

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

21. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Properties located at 32, 36 and 40 York Street and Part of 330 Thames Street (Z-8789)

- *(Councillor Cassidy enquiring about the amenity space and that there would be commercial on the ground floor of Option 1, what will be on the ground floor of Option 2, will the whole building be residential under Option 2 or will there be any commercial space.);* Mr. J.M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responding that primarily it will be parking so particularly on the western frontage of that building would be parking but there is an opportunity for commercial on the ground floor on York Street.
- J. Barry, 19 King Street – noting that this is a potentially welcome addition to the neighbourhood and he would certainly like to see an effective, good development on that section of York Street; stating that he is not there to be totally negative but he does want to make a couple of comments because he does have some serious reservations about what is being proposed; indicating that he will start with the issue of zoning, the amendment that is being requested; stating that obviously the developer bought a piece of land of a certain size and knew what the zoning was and that it already permits a 90 metre tower on the site without passing this amendment at all and the bonusing basically allows a greater density; stating that he is in favour of intensification and greater residential building downtown because there will be benefits from that, but it has to be done carefully and with good design and style in a way that respects the existing neighbourhood and the context that is already there and that is why bonusing should not be an automatic decision, but should be looked at very, very carefully in terms of good design; indicating that he has not seen any good argument, in the massive amount of material being presented, why bonusing should be granted, other than the fact that the design the developer has is too large for the piece of land he possesses; stating that it is unfortunate but he knew the size when he bought it; noting that the design that is given (focusing on option two) would fill the entire lot with no setbacks, no softening or greenery, and on York Street would simply present pedestrians with a concrete and glass wall at the edge of the sidewalk; stating that density would increase by 73%, beyond the current zoning and intensification of the London Plan; stating that London has too many recent examples of this brutalist pedestrian unfriendly architecture; noting that the London Plan was designed to put some limits on this and we should think carefully about that; noting as well that on page 60 of the report, the Urban Design Review Panel, at the end of July, said “that the proposed development represents an appropriate direction, but not yet a bonus-worthy solution for the site...the panel feels it should see the project again as it is not developed enough at this time”; indicating that he knows there has been a lot of design that has gone since then, almost on a daily basis and what is being considered now is very different from what was sent out to residents three weeks ago, so there is a certain vagueness about where we are actually going with all of this; noting that his major concern is about 330 Thames Street; stating that as has been noted, that is part of Ivy Park and some years ago, City Officials supposed that a tree-lined avenue, with greenery and trees on both sides, leading from York up to King Street, would be a wonderful entrance to the City and so Thames Street runs through Ivy Park, not along the edge of it; indicating that what the developer intends, if they are allowed to trespass into Ivy Park is a little unclear because it keeps changing from day to day; noting that the last design that he saw a few days ago has a restaurant with a patio, with brick walls and a lot of concrete replacing what is now grass and trees and if that happens we can rename the Peace Park because it will not be very peaceful anymore; indicating that if City Council intends to shrink City parks planned in order to produce greater residential intensification, that is a major policy switch and he does not think it should be approved tonight and in fact if you want to change the policy on City parks there should be a full public debate on that with public participation and a clear policy statement from Council that downtown parkland is going to shrink because of the need for greater residential intensification and taxpayers better get over it and he does not think Council is going to do that because that is not the kind of leadership we want from City Council; summarizing that he thinks this development amendment should be rejected and the developers should be encouraged to work within the existing zoning and come up with a good design, or else present something far better to warrant the bonusing that the Urban Design Peer Review Panel is looking for.

