

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

14. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Properties located at 560 and 562 Wellington Street (OZ-8462)

- Steve Stapleton, Vice-President, Auburn Developments – expressing appreciation to everyone for their contributions to the evolution of the proposal over the last three years; looking forward to continuing with the dialogue tonight; advising that they have completed many developments in London as well as major intensification projects in Barrie and Waterloo; indicating that this proposal represents their return to London, in this housing form, and they hope to contribute to the streetscape of the city further; stating that their approach to this development evolved from researching the development history of the area as well as the study of current planning documents but also identifying planning principles that are fundamental in determining where people want to live and where cities need people to live; believing that their proposal supports both of those objectives; knowing that intensification and redevelopment applications must be reviewed individually as they change the current understanding of the area; advising that their presentation tonight will highlight the evolution of this area and the context of the proposal, determination of a neighbourhood character and characteristics of the immediate area, review the policy frameworks of the area, supporting intensification of the site, review the architectural response give the context within the Heritage Conservation District, reviewing the impacts and the compatibility issue that was raised earlier; acknowledging that infill developments will be resisted and that the issue associated with this development is primarily the height and therefore we have proposed an alternative to the original application for a twenty-two storey building reducing it in height to seventeen stories.
- Hugh Handy, Senior Associate and Land Use Planner, GSP Group – see attached presentation.
- Megan Rivard, Heritage Consultant, Stantec Consulting – see attached presentation.
- *(Councillor S. Turner addresses the applicant; the part that has not been addressed in any of this and does not get addressed is a question of how it addresses the inconsistency with the planning policies within their framework; there was some discussion about the Provincial Policy Statement and he is sure that they are well aware that the Provincial Policy Statement must be read in its entirety and not just by section that might happen to support the application, the rest of it must be read through and understand where the consistency and inconsistency might lie; the question though, is that knowing that the proposal is inconsistent with the planning policies of the City and the Province, why not put an application forward that meets the framework that has been established.);* Mr. S. Stapleton, Vice-President, Auburn, indicates that is the basis of the disagreement, quite frankly, is the interpretation of character for the neighbourhood and the establishment of that character and that is where they are at with the proposal; advising that they define the character as the wider community; Woodfield includes a lot of other designations including high rise buildings throughout, the Wellington corridor itself is the plan, the

density is significant along that corridor and it contributes to the community as well and that character is what is established through the evolution of the area, established the character that is most directly influenced in this development; pointing out that it is that characterization as it relates to the planning policies not the preservation of Woodfield, which is not a homogeneous neighbourhood, it is diverse, it is multi-faceted and it is not a romantic notion of single-family homes; stating that this is not out of character for central London or Woodfield; reiterating that is the difference in the planning opinion; pointing out that what they tried to demonstrate is impacts relate to the form; stating that the use and the impacts go to the scale of the development and in this particular instance where they have demonstrated that the block itself is in a transitional neighbourhood; noting that this is not a stable neighbourhood as it relates to this proposal; outlining that it is a conversion of single family homes to multi-family homes and commercial uses where rear yards are used as tarmacs; pointing out that this is not an impact that is measurable and therefore does not contribute to any negative impacts; reiterating that that is how they measure the density aspect; advising that they did that also through the framing of the existing zone at Dufferin to this particular site with the height of twenty-two storeys with the London Life parking lot at thirty storeys teiring that streetscape across from the park; indicating that is where the evolution from the discussion from a built form came from and from a planning perspective you have an evolution of the uses; reiterating that that is the differences in opinion; planning is not just checking off the boxes with the static documents that are in front of the Committee, they have to evolve and they have to see how those policies relate to the lands specifically and that is why they did the wind study, the shadow studies and those impacts on the community which have not shown that there are any significant impacts and that is why the proposal was twenty-two; indicating that what they did not get to in their presentation is the acknowledgement that intensification brings change and those changes also infringe on others; stating that the seventeen storey building proposal that they submitted in their documentation is something that they believe softens that encroachment but still fulfills the objective under the Official Plan for intensification and under the Provincial Policy Statement for intensification; advising that as it relates to the Provincial Policy Statement and heritage, they spoke to that, there are no significant impacts; with the planning rationale on the heritage, he does not believe that there are any impacts, they are not tearing down any heritage buildings, they do not encroach onto any heritage significance and they have done that analysis; hoping that he answered the Councillors question on impacts and character because that is the premise of the proposal; *(Councillor M. Cassidy asks questions of staff; talking about the buildings that are there right now; asking staff to explain to her what it means to be "B" rated on the Heritage Conservation District listing.);* Mr. J. Yanchula, Manager, Urban Regeneration, explaining that under the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Plan, at that time, there were three categories of "A", "B" and "C" and how much they contribute to the character of the District and "A" contributes the most, "B" less and "C" is less than "B"; noting that staff will read the categories from the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Plan in a moment; *(Councillor M. Cassidy indicates that in the applicants presentation they say that the height at Wolf Street is zoned for a ninety metre building, wondering if this is accurate and would that just be the south side of Wolf Street.);* Mr. J.

Adema, Planner II, responding that that is accurate, it is a DA-1 zone which permits up to ninety metres in height; acknowledging that for residential development there are setback requirements from that zone and it also permits a wide range of commercial, office and residential uses; advising that they did go back to try to figure out how that zone got applied because it has never been part of the Downtown Area and there is no record of this as far as they can tell; indicating that he asked the City Clerk's Office to help him out with that and they could not find anything because it predates the Z.-1 zoning by-law and those records have been lost; what they think and based on the institutional memory of people who have been here since the late 1980's that it may have been a candidate site for a Convention Centre because the zone has a special provision to permit a Convention Centre; reiterating that he has not been able to confirm that; *(Councillor Cassidy asking if that would be the Centennial Hall site or the parking lot or a combination of the two.);* confirming that it is both sites, it goes all the way up to Wolf Street and then down to include Centennial Hall; *(Councillor Cassidy indicates that in the aerial views they see a lot of apartment buildings on Central Avenue and she would like to know how many storeys, how tall that apartment building is and how many units and if the applicant is now asking for seventeen storeys instead of twenty-two how many units does that mean.);* Mr. J. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responding that the applicant has presented that information in their submission and they would be able to speak to the proposal of seventeen storeys and how many units it is and what it looks like; a representative for the applicant responding that it is a similar amount of units, approximately one hundred fifty units in the seventeen storey, which is similar to the proposed twenty-two storey building; obviously it is quite a bit lower, the base of the twenty-two storey building is three storeys which is intended to relate to the existing scale and character of the neighbourhood and above the three storeys will be fourteen storeys, the floor plates are slightly bigger and obviously the building will be slightly reduced; showing a view of the seventeen storey, showing the base looking from the park and some of the animation that they will be creating, some of the architectural style; indicating that they are not trying to emulate what exactly is in the neighbourhood or the houses but they are dealing with the historic nature; expressing appreciation to the Urban Design department for appreciating the effort that they have put into the look of the building; reiterating the twenty-two storey option and comparing the seventeen storey option; indicating that there is a fair amount of height in this building, it is a slightly slimmer floor plate and showing the character of the building; using similar materials, using the red brick materials, the buff brick colour in the base to reinforce the lower form of the three storey and then setting back the tower piece that goes up to seventeen storeys; playing with the scale of the building; recognizing the concern with the height of the building they addressed it quite clearly, the top four storeys are a lighter element and the interplay of using some of the traditional character elements of the building; Mr. K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, reading the categories from the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District; *(Councillor Hopkins asking for clarification from staff because there is this understanding of not being sure where the zoning came from for the ninety metres which is about thirty storeys across the street from this site but in staff's presentation, they talked about The London Plan allowing for approximately six storeys; advising that she is trying to*

