time; indicating that her message is that we need this development; expressing appreciation for considering the Downtown as part of this but we need to save a lot of the other buildings as well and we need to use the tools that we have and we need some money, heritage needs a champion with a lot of money; and that is what we need to do, besides the public art donation, she thinks we need to look into heritage preservation donations as well, or split them up; expressing support for the application as well as heritage preservation in the Downtown.
- Murray Neilson, 100 Fullarton Street – echoing and supporting the comments of his colleague, Mr. Downs; advising that he has practiced law for almost fifty years and he spent about forty of those years at 479 Talbot Street and he moved out two years ago because the building was literally falling down around him; talking about the structural, hygiene and sanitary concerns at the building; noting that his wife would come in and work part-time when his Secretary was on vacation and it often cost him an extra dozen roses to keep her there; advising that the building simply should be demolished; advising that he likes this new plan, it is exciting, it is new, it is modern, it is vibrant and he thinks that it can do nothing but assist in the rejuvenation of Downtown London.

- Kelly McKeeting, 329 Victoria Street – expressing support for the two Architectural Conservancy Ontario submissions that the Committee has received, by Janet Hunt, Mark Tovey and Mike Bloxam; indicating that the adaptive reuse and preservation, if it does come to pass, would make this a better project that is certainly more aligned with the kind of city that she wants to live, work and shop in; pointing out that she has seen commemorations like what is proposed in Halifax and the piece of glass between the building and the sidewalk really is a barrier and she does not think achieves the goal that the proponent appears to want to achieve with it; indicating that there is very little heritage atmosphere left in Downtown and she really believes that we cannot afford to lose more; stating that, in terms of setting priorities that has to be taken into account as one building demolished is one building too many; advising that over the last couple of years she and her husband spent a lot of time searching for an investment property somewhere in the core and they looked at a lot of buildings that were in really sore shape because landlords tend to want to make as much money as they can and sometimes they unfortunately do skimp on maintenance and they do not do repairs when they are first required and when they first could be more cost effective; indicating that it would seem to her that despite the issues with this building right now, Camden Terrace, the cost to repair, restore and incorporate are probably a drop in the bucket, something that would get lost in the rounding given the budget for this entire project; indicating that she does not view this as an either or, she views this as a let us make this a really good project and a really good development is going to incorporate those buildings; noting that those buildings are the places that she would want to live and work in if her office was a little closer to the core than it is right now as she is on the north edge of the core and if she was going to retire and live a couple of kilometers closer to Covent Garden Market where she buys her groceries; reiterating that those are the sorts of buildings that she wants to live in, she does not want to live in a tower and she thinks that the City should, in terms of finding balance, take this into account; encouraging the Committee to recommend designation and to work further with the proponent and not accept the zoning change application at present.
- Marilyn Loft, 784 Wellington Street – following up on what the previous speaker said about demolition by neglect; indicating that if Camden Terrace is demolished she believes that it will accelerate this unfortunate trend where demolition by neglect happens all too often; advising that she lives in one of London's beautiful heritage neighbourhoods and just around the corner from her are three empty buildings, one of them built in 1878, it is a Priority 1 on the Heritage Inventory; advising that it was rented but it has been empty for many months, the owner lives in Toronto and she imagines that he is following these proceedings with great interest; going to hear many compelling reasons why Camden Terrace should be conserved and she would like to mention the environmental one, every brick in Camden Terrace required the burning of fossil fuels in its manufacture, the wood also contains energy and if the building is conserved, that energy is there serving a useful purpose, if it is demolished and goes to the landfill, so does the energy, it is well known that the greenest brick is the one already in the wall; indicating that this is a fine development but if Camden Terrace is incorporated in it, not as a fake façade, not only would it become a show piece of which all Londoners could be proud, it would be environmentally friendly.
- Genet Hodder, 20 Mayfair Drive – advising that approximately three hours ago, she returned from a trip to Europe, and like many of you, and she is sure, many people in this country, she has come back saying "Wow, how do they do it?", "How do they manage to save their heritage buildings, going back to the Middle Ages, and certainly, the last few hundred years, no problem at all", "What is it that they are doing that we are not?"; advising that they seem to seamlessly turn these buildings into new purposes and make them live; pointing out that we are fortunate, in this country, that we have not had wars that destroyed our buildings, but we manage to do it anyways, on some of them, destroy them; addressing the question of commemoration of Camden Terrace; reading the short poem that she has in her letter.
- Sylvia Chodas, 1004-82 Ridout Street South – advising that she works Downtown and has for 18 years; indicating that she loves Downtown, loves the feel of Downtown; pointing out that a large part of the feel of Downtown is in the heritage buildings; stating that we are bringing people Downtown and we want them to feel that heritage; indicating that when she walks up and down Dundas Street, it is in the buildings; welcoming people coming

Downtown, welcoming new developments and welcoming high-rises, if they can be done well; believing that they have to be, in her view, built around our existing heritage, you call them resources, they are buildings, they are a tangible bit of London's history, London's story; advising that if you could take a look at that brick, if you could touch that brick in Camden Terrace, with permission, you are touching 1870; advising that the person who made that brick made it out of London clay, a local clay, that is why it has a yellow tinge to it; commenting that the brick layer that set that brick on the mortar in 1870 may have been friends with the Donnelly's; noting that the Donnelly boys were running their stagecoaches and they had not been murdered yet; stating that the brick layer was making a bay window, he knew that was the fashion of the time, those bay windows were the style, as was the group of ladies walking down the street; noting that their skirts were the style, they were down to the ground, that was the style, and the brick layer probably looked over at them and tried to catch view of an ankle; outlining that they are a living, and she says living because you can feel it, you can smell it, you can scrape it, you can hear it, you can taste it if you are interested in doing that; pointing out that this is why people bring home a piece of the Berlin Wall, or the Donnelly grave, they chip a bit off the Donnelly gravestone, it is something you can feel, it is something that is alive, it is not a picture; realizing that we live in a society where a picture is as good as the thing but it is not; standing in front of Camden Terrace and it is a slice of London's history and London's story; saying that it is London's story because history is not everything about London, it is our story, an ongoing story, and we want to contribute to it and honour what little heritage is left; pointing out that, as previously mentioned, we need to honour those buildings; stating that this is a fine proposal for another location, but please, ask them to do better, they can do better; pointing out that they can build around it, behind it, incorporate it; asking that they set a high standard and let them try to meet our standards that we set; indicating that we do not have to settle; asking that you leave Camden Terrace where it is and it is in a historic heart of London and we want to keep London's historic heart beating.

- Maureen Temme, 66 Palmer Street – advising that usually environment stuff is her thing, not heritage stuff, so thanks for the opportunity to weigh in here; thinking that Camden Terrace should be reused, refurbished and kept; pointing out that some years back the City hired the US Main Street Program to come in and survey resources, make a report with suggestions for the Downtown; recalling sitting on the floor in a crowded room while the Main Street presenter gave his findings; advising that the gist of the report was that London has everything needed for success; advising that he also asked the follow-up question in polite and socially acceptable terms, but the gist of that was what was wrong with you London that you have not made this work; pointing out that she has respect for long-time Downtown businesses like Attic Books, run by Myron Post and Jonathon Bancroft's self-named Jonathon's Ceramic Art Store is brilliant; advising that she has respect for others like the Hassan's who have moved Downtown and refurbished buildings; sharing that personally, she has not seen or perhaps she does not feel the kind of progress that some people think has been made in the Downtown; indicating that, since that Main Street report there have been fewer mid-price range stores in the Downtown, department stores are gone, there are no new book stores, there is no place in the Downtown where a women looking for comfortable, quality cotton underpants can actually buy them anymore and there is still no grocery store; admitting that she loves Covent Garden Market, it is a good place and Market Lane, which is apparently designated a park, making its planted, trampled area even sadder, it cost initially \$650,000, it overran its completion date, closed again for renovations to the building beside it, keeping up the coloured strings of lights, which caused a lot of colourful language to the poor construction workers working around it and ended up costing who knows what; indicating that every trip Downtown she does not see the vibrant Fanshawe student place it was promoted to be in that Market Lane; it does, however, remind me to be thoughtful and caring about others life situations; speaking about the development proposed by Rygar, she is getting to Camden Terrace, will add a lot of apartments to the Downtown, probably all inhabited by people with more than adequate income to do their serious shopping for groceries and goods far outside the Downtown, because most of the stuff that rich people want you cannot buy Downtown; indicating that really tall buildings are not the answer to anything; advising that, on the environment side, the pictures she was looking at for this Rygar development talked about green space on the far side, but that is not the same as a green