understand what this property is allowed and being in the Heritage Conservation District it also allows for eight to ten storeys; the property across the street, from what she has heard, is allowing thirty storeys so she is trying to understand that as it is not clear because it is in the Heritage Conservation District which allows for eight to ten storeys and wondering what The London Plan calls for that strip along Wellington Street.); Mr. J. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, clarifying that ninety metres of height is allowed directly to the south across Wolf Street; indicating that for a commercial use building there are some regulations relating to setback for residential and there could be a mixed building so there are lots of permutations and possibilities but certainly as a commercial building in terms of height, ninety metres is attainable; outlining that there are Official Plan policies and designations and then there is zoning; stating that where there is a conflict, the zoning does prevail; outlining that the Official Plan is used for evaluating zoning amendment applications but if there is a zone that applies to a site even if the designation that applies to that site would allow for less height, for example, the zoning does prevail.

- Anne Dyer-Witheyford, 555 Dufferin Avenue – indicating that a previous speaker dismissed Category “B” buildings which this 1970’s building is that they want to take down, the six storey; stating that, from what Mr. K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, read a “B” was quite an important building and in fact they are grouped with “A”’s in the discussion of their qualities; following on Councillor S. Turner’s remark, wondering why people put a lot of time and money in to something that completely violates what supposedly the citizens and the officials of the city have decided; indicating that it has been said by the applicant that they did not agree with the City’s interpretation of how London should be; advising that she has certain disagreements to but how can she get an audience of x number of hours of the public’s time because from her different opinion she finds this process a little strange; on that note, in the end, apparently they spent a lot of time designing this building which is quite attractive, but what do they do in the end, they cut it off and they are interested in aesthetics and if you spent so much time on your building, and you believe in it and you have confidence in it, why would you truncate it so that it is a little mound compared to what it was before; thinking that is a disingenuous process; fearing that if you get high rises around this park, eventually Sunfest and the other concerts will be told bye-bye because you cannot get a lot of people having to stay up late listening to music all the time; thinking that might spell a little bit of a death knell to those concerts in the long run.
- Jay Parkinson, 727 Waterloo Street – stating that he is a big yes, he thinks that the city needs the jobs; advising that it is an attractive building and he is on board with that; indicating that the current building is nothing special as far as heritage in his opinion; thinking that there has been a lot of talk about Downtown and in order to make it vibrant and feasible we need to get people down here if we want to compete with other cities like Kitchener-Waterloo, Toronto, we need people down here and then the big infrastructure projects start to make a lot more sense.
- Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent – asking Auburn Developments what year they purchased the property; indicating that we know the Official Plan came into place in 1989 and we know the Woodfield Heritage Conservation District came in to place in 2005; advising that if they purchased the property afterwards in her thinking they should have

known what was in the Woodfield Heritage Conservation District plan and if they purchased it before and they knew that they might be developing this high-rise why did they not object to the plan; noting that one developer did do, they opted out and the proponents of the plan agreed to let that developer opt out and remove those properties from the Conservation District; indicating that there has been a discussion of the London Life Parking Lot to justify this application; thinking that this zoning or use in the London Plan excluded the London Life parking lot from the high-rise development; understanding from listening today that the zoning is before that Ontario Municipal Board now; indicating that she would like that confirmed as well as some comment on really what that means; stating that we have to evolve, yes, however the Woodfield Heritage Conservation District plan was a resident driven plan; how the residents wanted the redevelopment to proceed; we are not against development we have a plan in place that we want followed to develop our neighbourhood; indicating that you may wonder why she is living way out London East, in the Hamilton and Gore Road area; the answer is simple, she cares about the city she lives in; she spoke to the this Committee in opposition to the proposal presented to the Planning and Environment Committee in 2015; at that time she did her due diligence and read all the documents that were available to her, the Heritage Impact Assessment, the planning justification report, traffic study, wind study, urban design review panel; knowing this proposal has changed somewhat, it is only twenty-two storeys instead of thirty and the podium will now be three storeys instead of five, but not much else has changed; sadly it appears that none of her concerns with the 2015 proposal have been addressed either; what has changed, however, is that she clearly knows the City staff's position on this as presented tonight; thanking City staff for clearly explaining why this project should not be approved; it is a daunting challenge for a lay person volunteer to tackle, understand and comment on this type of project; she is sure it is also daunting to members of Council to wade through everything as well; advising that her concerns in 2015 were in accuracies and sometime misleading, to her mind anyway, issues with the planning justification report and the heritage impact assessment; showing the Committee inaccuracies in the current heritage impact statement; stating that the wind study failed to account for the rise in land from Central Avenue and Waterloo Street to Wellington Street and Wolf Street; advising that this is important because she learned from the wind study that air velocity increases as it rises and so much for the trees, the top floor of the 2015 building was so unsafe in the winter that access to them had to be padlocked; indicating that the traffic study failed to account for changes in traffic patterns due to activities in Victoria Park and the winter snow piling up on Wolf Street; advising that Wolf Street is very narrow; fortunately, this winter we did not have a problem, but two winters ago we certainly did one lane down the street; pointing out that there was no Heritage Impact Statement of the development on Victoria Park; feeling there should be one as it has its own heritage designation even though it is also part of the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District; advising that Victoria Park is mentioned in the current heritage impact statement, but not with the depth that should be; believing that Victoria Park will be adversely affected by the wind, shadowing and traffic increase; asking the Committee to please prove to her that this is not so; pointing out that staff has listed three plans to which this development does not conform, the Official Plan, The London Plan, notwithstanding the Ontario Municipal Board

appeal and the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Plan and in particular the residential land use sections within these plans; stating that a high rise is not suited to this location and this is a major reason to oppose the plan but it is not the only one; advising that if we allow this development to proceed it will set an unhappy precedent for all neighbourhoods in this city and this includes my new one as well as there is a parcel of land on Hale Street currently for sale as an infill development; however, today she has new concerns that are highlighted in the executive summary of the heritage impact statement, vibration and views; first of all on page iii we are told that "some impacts, such as the potential for vibration on properties within 40 metres can be mitigated with vibration assessments"; please remember that this site, like most of the Woodfield area is sand all the way down; it is wonderfully easy to excavate but vibrations travel as anyone who has had major sewer work on their street will know; stating that she experienced this first hand in 2008 when the sewers on Palace Street were replaced; to quote further "it is recommended that assessment occur before construction to clearly identify a benchmark for impacts and post construction to identify whether impacts have occurred."; further on it states that "it is recommended that a ten metre buffer zone be established around all residences to indicate where all construction activities must be avoided; pointing out that as this is a zero lot line development on the north and east sides she wonders how this can be accommodated; noting on the north side there is only a driveway, maybe three metres separating the buildings; advising that there is more "if construction activities enter into the ten metre buffer zone, all activity should cease immediately and a temporary forty metre buffer zone surrounding the impacted area should be established where no construction activities should occur; indicating that this site is forty-eight by forty-six metres; advising that it seems to her that the probability of damage occurring is quite high; noting that in section 6.3 of the Heritage Impact Statement, pages 6.7 to 6.21, lists thirty-five properties evaluated for potential impacts; noting that of these thirty-five properties, fourteen will require mitigation to help offset the possibility of impact, that means forty percent of the properties are within forty metres of construction and are at risk of impact; stating that the risk if impact is more than one in three properties; wondering who is willing to take this risk; hoping the identified property owners are aware that their foundations are at risk, bearing in mind that many foundations are not poured concrete but yellow brick; pointing out that she also hopes their insurance will cover this, but a foundation is a foundation, damage it and what do you have left of your house; reminding everyone that most of these properties are rated A and the rest are B so they are integral to the Heritage Conservation District; wondering why would the community accept such a high level of risk, after all the community is not directly profiting from this proposal; now to views, she quotes from page iii, "impacts on views from within the park, meaning Victoria Park, and along adjacent streets may not be completely mitigated given the substantial change in height proposed to minimize impacts to the contextual character of the park it is recommended that strategic planting of evergreen trees within Victoria Park be implemented; similarly, the alteration of views along Wellington Street cannot be fully mitigated"; quoting from the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Study page 2.4, streets scape heritage character, "with the shady tree-lined streets and picturesque Victoria Park at its core, Woodfield is the heart of historic London; the stately trees of the

neighbourhood along with the more intimate scale of many of the streets creates streetscapes that are remarkable; stating that it is remarkable that we have so much to lose; indicating that, in her 2015 efforts to visualize the scale of that proposal led me to create this model; noting that it is as close to scale as she could manage and all the houses are shown on the south side of Wolf Street and Central Avenue; indicating that in her second effort to try to visualize the scale of the 2015 proposal and its effect on Victoria Park she had help from a student at Fanshawe College; noting that he was experienced in virtual reality drawing; indicating that he added the 2015 building to her pictures of the park with the intent of keeping it to scale; Section 4.17 and 4.25 of the heritage impact statement provide for this new development, not the third one, but the 2017 one that is before us, provides photographs of views around the site; thinking it might have been an informative exercise if the 2017 Heritage Impact Statement had offered us similar pictures to what she is going to show; entering the park from Central Avenue and Richmond Street, proceeding to the bandshell; halfway to the bandshell we see 560 Wellington Street as it might of looked if the 2015 proposal had been accepted; near the bandshell area at the northeast corner of the cement we look across the park to 560 Wellington Street as it is now and as it might of looked if the 2015 proposal had been approved; starting at the other end of the park near the Boer War monument; walking from the monument in a north easterly direction we get a little closer and this is what we might have seen; looking from Wellington Street and Wolf Street, note the size of this building at the corridor of Wellington Street; she would like to know how many corridors end in a dead end; noting the size of the apartment building at the bottom, this is one of the buildings used to justify the height of this proposal; also noting the narrowness of the green space where they are going to plant all the trees; reiterating this is how the 2015 proposal might have looked; pointing out the original 2015 project and the view that was given to her in the heritage impact statement; advising that, in the heritage impact statement that she was given, called the south view, clearly it is the west view, but look at this building here, what is it, what is this; answering that this is the apartment building you use to justify the height of this; indicating that she has found errors, if you call them such, in both the 2015 presentations and this one; stating that this bids her to wonder what other errors are there that she has missed, what else have the experts got wrong; commenting on the importance of heritage, she again quotes from the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Study Plan, “designation as a heritage conservation district can provide and they list five points, two of which are increased community stability and a sense of community pride; these items, stability and pride, should be of critical importance to the City of London as embodied by this Committee and Council, as well as all who live, work and play here, including the development community; realizing that the Committee may be aware that greater Woodfield, composed of two heritage conservation districts, was voted in 2012 the greatest community in Canada by the People’s Choice Canadian Institute of Planners; noting that she has the t-shirt to prove it, but more significantly, in 2016 Woodfield was judged great place in Canada neighbourhood category; in 2014, Old East Village was judged best neighborhood in Canada.

- Kelley McKeeting, 329 Victoria Street – expressing support for submissions that the Committee has already received, namely from the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario,

on Wednesday, May 3, 2017 and also from the Woodfield Community Association on January 25, 2017; advising that she would also like to express her support for the excellent and thorough report prepared by City staff; outlining that although she is not a Planner by any stretch, she suspects that the staff recommendation would not be any different if the proposal in front of the Committee had been for the seventeen storey new idea versus the twenty-two storey building that they performed their analysis on; indicating that, as a property tax payer in this city she sincerely hopes that at the end of this meeting, the City does not direct staff to continue discussions with the proponent on this; indicating that a lot of City time and money has been invested in this already and it is not clear to her that the direction that the proponent is going in is towards something that is truly compatible with the neighbourhood; stating that she worked at 560 Wellington Street for several years; noting that for three to four years she walked in and out of that building ten times a week and she would like to make a couple of observations on some of the material that has been presented to the Committee; stating that she never noticed the setback of the two existing buildings being dramatically different from the neighbouring residential properties and certainly the current setbacks are more compatible with them than the proposed new setbacks; indicating that she also did not see that neighbourhood as being in any way shape or form a transitional neighbourhood although the photographs that were shown to the Committee, either in the Fall or the Spring, when there were no leaves on the trees, make it look a bit desolate, it is an incredibly vibrant, warm, colorful, beautiful, quiet residential neighbourhood with a lot of street activity; noting that the neighbours do walk on those sidewalks; advising that it was helpful to get that little bit of education on the fact that the Zoning By-law is actually overrides the Official Plan and it seems to her that a lesson in all of this that perhaps that thirty storey zoning to the south of Wolf Street which appears to be incompatible with both the Heritage Conservation District and the Official Plan probably should be revisited and fixed.

- Gina Brumet, 151 Dundas Street – indicating that a letter has been forwarded to the Councillors by Amir Farhi on their behalf and she is here representing the Board of Directors for community organization The People of Downtown London which is committed to making Downtown London the best place for living, working and playing; indicating that one of their primary goals is to support greater density in the core as The People of Downtown London believes that the more residents that we have in and around the core who are invested, the more it will generate positive services and attractions; pointing out that services, attractions and community events will draw people from all corners of London and Downtown; The People of Downtown London is thrilled that the City is continuing to experience growth; however, real estate values in other parts of London are booming, Downtown not so much; advising that private developers like Auburn Developments appreciate the value and customer need for higher density housing; advising that The People of Downtown London supports medium and high density residential projects as it directly adds people to the core and contributes to London's property tax base; outlining that this proposal will generate significant property tax revenue which would fund City projects and services; Live, Work, Learn, Play, the Toronto consultant hired by Downtown London has said that Downtown's that have successfully come back to life have done two things, one is build more residential density and the

second is have really good quality businesses opening Downtown; indicating that they concur, they acknowledge that there are challenges to making properties like the Q.V. fit within the Guidelines of the Woodland Heritage Conservation District but as Mr. J.M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, has stated on many occasions, there are always going to be exceptions to the rule; to ensure that London continues to be a City dedicated to progress, they welcome new opportunities like this one; advising that they looked at the twenty-two storey proposal; a vibrant people Downtown contributes immensely to the overall health of a city; The People of Downtown London ask the Planning and Environment Committee to support this proposal.