roof; thinking it is Toronto or Montreal that actually says that you have got to have green roofs; stating that she does not think we have got anything like that in London here and there is sure no green roof on whatever these towers are that Rygar is proposing; commenting that somebody earlier, in one of the presentations of the Downtown, the Harriston, she thinks that is the one across from Eldon House, and if you ever go down there, they do not have a sidewalk; indicating that residents of that building walk from the sidewalk and then they have to walk onto a driveway, a car place, to go up the steps to that building; indicating that that is where that development is at; indicating that it is not particularly environmentally friendly; pointing out another tower, particularly one that is over ten storeys; noting that she can deal with one that is 10 storeys, but above that, no; advising that it cannot possibly be environmentally friendly, it is a mean ecosystem for people, there is no roof garden, green roof, you get a roof garden, not a green roof; thinking the landscaping is kind of boring and the resource use for water moving cannot possibly be good; believing that if you have got a critical mass of people Downtown, we are talking about services and how many people it takes to get to transit, but the idea that it is 10% of people who use London Transit System, like, not their cars, which means that you have got 90% of those people in this building, this big, tall tower going in; letting Camden Terrace go to ruin has been nothing other than another London demolition by neglect situation; Rygar's proposal to put a replica in the bottom of its building is just enough and it is certainly not going to answer that "What is it with London that they do not get on with the right stuff?", at least in her mind.

- Sharon Lunau, 1096 Kingston Avenue – advising that she went to the London Plan, our new Official Plan for the future playbook for how London will look in the future and some of the items there; thinking that it supported what we were saying, obviously she supports the continuation of our cultural heritage; pointing out that in the section on cultural heritage resources, item 573, it lays out the criteria for the identification and designation of cultural and heritage value and interest and the importance of these buildings to London's cultural identity; indicating that, as we have heard today, the buildings in Camden Terrace are a vital part of our cultural heritage because of their connection to Samuel Peters Jr. and because of the unique style of architecture, the almost disappearing terrace buildings in London; stating that Rygar Developments plan has made an attempt to recognize the importance of these buildings to our city's cultural heritage, but its proposal for the Camden Terrace building is contrary to item 566 of the London Plan and she quotes "relocation of cultural heritage resources is discouraged. All options for on-site retention must be exhausted before relocation may be considered."; believing that, to adopt the current plan, then, at this stage, would fly in the face of our city's Official Plan; indicating that Item 568 goes on to state "conservation of whole buildings is encouraged and the retention of facades alone is discouraged."; outlining that the suggested commemoration in the proposed lobby of the complex is diametrically opposite to this guideline; referring to the London Plan, in items 570 and 584, City Council has options for cultural heritage protection and conservation, namely through demolition control, heritage easements and bonusing, but bonusing for heritage can only be given for retention of existing buildings, not for facades and commemorations; believing that these buildings, part of our cultural heritage, are important in distinguishing London from other cities, after all, the yellow brick is called London brick, not Kitchener-Waterloo brick; indicating that smart cities use their heritage as an asset and if we want to stay competitive with other cities in Ontario and in the greater geographical region, we have to be seen as a dynamic place that values our culture as a selling point; relating to the London Plan item 552 says "our heritage resources contribute to London's continuing prosperity, making a place for people to visit, live or invest in. Our heritage resources are assets that cannot be easily replicated and they provide a unique living environment and quality of life by conserving them for future generations and incorporating and adapting and managing them, London's cultural heritage resources define London's legacy and its future."; reiterating that this is a direct quote from the London Plan.
- Susan Bentley, 34 Mayfair Drive – advising that she did write a letter, which she believes is on the Agenda, from the Heritage London Foundation, but this is a personal comment; stating that when she wrote that letter she did not realize that the new design actually was incorporating a commemoration of Camden Terrace inside the lobby; adding that she would just like to say that she thinks that whole design is incredibly creative and there is