- Gil Warren, 16-64 William Street – expressing support for the position that City staff have taken; thinking that this proposal is not appropriate and it should be rejected; indicating that there was one suggestion that there is a shortage of land in Downtown London so therefore we have to throw away all of the rules about Heritage Conservation Districts and everything else because of this chronic shortage of land Downtown; apologizing, but he does not agree as he sees a lot of empty parking lots all over Downtown and it is too bad that Auburn did not buy one of those because if it was Downtown then they could have put this project there; reiterating that there is no shortage of land Downtown, there is a surplus of empty parking lots because of the bad planning of the city in the past; stating that he supports intensification Downtown, in the Downtown area but he does not support Downtown wiping out Woodfield; outlining that the proponent put forward this idea that Woodfield is not homogeneous and suggested that not all of the houses in the Heritage Conservation District look exactly the same; noting it was kind of a suburban idea there, we know it is not homogeneous, that is why they moved there; indicating that you do not have Heritage Conservation Districts that look like a suburb, they look like Heritage Districts; finding that a strange argument to try to justify a development that is way out of character for the adjoining buildings; pointing out that his solution to this problem and it was referenced in the presentation by the City, that a medium rise, medium density development would better fit this location; pointing out that he does not believe that any of his neighbours or himself in Woodfield are saying that the current existing building should be torn down and they should have a one storey building but a medium rise medium density building of four or five, six storeys would be more appropriate to transition; indicating that there is already a medium rise medium density building already there; indicating that he does not understand why Auburn is proposing to throw that building in the garbage; wondering why they do not just convert it from commercial space over to residential space, both buildings; thinking that they could support that and they would save a lot of money and there would be a lot less risk; advising that a lot of people think that the housing boom is about to bust and if you are trying to finance a really big development, if you cannot get the banks to do it you have got a lot of problems; indicating that medium rise medium density is more likely to survive a bursting of the bubble; pointing out that there was a comment about jobs, that we need jobs Downtown, that the building is so big that it will create a lot of jobs; noting that there is an assumption there that there is sort of an infinite market for rental housing or condominiums Downtown and that we can just keep building more and more and more big buildings and that Councillors should be really afraid that if this does not get built there will be massive unemployment but the truth is that there

is a finite number of people who are willing to rent Downtown, there is a finite number of people who are willing to buy; noting that he bought a condominium, he bought in the neighbourhood but it is not unlimited and if this large building is not built on this property, another developer who has one of those many empty parking lots will build and it will be the same number of jobs, it will be the same number of storeys or more storeys; advising that he does not think that Councillors should fall for this kind of blackmail idea that if you do not approve of it you are going to create unemployment; pointing out that those types of jobs are going to happen, whether it is on this site or three blocks closer to the Downtown, they are still going to happen if the market is there; reiterating that the staff report should be recommended for coming up with a reasonable proposal.

- Mary Ann Hodge, 310 Wolf Street – comment about the enhancement of the pedestrian experience on Wellington Street; suggesting that people do not walk down Queens Avenue in order to experience the ambiance of One London Place but they certainly walk along Wellington Street to enjoy the ambiance of Victoria Park and it would radically change the ambiance on the streetscape by putting a large tower there; indicating that the picture that they showed of the transition area of the back lane area being tarmacked, the reason for that is because there are very few driveways along Wolf Street and those properties use that back lane as a driveway and a parking lot so of course there is going to be a lot of tarmac back there which preserves the streetscape on the street side for a much better view; understanding anecdotally from someone that the thirty storey zoning on the London Life parking lot is something that would require a significant setback, that that would not be right up to the sidewalk, up to the property lines, that it would be more setback from Wellington Street and would not impose on the street quite as much as this development would.
- Danya Walker, 570 Wellington Street – advising that she is one building north of the proposed project; clarifying that in the proposal it would look as if the properties to the north of this proposal are all commercial; reiterating that she wanted to clarify that she is a residential owner and has been for years; indicating that her property is zoned “B” so she cannot do anything to the exterior of her property without the City’s approval and, from what she is hearing, there could be implications for the integrity of the property at 570 Wellington Street.
- Arthur Gonzales, 536 Kent Street – indicating that he is a young professional and an academic; sharing with everyone some insight that he has uncovered through a research project regarding downtown development; pointing out his biases in this conversation, as a professional he has no biases, he believes that the work he does will not be affected by the decision that the Committee makes tonight, as a resident of Downtown his preference is for the Committee to approve the motion simply because more Downtown residents mean more customers for Downtown businesses which then increases his options for the types of venues, options and retail that young professionals like himself can enjoy; stating that it is important to recognize the difference between young professionals and the secondary students demographic; noting that young professionals are more inclined to care for the place that they live in, they do gravitate towards nightlife activities that are less chaotic; a Downtown economy that strives to serve young professionals could even inspire young Londoners to become what they see in the Downtown area; as an academic his

preference is for the Committee to make the correct choice, in theory the correct choice is whatever choice the Committee makes; indicating that this Committee consists of Councillors who serve the interests of the constituents, not just Wards 4, 5, 9, 11 and 13, but more so all of London; therefore, we need to understand exactly how London gets affected by this decision; indicating that nearby residents would probably be the most affected as they would be able to see the building from their own backyards and this creates a fear that their properties may be reduced in value; of course this fear is felt the most by the dozens of homeowners near Wolf Street and this fear is also propagated outward even though the building will not be so visible beyond the blocks; on the other hand, Downtown businesses are also directly affected; based on a survey of participation in his research, retail business owners along Richmond Row are in full support of residential buildings; noting that this makes sense as the more people Downtown means more business or busyness Downtown; four percent were against Downtown development in general mostly due to the Ward being associated with transit issues but they were still in full support of specifically residential building development; pointing out that local retail consumers are also in significant support of residential buildings Downtown; stating that he did a quick survey of local retail centres and one hundred percent of them supported residential building development, two were against Downtown building development in general due to their experiences living in low income neighbourhoods but they were still in full support of specifically residential building development for Downtown; outlining that through the surveys he has learned that a notable portion of the business owners and retail consumers mentioned their support of the preservation of heritage buildings; noting that the vast majority of them do not perceive a conflict between property development and heritage preservation; interestingly, those who did mention this conflict tend to be near or beyond the retirement age and they also favoured entrepreneurial spirit and Downtown growth over preservation policies; another finding worth noting is that there was zero mention of The London Plan; it appears that The London Plan, which is a significant element in tonight's decision, is not even known or relevant to your constituents, that aside, it is important to know exactly what we are referring to when we say Downtown; advising that City Planning describes Downtown as an area south of Dufferin Avenue and he believes that the spirit of this description reflects their local desire to address the perceived street level deterioration along Dundas Street; reiterating that is just his belief; however, people themselves describe Downtown based on their experiences of Downtown; for many Downtown is experienced frequently along Richmond Row; in fact, another organization called Downtown London provides a map that helps visitors navigate Downtown which stretches all the way up to Oxford Street; advising that if our decision is based on what Downtown is to Londoners then we must not recognize Downtown based strictly on planning principles, we must recognize Downtown based on what it truly is, an experience shared by your constituents and the memory that it is serving is the local identity; indicating that this research will eventually be disseminated through various publications and channels; noting that this will be within about a year; stating that it does take a while to explore the broader topic of Downtown development but based on his findings with stakeholder opinions thus far, he would highly recommend that the Committee approve the amendment; expressing that he is confident that his research

results are and will be one hundred percent repeatable and it is all about Londoners, not ducks, geese and birds; reiterating that the vast majority wish to see high rise residential development whenever there is opportunity to do so; thinking of himself as an ally to the Councillors because for one, he does support increased wages for all Council members or whatever is feasible to ensure proper representation.

- Peter Kloczko, 107 Grand Avenue – indicating that he has been a resident of London his whole life; noting that he has been living here for the last twenty-seven years; pointing out that he has lived in Old South, he has lived all over Westmount and he has lived in Pond Mills as well; advising that besides going to CCH and getting bussed into Downtown, he has no reason to come into the Downtown core, there is no reason for him to come down here besides the odd few festivals and being brought here when he was younger, there was a lot going on but we cannot deny that it has been dying Downtown over the years; having a residential building like this, bringing in three hundred people as well as some of the other propositions that he has seen come before Council is only going to bring more people to the Downtown core; indicating that we have thirty-thousand or forty-thousand students that come here to London every single year and once they get their degrees, once they get their diplomas, they leave; advising that there is nothing keeping them here in London, there is nothing driving them down to the Downtown core; requesting that the video he sent earlier be played as it represents some of the people who had to leave earlier; *Note: the Committee was unable to view the video at the meeting.*
- Robert Kape, 300 Wolfe Street – meaning no disrespect but he thinks that the proper change is not necessarily the one that Council makes; it is the one that in the long term best interest of city development; thinking that it is generally accepted that everyone likes more jobs, for the most part, change because things cannot be static; change is good; but that is not the only thing in the picture; if we look in our city, he can think of two off-hand past developments that are dreadful; pointing out that one, and no one has mentioned it, is just down the block, Centennial House, it is ugly, it adds really nothing to the city; indicating that the other one is the Court House that was built in the 1970's, an imposing, ugly structure that gives no character to our city, nothing; indicating that when he saw the pictures of this new structure, it also is imposing; stating that the park is a nice tranquil place in the heart of the city and it is in a nice, historic district and we do have a nice building there now, it is a six storey building; stating that it does blend in quite nicely; pointing out that there is nothing wrong with making money, he likes making money; understanding that as a developer it is a lot easier to rent out a building if it sits next to a beautiful park but that is not the only thing that we have to consider.
- Colin Tattersall, 671 Richmond Street – indicating that he runs The Ceeps and Barney's Downtown; stating that a previous speaker encapsulated everything that he thinks business owners Downtown concerning how they have had difficulty using bus rapid transit; stating that when you see a building like this and it seems like the mandate for the city is to increase people Downtown; noting that the Committee is about to spend twenty million dollars on a flex street for Dundas Street; stating that it seems to be that the push right now is to get buildings Downtown, get them built, get people living, working and going out to the restaurants, coming to his restaurant, to his bar and spending money; indicating that there is a place like the Keg that is closed and they have opened up at Masonville;

Cadillac Fairview came to the Council and the Committee gave them more restaurants and hospitality footage within the mall space and at first he did not really think anything of it and now that they see the success that the Keg has been and now that he has heard that there is a new games centre, bar, nightclub and concert venue that is going in there called the Rec Room that would not have been able to go and move into that mall until the Committee allowed them to get more of their footage; suddenly we have got people that do not want to move Downtown or do not want to come Downtown; indicating that he is not sure where the vote is going to go next week regarding the bus rapid transit; noting that hopefully it is not voted for, but if it is then it will be that much more difficult for people to be coming Downtown; if the idea is to have people living and working and spending their money and there are so many livelihoods that are on Richmond Row and on Dundas Street; advising that he genuinely thinks that this is the type of project that the Committee should be really considering approving; expressing support for more intensification Downtown; advising that from the pictures that he saw on the screen, it looks beautiful and he thinks it would be a great addition to the park and the area.

- Gary Brown, 35A – 59 Ridout Street South – expressing support for the staff recommendation; indicating that there have been some references made to The London Plan and how it does not represent Londoners; advising that it is the largest public engagement plan in the history of this country; stating that it does represent Londoners; maybe you were not there, that is ok but it was huge; asking that people not trash the Plan; reiterating that The London Plan does represent the wish of Londoners and what does The London Plan say about block, it says five or six storeys is what the public, what Council, has decided should be here, what Planning staff have decided; outlining is that all he can hear is the word exception; advising that they all support intensification of the Downtown; did Council not just approve some bonus zoning and intensification of a building on Richmond Street and or was he not here twenty minutes ago; indicating that it has been demonstrated beyond a doubt that the city is for intensification of the Downtown; indicating that this is a question of a community, this is the Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, one of the earliest ones done in the city; indicating that his own community has learned from the language used in this Conservation District; noting that they have learned and evolved to intensify the language; advising that he was here last week when the Committee was talking about what is probably the largest infill, new set of by-laws that have ever been passed in the City of London; incidentally most people up here missed that but that is ok; having a discussion about the rhythms of the streets, it was an extreme part of this passing, he did not even hear any developers speaking against it; maybe they agree with it as well, he does not know, we will find out at the Ontario Municipal Board; looking at the rhythm of this street, are we going to go two storey, two storey, two storey, twenty odd storey; indicating that most people know who Brent Toddering is and when he was visiting London a few years ago, one of the comments he made to him and he made the comment in public as well, is that we are a city of thumbs; advising that this is poor planning, we have areas where we want tall buildings, where we are directing tall buildings to be Downtown, do we not have the Fincore property out by the river, one of the most prettiest properties in the city where we are encouraging high rise development; stating that this Council has been encouraging this, we are just saying

that this is not the place, it might not even be the right building; reiterating that this is not the place for that building; expressing support for the Community Association as well; wondering what is next, are they putting a twenty-two storey building in next to the green; wondering if he would have to come and speak against that; there is something to be said for the historical vistas of London; we have to draw a line somewhere; pointing out that we are going to build two huge towers over hanging the Coves; realizing Council was handcuffed, this had to be done; we have just destroyed Meadowlily, watching the destruction out there brought tears to his eyes; is this not destroying a historical vista as well; they were talking about the history of Victoria Park; he does not think that any of the military folks were looking up and seeing a giant tower, he thinks they were able to look out on the City of London; we welcome development in London, we always have; this has been a welcoming Council but what we are saying is that we have rules and guidelines and we would like you to follow them; asking that the exceptions be said no to; stating that he does not see any giant buildings of this size in Woodfield; indicating that he loves going to the Woodfield Community Fair; noting that he walks up, the streets have a nice rhythm to them, the houses are eclectic and that is what makes your neighbourhood; wondering who wants to go into uniform garageville, they are not the hot houses selling; pointing out that he has not seen a house on his street stay on the market for more than a week; the market is flying right now, there is demand to be in London so let us make the right decision for the future because this is kind of a cross roads and stick with the plan that we have; stating that the plan that we have now is pretty clear about what we say to this building; enquiring if this falls under the development rebate guidelines and if it does, what the exact cost would be to the taxpayer in paying the development fees; realizing that we do not write them off, taxpayers have to pay them and he would like to know if this is included in that particular program just because of its location; knowing that it is kind of on the edge; knowing the Downtown one we do.