several iterations of the design, the evolution of it are very encouraging; pointing out that the architect has obviously tried very hard to work Camden Terrace into this design; applauding the fact that the Dufferin Avenue property has been incorporated; encouraging them to go back and give it one more try as commemoration stinks; pointing out that Budweiser Gardens used to be the Talbot Inn and they turned it into a replica; believing that they should have ripped it down and built something spectacular in its place, in her view; noting that with the Adam Beck Manor, it is the same story, you take down a crumbling old mansion and replace it with sparkling yellow brick as a pretense, you are referring to something that was there in the past; indicating that the creativity of this design is to be commended and she would just love to see them make one more effort to retain a genuine example of a spectacular Victorian building.

- Anna Maria Valastro, 133 John Street – indicating that their house was built in 1876; stating that there are a lot of problems with that house, but we rent it out and the heritage of the house is a real selling feature; wanting to make a couple points; pointing out that the Building Code does not permit glass balconies; think that Barry Card must know that and the same with the architect, but they presented a building with glass balconies; reiterating that it is no longer permitted under Ontario's Building Code; advising that what got presented tonight is not what we are going to get; advising that they have to be solid balconies and that is going to impact on shadowing and she is not sure why that was not raised here tonight and she is sure many of the staff can confirm what she is saying; pointing out that the second thing is that the City did not recommend demolition, so it is repairable, whatever ails Camden Terrace is repairable, and she knows from living in a house from 1876, which is just two years older, she thinks, than Camden Terrace, is just an ongoing project of love; outlining that there is a whole revival of renovating beautiful old manors like the one down the street on Dufferin Avenue at the corner of Dufferin Avenue and Colborne Street, that used to be a rooming, sorry, drug house when she was a kid and now someone has bought it and they are doing it all brand new and it is going to be a spectacular building; reiterating that all these buildings can be brought back to life, It does not really matter what ails, everything is repairable; stating that if the soil is contaminated, her guess is all the soil is contaminated in that area; pointing out that we still have a cement factory on Ann Street at Talbot Street; stating that there is hydro down there, which for sure is full of PCB's and if it is contaminated, that is an issue for the Ministry of the Environment on Climate Change, that should be done provincially, not based on a decision of an architect and a developer; stating that all of that can be remediated, she is sure; advising that she does not want Camden Terrace torn down, she just thinks the panel of architects that reviewed the project were drooling at the opportunity of making this a showpiece, it is one of the last places on Talbot Street; advising that her heart still breaks that we lost Kingsmill's; pointing out that she feels betrayed by that project; advising that she walks by there and she is blown away by what she sees, it is just gone and that was a department store that she went into, almost never bought anything in there, but would just go in and walk around because it was such a beautiful piece of our heritage and now it is gone; stating that the other buildings are gone because these decisions are made case by case and what happens is before we know it they are all gone; pointing out that Camden Terrace is a spectacular piece of architecture, it is repairable, there is nothing standing in the way except creativity; thinking that this city just takes what it is given to them, where other cities make demands and the result is that they get more interesting, cutting-edge type of buildings and let us face it, it is the buildings that play a great role in space and environment and community well-being; encouraging the Committee to, she does not want to be held hostage by economics and people being Downtown; indicating that no one is saying that there should not be a tall building on this site but we just want it to incorporate Camden Terrace so that we have a really spectacular site that is cutting edge, as good as anything you are going to get in big cities like Toronto or Ottawa or New York.
- Maggie Whalley, 250 North Centre Road – advising that it really makes her feel quite sick that Camden Terrace should be demolished and then, apparently, commemorated; asking why, and so would so many others, ask why you need to commemorate an already viable building that can be incorporated into a new structure and will add inestimable value, interest, quality and design into this rather bland outlook; indicating that Camden Terrace and the houses on Dufferin Avenue provided viable offices until fairly recently; realizing