- Mark Enshaw, 405 Waterloo Street – stating that it is great to see a discussion and debate about this because there are a lot of people who care about this; expressing support for the notion that evolves and develops this Wellington Street building in their community; hearing a lot of homeowners speak tonight about wanting to keep their neighbourhoods the same; indicating that he is not a homeowner; as a young professional with nine years of Liberal Arts education he cannot afford a home and will not be able to afford one for many years; stating that this means he is reliant on high density housing to afford to live Downtown so that he can continue to work Downtown; advising that it saves him one hundred dollars a month living Downtown because he does not need a bus pass, he can just walk to work every single day; indicating that he would like other young professionals to live and stay in London just like him because, let us face it, London is a great place, the parks, the bike path, the river, it is gorgeous and living Downtown he gets to experience that at a lower cost than Grosvenor; noting that he could not afford to stay at Grosvenor so it was cheaper for him to live Downtown; expressing that he votes to support the evolution of communities; growing pains will happen but that is how we grow; wondering if we are trying to conserve buildings or are we trying to conserve intergenerational communities so that he can see himself and his family here in the future.

- Sylvia Childis, 82 Ridout Street South – indicating that she works on the corner of Dundas Street and Clarence Street; advising that she is for intensification and beautiful high rise buildings; indicating that their argument has to do with the location and everything is the location; stating that this building sets a precedent and it is the personality of London which is at stake here because of this particular location; indicating that this proposed high rise is in the middle of a Heritage Conservation District; perhaps, London’s premier Heritage Conservation District, Woodfield; realizing we need to grow inward and upward but this breaking of a Heritage Conservation District is precedent setting and it endangers all of our Heritage Conservation Districts; advising that Council and Londoners made these Districts for a reason; quoting from the Ontario website, “District designation enables the Council of a municipality to manage and guide future change in the District with policies and guidelines for the preservation, protection and enhancement of the areas special character.”; thinking that is what is at stake here is the area’s special character; asking the Committee to consider that and ask Auburn to put in a medium rise medium density building and build that high rise in another location and they would be more than happy to bring all kinds of people Downtown, millennials, old, families, retired; noting that some of them have been here longer than your twenty-seven years, she has been in London fifty something; indicating that she loves London, loves the Downtown; congratulating staff; asking for support of staff’s recommendation.
- Rob Anderson, 767 Hedley Drive – expressing support for this project; expressing disappointment that it is not thirty storeys; thinking that would be much better for Downtown; however, he would be satisfied with twenty-two or seventeen; advising that he has talked to many of his friends and colleagues around London, people in Masonville, Hyde Park, Oakridge, White Oaks, the East End and not one person was against this project because it does benefit all of London; not only from the tax revenue; noting that taxes are going up every year; stating that this will help broaden the base and help eliminate some of those larger increases; reiterating that the foot traffic has been talked about Downtown, a lot of young professionals like himself would love to live here and it seems like it is a not in my backyard opposition; reiterating that people from all over the city want this project; wanting to ensure that the Committee thinks about all of London in this, especially our Downtown; expressing appreciation that someone from the business community attended the meeting because they do have businesses to run; indicating that he cannot wait for this project to be built and he looks forward to living there very soon.
- Kate Rapson, Chair, Woodfield Community Association – indicating that they wrote in a letter on January 25, 2017, opposing the application; listening to all of these fascinating remarks; commenting on the statement that was made about all of London supports, she has to disagree with that comment as there have been a number of petitions running for this one, a signed paper one and an electronic one on change.org and the last time she checked there were a couple of thousand people who signed it from London but also as far away as British Columbia and Los Angeles; reiterating that there are people that are opposed to this as well; something that former Councillors J. Bryant and J. Baechler instilled in her is that this area of West Woodfield is already very intense so if you walk down Wolf Street, Central Avenue, Waterloo Street, parts of Pall Mall Street, Colborne Street, these are large estate homes or large historic homes and a lot of them have a lot

of multi-unit dwellings within them; in a lot of ways they are already very intense, not sure how they line up with the criteria that Mr. J. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner was mentioning but, from her research, from her understanding, being involved in this role for a number of years is they have a lot of people already in these areas, it is like, Joni Baechler, called it the horizontal apartment buildings; they are not thirty storeys high but you can count on a lot of those buildings holding definitely more than one family; reiterating that they are very intense already; the other thing was the B rated buildings and this has already been mentioned so she will not spend a lot of time on it, but if B rated buildings can come down in favor of something new then that is half of the heritage district; almost fifty percent would be B rated buildings, which is a sad thing; why do we have heritage districts if it is ok to pull them down if they are just a B rating; B and A, to Mr. K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner's point, they are similar in value to the community; the original proposal was for twenty-four and then it was twenty-two and today we saw seventeen; seventeen storeys, to give the Committee some perspective, the London one is nineteen storeys; imagining something like that on that corner and again it feels like over intensification at that site; the Woodfield Community Association, as she stated in her letter, they are definitely for intensification, there is another application at Waterloo Street and Central Avenue, which was a very respectful, more modern looking building so they are not all about keeping heritage exactly as it is and opposing change; that used to be the former Supertest gas station and it was pulled down and it has been a very nasty blight in the community for a long time and B.J. Hardick came forward a few years ago with a lovely proposal, it was a step design, six storeys at the highest and that was against the granite house so it was quite respectful of the community, six, four and three so it was stepped to the streetscape on Waterloo Street but it was higher against the granite house which made sense; she cannot remember the number of units in that but it was a fairly heavy intensification for that site and very appropriate for the neighbourhood, in keeping with the neighbourhood but also looked forward and brought in places for younger people to live or older people if they wanted to retire in these really lovely places; there was another building that the Woodfield Community Association supported on Princess Avenue, the Woodfield Commons, it is approximately five storeys; noting that was a long, narrow building and again they supported that; reiterating that they are not against development, they are not against infill, they are not against all of these things that have been mentioned and, in fact, they will support them if they are appropriate, they just do not feel that this building, as nice as it looks, is appropriate for that site, it is an over intensification; thanking the City staff for their great plan and their recommendation; expressing support for the staff recommendation; asking the Committee to follow The London Plan, the Official Plan and the Heritage Conservation District guidelines and refuse this.

- Jim Fenton, 481 Dufferin Avenue – advising that he has lived in Woodfield for the last thirty years; indicating that he is a Senior Financial Executive; expressing concern with business, but he disagrees with the proposal that Auburn has put forward not because it is infill, but because of where it is going to be, where they are proposing to put it; these folks talked about business issues, he understands those as he has been doing it for well over thirty years; indicating that it is important that we have intensification, but again we need to consider the impact of what we are doing and where we are doing it; every single

building that is proposed should not be accepted; you understand that as Council, you understand that as building planners and I supposed that's my biggest concern; expressing concern about this particular proposal is, firstly, the height of it, the size of it and the impact it will make on the area, but additionally let's face it he does not want to see that Manhattanization of Victoria Park; interesting enough he went to a meeting with these folks during the winter and they told him two things; one, they told him, oh this is going to be just like Central Park, well he is from the east coast, he knows Central Park and London's Victoria Park is not Central Park and London is not Manhattan; he does not want it to become that, but he does want us to intensify the number of people who are in the Downtown area; advising that he is in favour of infill, has been always as a Woodfield member; open to opening up the Downtown to more residential options; however, there needs to be judgement and thought involved; London certainly does not need this type of development around Victoria Park.

- Sandra Miller, 32 Upper Avenue – stating that many people have spoken and there are mixed opinions across the board; a lot of interesting and very good points have been made and she is not going to repeat them; she, among probably most of the people here, is a supporter of intensification Downtown, especially Downtown; thinking we are all aware of the endless acres of surface parking lots that continue to sit half empty or basically shovel ready building sites which we would love to see high-rises on, that is just one place to start; advising that she does not work Downtown, but she comes Downtown probably four to five times a week to shop, do volunteer work, meet friends for dinner, do other social activities, go to the park, obviously; stating that she loves Downtown; one day she hopes to live Downtown but right now she foolishly owns a house that she hates mowing the lawn of and she often thinks what the hell were you thinking, just buy a condo or rent an apartment, which is where she would like to end up and ideally she would like to end up Downtown; she is not a Londoner by birth, she is one of the hallowed who came to grad school and stayed, yes we do exist and we did stay; she sort of thought, oh God, when can she leave, but now she has really grown to love London; she commits a lot of her time and energy to this city and she thinks it can become a great place and often times it is a great place despite itself; she says to people, because on the surface, there are a lot of things going on, oh the bus rapid transit fight, etc., these types of arguments, but there are so many amazing people in this city doing amazing things, including all of you who have come out here tonight on your own free time to speak passionately about something you believe in regardless of your perspective; she is a big fan of the people in Downtown London, she is a member even though she does not live Downtown - she plays Downtown and she learns Downtown; thinking that something that has been kind of missed in this conversation that a lot of people have been talking about the fact that they own residences or they live or they work Downtown and we sort of have forgotten about all the people that come downtown to Victoria Park to play and Victoria Park really is London's back yard and its front yard; she is sure that everyone in this room goes to at least one, if not all, of the festivals that happen in the park during the summer; part of the experience being in that park for any particular occasion is the openness and the vista that the park provides; a lot of times we hear this comparison to Central Park, she did some very cursory math and Central Park is actually forty-six something times larger than Victoria Park so proportionally even the tallest buildings standing, or even proposed, around Central Park ironically would be about the height of that building standing on this site right now, about in six, seven storeys; the buildings that are on that site right now she would argue they are excellent transitioning buildings between the open public space of the park and the private residential neighbourhood; they are high enough to kind of block the noise issues if people in Woodfield are concerned about noise from various park festivals, but they are also low enough that they blend in very nicely to the residential character of the neighbourhood;

several people have mentioned the Canadian Institute of Planners; in 2016, they awarded Woodfield Neighbourhood of the Year and she thinks their quote from their site “Woodfield is one of the largest and finest examples of intact Victorian streetscapes in Canada” and that is one of the reason it is a Heritage Conservation District; she would argue that the planning that we do for the city impacts everyone in the city regardless of where you live and it does need to be taken case by case; we do have planning procedures and policies in place to guide us and to guide the Committee in making these decisions; wanting to compliment Auburn Developments on the building proposal they originally presented, it is an attractive building; she does not know if people are familiar with the building they did in Kitchener-Waterloo; it was a redevelopment of the arrow shirts industrial complex, it is now a loft building; they added additional floors to it and it has won several awards for adaptive reuse; it is a remarkable complex; kudos to them for taking that project on; she would love to see them do something like that in London with some of the industrial and heritage building we have here; kudos to them for the building they did originally present; she would love to see it built somewhere else in London on any number of these empty lots we see in the Downtown area; it is a beautiful building, it could be filled with families and young working people who may or may not be able to afford it if its condos if the market continues to develop as it does, but she fully supports the staff recommendation and she thinks it is a very considered and balance approach to the situation that we are looking at; hoping that Council and the Committee will follow it; hoping that we will see a similar development on another site in our Downtown area to continue the intensification of and support of our businesses and the people who live, work and play in Downtown London.

- Amir Farhi, 536 Kent Street – mentioning that, based on the agenda there is a tremendous amount of support for this project, notably the Downtown London, Main Street LDBA, People of Downtown London, people who live here, who work here, who play here and also there are a number of other organizations and stakeholders in the community who have also supported this project; knowing that they were not able to attend possibly because of the time, but he thinks their support should be noted; this notion that we need to intensify and we need to stop sprawl, we need to stop growing outward and we need to continue to grow inward, but it is always ok, let us intensify, but not in my backyard or not in front of my view or let us not do in the location where the birds path is going to be constructed or where there is going to be wind tunnels and vibrations; folks come up with a whole bunch of excuses to try to stop a project simply because it is so close to them and there have been many of these instances in the past and it just continues to go on; the object that is standing right in from of me fails to actually look at other residential buildings and commercial building that are along the Wellington Corridor of high density and that needs to be noted; if you talk to any of the vendors who are part of Sunfest or Ribfest at Victoria Park for those festivals they will tell you they would love an additional 325 residents buying from them, being consumers and patrons of them; if you talk to the downtown business on downtown Richmond Street, on the Dundas flex street and what it is going to become they will tell you they would love an additional 325 residents; the People of Downtown London will tell you we have a food desert, the only way we can bring about an actually grocery store, supermarket downtown is if we about 15,000 people living there, but we only have 7,000 people living there currently; in fact if you look at Downtown London’s population relative to London’s total which is at 3.5% it is much lower than the 13% across comparable cities; there are 180 retail square feet per resident ratio in the

Downtown where the ratio, for example, in Waterloo or in Guelph is 52 and 24 respectively; the project is, he thinks, phenomenal because one it adds more property tax revenue to the city which can help fund vital city projects and also it creates construction jobs in the short term; again millions of dollars in consumer spending so there are a lot of spin off effects that are super vital to the prosperity of the downtown; we have over 1,000 job vacancies in the tech sector right now; people working the tech sector want to live Downtown and this kind of residential building will provide them with that opportunity; not to mention again that we really need to curb sprawl; thinking it is a financially prudent way to grow as a city and he admires the London Plan and its mission to want to reduce sprawl and he thinks this is one step further towards that; appreciating the fact that the Committee has taken all this time to listen to everyone here as it is a lot of time; commending the Committee for sitting there and listening to all of us; expressing appreciation and hoping that the Committee will approve the applicant's proposal because he believes it is for the betterment and the long term prosperity of the entire city; when the Downtown prospers, when the heart of the city prospers, when the heart of the city is healthy, so is the rest of the City.