that they may have been needed to be repaired and she would like to know why they were not, but the Building Department said demolish or repair; guessing that is a good question; wondering why do we have to go and demolish; believing that, authenticity, in her opinion, is priceless; identifying that you have already read of this Terrace being deemed an architectural gem; wondering why would, therefore, you want to replicate it; thinking that we had gotten beyond that point in this city; asking why we would make another Disney pastiche when we can do so much better; pointing out that the way forward is to incorporate and not replicate; advising that heritage is regarded by many Ontario cities, and the public's view, in general, as an irreplaceable asset and confers an economic advantage; stating that we have shown you many examples of the way forward-looking cities are creating the best of modern architecture with the heritage structures still standing; advising that we do not want another black box, which is supposed to hold value, mainly for putting feet on the street; advising that we can do that and still keep the heritage buildings; indicating that we can achieve so much more than this by creating a memorable structure in its own right; outlining that it can be accomplished with a little political will, determination and imagination; stating that these buildings represent a part of our history and they are out in the community's view every day; realizing that our history is there and it is for all of us and in a very real way, belongs to all of us; indicating that the very least we can do is at least respect our past; urging the Committee to continue with designation for these buildings and then move on from there, not just for us but for the City's reputation and for its future.

- Jim Hill, 567 William Street – indicating that his house was built in 1854 and he knows all about the value of a cultural heritage and he can tell all of you that you need to understand, not all old buildings have an architectural value; thinking that Camden Terrace has become a focus that ignores your document “Our Move Forward”; suggesting we be innovative, work with the community, make Downtown healthy; keeping an old building for the sake of it being old ignores all of those values; addressing the heritage committee, he appreciates your sentiment and your views, you just do not speak for all of us.
- Betsy Odegaard, 463 Jarvis Street – thinking that there are so many people here today because we have all driven down Talbot Street and seen those beautiful buildings at Camden Terrace; feeling that they are buildings that have a heritage value and an architectural value; advising that she has stayed in a hotel in Florida and to add to what S. Bentley said, it was purported to be a reconstruction of an Italian seaside village and it was lovely, but it was soulless; thinking the reconstruction of buildings that have been done here in London, you have to appreciate that it was commemorated, she guesses, but they just do not have the thrill of the buildings that reside on Talbot Street and are reusable; enquiring about the contamination of the soil as these buildings were built in the 1880's, she believes, and what is it that was there before; enquiring as to the nature of the contamination, is what she is asking and what other remediation can be done besides digging ten feet of soil out and taking it elsewhere; advising that there are biological methods that can be used to remediate that soil.
- Judy Bryant – concurring with the comments of Bob Usher relating to feet on the street; noting thanks to the developer and project design through the architect for the work done thus far, and that she is thrilled to see 93-95 Dufferin Avenue held in perpetuity; questioning how these properties will be held; advising she is very discouraged to see the plans orientated eastward instead of north-south so it took a long time for figure out the drawings; pointing out that, after all that, we are not just looking at one building; noting that the building is fairly modest, it is not a Georgian square building from London England; stating that one of the remarkable things about London is the mixture of stuff; suggesting you can look at all the streets and see a little bit of everything; advising the city does not have the continuity of being built around public squares, especially not now; indicating that Council, in its wisdom, took down all the fabulous mansions on Wellington (between Dufferin and Wolf); outlining that if you could have seen what was there it was unusual and very unique, including one house with 10 marble fireplaces; noting that now there is Centennial Hall, but we could have kept that; also noting the architecture that was on the Talbot block, which could have been maintained; indicating that now we have the Budweiser Gardens; hoping this is what we can kind of do, with Camden Terrace in the middle of the block, the restoration or commemoration can be in the middle of the block; suggesting that in order to penetrate through there is a bit of a sitting area and a possible

reuse of some things going on such as retail, coffee shops, although she is not quite she of the program, and that needs to be flexible; acknowledging that a lot of work has been done on keeping the building in its entirety, and that would make the design process extremely difficult, but why not keep the front room, or rooms and incorporate them into something in that space, by shoring up the back and underpinning; realizing the need to remove the soil; suggesting in a world where most of our body parts are replaced before we are 100, certainly we can do the same with our buildings, we have the technology; urging a review of not commemorating, but keeping part of the building so that the texture will remain on the street, with a new building around it; concluding it is the mixture of the texture of the buildings and the styles that is London's heritage, it is not just one building, so we have to do this in order to maintain the heritage, because the heritage is the mixture; noting she was very pleased to hear some very good heritage concerns, and the notation that heritage work continues to be done; citing the example of the work at the Delta Armouries, and these old buildings and the texture on the street is also residential and it is an interesting juxtaposition to the new residential building; offering good luck to the Committee and reiterating her hope to retain the building.