- Fred Dyck, 618 Wellington Street – advising that he was part of the Woodfield Heritage Conservation District Steering Committee about ten years ago that helped establish the Conservation District; stating that what they talked about then was that the Conservation District is a contract between neighbours; outlining that if he promises to maintain his home and upkeep then you will promise to do the same thing; advising that he has to go through lengthy processes to get permission to replace the windows on his house, to make sure they are just right; advising that in the time since the heritage designation came in there has been immense improvement within their neighbourhood; pointing out that Wolf Street, which is right next to the apartment building, has always been the gem of the neighbourhood; giving kudos to the residents for how well they look after their places; advising that Hyman Street, which is right near him, has gone through enormous improvements, many multi-units, buildings have been purchased by homeowners who have moved in, renovated them, they live in one unit and look after the others, it is really a tremendous improvement; realizing that this is a direct response to what they did in designating it a Heritage Conservation District; advising that if they build this building, if they allow this building to come in, it will break our heritage designation; pointing out that it is so out of character with the rest of the neighbourhood that there will be no value to what they have; stating that it might be development to one corner of the neighbourhood but it will have a severe negative effect on the rest of the neighbourhood.
- Alan Tipping, 2809 Dingman Drive - indicating that he has been here for many meetings, he ran for Council and the Committee has seen him here; advising that he does not usually speak but this is something that he has seen that has also impacted him, he lives out on Dingman Drive and he has been impacted by other stuff around his property values, he went to the Ontario Municipal Board with the Planning and Environment Committee on his side to protect the land beside him because his property is three acres of land; advising that the issue that he sees here is if the Committee allows a building like this to go up and it is within a Heritage Conservation District, are you going to lift all those rules on that heritage community to allow them to change their houses to make their value more

acceptable for resale; keeping in mind that these people are being told that they cannot put windows in unless you go through all this rigmarole; stating that as soon as you add something that is outside of the image that you want in that area, you have to release them, because are their property values going to increase or decrease with this building; advising that he has not heard anything about that; pointing out that if these richer people that want to spend the money and keep their properties looking nice and keep them up and the Committee puts in another two hundred thirty people there, you have people moving around which damages properties and causes issues; noting that we have seen that all over the city already; stating that if you want to keep this place looking nice, neat, clean and give it a heritage status, the Committee must force this company to make a heritage type building there, whether that means to lower it down to keep the building within the view of the neighbourhood or you allow the area residents to change their properties to sell to make money because you cannot regulate the area residents and not regulate the owners of the proposed development; outlining that that is not fair; thinking that the developer should not have the building the way that they are planning it, it is an eyesore for a beautiful community right in behind; reiterating that the Committee needs to keep with what they have made the area residents do; and ask them to do so in their community which is now Canadian known, it is known all over Ontario; asking how the Committee could let the developer change that.

- Wendy Dickinson, 522 Princess Avenue – echoing what a previous speaker, Ms. Sandra Miller, said, this is not a not in my backyard problem, it is a not in London's front yard problem; stating that Victoria Park is where we all go to congregate, every time there is a celebration, every time there is a festival, Victoria Park is the place that it is going to be; outlining that we cannot have a monstrosity looming over it, we also cannot have low density residential converted to high density residential just because someone wants to build a building; stating that it will never stop, it is just a precedent that we cannot let happen; advising that, as a long-time member of the Woodfield Community Association, she has written letters for the last ten or twelve years in support of high density residential development within Woodfield; noting that some of it has been built and some of it has not been built but they are not opposed to infill or intensification, they want more neighbours, they just want them in the right location; indicating that the long and short of it is that it is a nice building but the wrong place.
- William Latvinan, 298 Wolf Street – indicating that he lives ten metres from the proposed building; stating that he is not adverse to intensification, he just thinks that this is not the Downtown and as someone has pointed out, there is lots of available options in the Downtown and in the new river front proposed area for development; advising that Wolf Street is a historical, cultural and architectural gem and this building would destroy that neighbourhood; realizing that it is a transitional neighbourhood; pointing out that his neighbour behind him just bought a sorority house for a little less than half a million dollars and he thinks that he has twice that into it now and it is going to be a single family home; advising that that is what you are seeing more and more of; advising that they moved back, after raising their children, to Wolf Street because it was a beautiful street and he has always appreciated historical, cultural and architectural significance and that goes back to the early eighties when they had to get rid of a development on the street that

wanted to turn it into offices; noting that was Mr. Mitches; advising that he spoke quite passionately in front of the Ontario Municipal Board and it was recognized that he wanted to live there, he did not want people turning out the lights but what you are talking about is too many people; assuming that Council is familiar with Wolf Street, it is a very narrow street and if you get one service vehicle on there it shuts down one lane; reiterating that you have very little to work with; advising that to have traffic on there for the better part of, noting that he is not sure what the development span would be, would be bad for the park, bad for the neighbourhood and most importantly bad for the cultural icons, historic, that sit on the street because, as someone previously pointed out vibration in the sand does a lot of damage; referencing that as, having owned his property since the early 1980's, when they built the building across from him, which is the one just adjacent to the London Life parking lot, the damage that was incurred to his building from the vibration of the trucks; noting that he did not live there at the time, they had to come back over and repair a lot of stuff from the porch to the third floor; reiterating that was just from the vibration of those large trucks on a small residential street with the setbacks of the properties not too far; expressing that it is a nice building but build it Downtown.

- Tom Okanski, 310 Wolf Street – 310 Wolf Street, 312 Wolf Street and 570 Waterloo Street are all projects in which he has spent time, energy and money intensifying in a heritage context and intensifying the residential nature of that; attesting to the fact that you can make money doing that, perhaps not the rate of return that the developer is looking for but you can make money doing that; pointing out that he believes that this exercise is not necessarily one of residential intensification so much as short term profit making; stating that we can all support it for intensification and residential development but at the end of the day it is really about making money and it has been presented in many different contexts under the highest and best use of the land, but it is not the highest and best use of the land; outlining that the highest and best use of the land has already been defined in the City plan; it is, however, the highest and best use of the land for short-term profit maximization perspective; making one point on slide twenty-one of this presentation which they may or may not have seen up there; stating that they made some boast about forty percent more parking spaces than was necessary, which equates to approximately one hundred twenty extra parking spaces at two hundred square feet of parking space which is about twenty-four thousand square feet of parking, not residential intensification at roughly one hundred dollars a month to park inside in the Downtown core and that is approximately one hundred fifty thousand dollars a year of revenue for which you do not have to supply appliances, renovations or heat; making that point about the disingenuity of a lot of this presentation that the developer has made.