- Jerome Broad, 6 – 160 Waterloo Street – suggesting that once a place like that is gone, it is permanently gone; noting there is so much glass and steel everywhere that the beautiful yellow brick, bay windows, the doors and wooden trim, there must be some way to keep it; noting maybe it doesn't have to be refurbished so that it's useful, but use the façade and keep as much of the building as you can, and noting it's not just for us, but for the future.
- George Hutchison, 500 Talbot Street – indicating that he has been at this location for a little over 2 years and has had the displeasure of watching all the destruction of the heritage buildings on the northwest corner of Dufferin and Talbot; advising that his balcony overlooks the proposed site; indicating that he has a vested interest in the future of the building and his quality of life is being changed by the construction noise and the shadows that he can anticipate; advising he is not here to address those issues; stating that he moved back to London (where he had spent 20 years working at the Free Press) from Downtown Toronto; commenting on the condo development in Toronto, and such debates have been underway there for some time, and there are solutions to these issues; noting an example of a neighbouring area of Yonge Street, near Bloor where there is a huge development that preserved six or eight retail stores, on the west side of Yonge; encouraging members to familiarize themselves because the configuration of the property is very similar to this project; noting that this can be done; citing the development in the Distillery District; noting the developers have incurred extra cost, but that the result is that the demand for these condos has gone up, as has the price; discussing the state of heritage buildings, these are old buildings that will have cracks, holes in the roof, problems with the brick, but the value is not in the current state, but rather as they are restored and preserved for future generations; indicating that he hopes he does not have to look from his balcony and see the destruction of Camden Terrace.
- Janet Hunten, 253 Huron Street – indicating that Camden Terrace is important; advising that Samuel Peters was the architect; noting Peters was an early surveyor, engineer and architect in London, was known as Samuel Peters Jr., to distinguish him from his uncle, who was also a man of importance in London; pointing out that Samuel Peters Jr. was born in England in 1822 and trained as a civic engineer under Sir Isambard Brunel, England's most distinguished engineer of the 19th century; outlining that like many early engineers, he also practiced as an architect; noting he arrived in London in 1849 and by 1852 was the town engineer for London; advising that as the town of London became a city, he was the first city engineer in 1855; commenting that he drew and published a map of the city in 1855, which shows his concern for having an accurate survey and noting the map shows all the land that had been surveyed at the time, it shows in detail where the concentration of buildings were, including the owners' names of the buildings on Dundas Street; expressing that in his capacity as town engineer, and city engineer, he designed elements of the infrastructure such as the sewer system and levelling and grading the streets, he also designed and supervised the construction of London's first municipal buildings; advising that he bought a lot facing Talbot at the corner of Dufferin in 1851, and this map shows his house and office there; displaying photos of the town hall, built in 1854 (now demolished), the market building (including his sketch), Grosvenor Lodge, designed

and built in 1853, the Bank of British North America, built in 1856, the City Hotel on Talbot, built in 1860, which later became the Talbot Inn and was reconstructed on the corner, Elliston, the corner of the Adam Beck house, built in 1862, the Edge Block (southeast corner of Dundas and Richmond), the Eldon House addition 1977; indicating Peters moved his family to 93 Dufferin Street in 1865 (including his second wife Mary, five children, and servants); commenting that he designed and lived in Camden Terrace, and was the developer of the building; displaying various unique features of the building including: the windows, curved at the top; classical tradition, with some Italian features such as the substantial brackets at each end of the unit, the intricate brick detailing featuring a rare brick drop design; noting that the terrace is divided into groups of 2 and each group has good classical proportion and the whole is well-balanced forming a harmonious design; advising that when Peters died, his lengthy obituary listed his many civic accomplishments, including that his architectural firm went on to design over one hundred buildings. (See attached presentation.)

- Sandra Miller – speaking to the Urban Design Peer Review Panel notes for this project; advising that she sat in on the meeting where the applicants' agent presented their proposal for the building, commemoration and the site; advising the City's own Panel, unanimously urged retention, restoration and incorporation of Camden Terrace in place, as a signature feature of the development; pointing out that the creativity required to do so can be seen in many other projects across Ontario; stating that the Panel suggested that Camden Terrace could be used in the marketing of the project; noting that a Panel member noted a 'real gem here' and compared the property to the Yorkville district in Toronto; indicating that the Panel urged the applicants to leverage Camden Terrace for its unique value and that the Panel unanimously felt that retaining Camden Terrace, in place, should be the first priority of the project, and appeared taken aback that there was not effort to save it; expressing that the Panel noted that it would ground the project and break up the abundance of glass and give balance to the project; noting that the proposed towers are generally a very attractive building and the retention of the Dufferin Street buildings, mostly in their current state, was favourable, but the discussion about Camden Terrace was sometimes heated with the Panel; advising that the first proposal included a recreated façade of the Camden Terrace in a tribute fashion, but the revised proposal has it behind glass, much like Lenin's tomb; assuring that very few members of the heritage community support an embalmed building behind glass, and if anything, they would rather see the building on the street façade accessible to the public where it currently stands; noting that the Panel referred to the commemoration as Disney-esque, because it is taking salvaged material from a demolition site, including lintels, bits and pieces, headers, theoretically some of the yellow brick and this does not last very long once the demolition takes place; stating that the new brick was used for Budweiser Gardens which does not look anything like the original; advising that there are very few supporters of the Talbot Street façade on the Budweiser Gardens in the heritage community; advising that when asked by the Panel why they did not keep Camden Terrace in situ, the applicants' agent noted that it was purchased in a state of disrepair; advising that we have heard a lot about how they had hoped to restore and use in their proposal, but if the building was in such dire condition why was that considered, as inspections to be done; questioning why the building was allowed by London and the City in general, to decline to this point; noting that the purchase was completed with the building in disrepair and suggesting this was deliberate; expecting that the demolition would be allowed and have a whole new building on the site; noting that the proponent says that the existing structure did not fit with the central entrance plan by the architect, which she is not really sure what to make of that comment because interesting buildings have all sorts of asymmetrical elements and creativity is just one of the many things that comes into play; sharing photos of a few projects, mainly from Toronto: five condos in Toronto, 2015, high rise tower incorporated into existing low rise buildings, which were five 19th century buildings which were restored and shored up with fascinating engineering techniques, the tower is 46 stories, and includes 6 levels of underground parking, noting the entrance is to the right and was kept in a less-intact state (façade), similar to the proposed development, this is a multi-award winning project; 1 Yorkville, currently under development with a projected opening in 2018; stating that it involved the restoration and adaptive reuse of a row of 19th century buildings, the tower will be 58 stories, with 4 levels of underground parking; noting it is interesting that there

are a reduced number of public parking, due to public transit access; advising that there will be commercial and retail at the street level, there is public access at a laneway behind the heritage buildings, the roof terrace will be public garden and a green roof; pointing out that there are things being done, that we have the technology to use of older buildings; stating that they would like to see the retention of the front two and half stories of Camden Terrace and are happy to let go of the rear 'tails' portion, which are arguably in far worse condition; keeping the front portion of Camden Terrace and the Dufferin Street building still allows for 85% lot allowance for development and this is substantial allowing for high rise or midrise; advising that they like the building and the parking at the back, and that it is partially underground, but still feel that despite the arguments related to the condition of the building there is still opportunity for incorporation, restoration and retention in a respectful way and believe that high rise and heritage is a great thing for Downtown London, but it is particularly galling is that there is a parking lot immediately adjacent, and yet we are proposing to demolish heritage buildings; concluding heritage buildings attract entrepreneurs, young millennials, baby-boomers and empty-nesters to the Downtown, and heritage and high tech people are very interested in buildings that they can adaptively reuse and have character, it not cheap or easy, but the investment in heritage is arguably worthwhile, and should be incentivized.