- B. Early, 19 King Street – noting that he knows that this does not involve the rezoning, but something that everyone should be aware of is that within his building there is a pool which is a suspended pool that goes over top of the ramp that goes down into the parking area and that if this development goes on and involves a lot of pile-driving there is going to be some structural damage to the place so he hopes the developer would look at possibly drilling, or whatever it is they did over at the Azure building because he thinks there would be less impact with respect to pounding, that could be problematic; stating that what he also expects and hopes will happen is that the developer should be asked to put up a bond that would cover any damage done to 19 King Street because, as you know, most of this will be happening approximately five feet or less from his building; noting that by having a bond put up, there would then be somewhere to go if some structural damage happened to 19 King Street; indicating that he also encourages the City Engineers to come and go over and review what his building is like; stating that he knows the building is about 30 years old but if the engineers were there they would know what the status quo is of today and he thinks that is very important; stating that he thinks the bond should be there because whenever he thinks of water and insurance companies, he thinks of Springbank Park and the dam; noting that they do not want a water problem, insurance problems, they would have no place to park and that is very important with respect to their building; noting that with respect to the application, there was a very emotional meeting early on and he was glad to be a part of it and at that time many in attendance thought you would have to be pretty heartless not to feel for those people; stating that there are some people in the building, number 19, that will soon have a tower in front of their view and this could be taken care of dramatically by flipping the building; indicating that he thinks that what they saw earlier on is that maybe the residents who live in an area should have some priority over developers or people who want to build factories; stating that he thinks that is a very important thing and that we have to look at people; noting that the people in his building would have so much more enjoyment in their lives, if the small part of this development were outside their window, not the tower; indicating that he realizes that the developer realizes that he could end up with more money from his apartments that he may rent or condos that he may sell because of the design that is presented now, but if you are going to have an idea with respect to looking after existing people; noting that it was interesting that when the pros and cons of this particular development were talked about, there was no reference to the people nearby, there was no comments on that; stating that he was surprised that the planning department did not say something about that; stating that they are nearby and look after us please; indicating that with respect to 330 Thames Street, he read somewhere that people say it is never used; noting that on Canada Day and see the number of people there because that is the best place to see the fireworks, the whole front of 330 Thames Street is almost covered with people on blankets; stating that the building, at the front, going out onto that park really should not happen; noting that it is like a land swap and that increases the existing size of their land that they now own by about 50% and that 50% is Ivy Park and he thinks it should be left alone and he thinks it is very important to look at what is going to go on in the future because there may be a use for it with respect to the park; stating that there is probably going to be dogs in this new apartment building and right now they go in the front lawn of his building and maybe they need something on 330 Thames Street as opposed to all these other things.
- D. Ross, 19 King Street – indicating that he wishes to voice his opposition to the request for a zoning by-law amendment; noting that the amendment includes re-zoning a portion of Ivy Park for commercial use; stating that so many citizens use Ivy Park to drive through, to walk in, to use the bike path, to enjoy the gardens, to get their picture taken, to cool off on a hot day and to get close to the river; indicating that he objects to any re-zoning that includes turning part of Ivy Park into a commercial property and he thinks the people of London would agree; noting that secondly, the developer has an alternative design that does not require use of Ivy Park; stating that finally, not many cities have such a distinctly beautiful entrance to their downtown as London has through Ivy Park, starting at York Street and turning on to Thames and traveling up to King provides an amazing, scenic route that should be preserved; noting that the route shows the beauty of Ivy Park and as you travel up King you are introduced to the architectural heritage of the London downtown core; asking to please not disrupt the scenic entrance to the downtown core; stating that for these reasons he objects to the request for the zoning by-law amendment.
- Mia Shatzmiller, 19 King Street – indicating that she lives in a 03 unit; advising that all of her windows, bedroom, little balcony, study and the living room, are all pointing in the direction of York Street; pointing out that that means that when the tower is going to come up, her place is going to be encased in cement; stating that there is not enough room to

give them any light or any air in these 03 units; advising that the beautiful depiction of the towers does not show 19 King Street, you do not see how close these walls are going to be; asking Council to exercise caution and to request that the developer looks again at the project and move the tower in a way that would not be destructive to people who live at the southern part of 19 King Street.

- Judith Potter, 19 King Street – expressing appreciation for the opportunity to speak on this issue; expressing opposition to Option 1, the encroachment on the parkland; stating that the City of London's Official Plan calls for city growth to be inward and upward versus urban sprawl; advising that she has no quarrel with that; advising that they already see the beginnings of that with the high rise buildings beginning to proliferate and the proposed Tricar building being the latest with others sure to follow, in other words, the wheels are already in motion; believing that it is essential that we protect our city from the unintended consequences that could result from the Official Plan; indicating that this density shift must be countered with the soul food provided by green space and parkland which gives us opportunities for physical activity for all ages with walking trails, bicycle paths, children's playgrounds, the splash pads, pools, etc.; equally important green space and parks provide trees and shade for picnics, relaxation and quiet contemplation; in essence, they are the backyards for apartment and condominium dwellers in particular and for all of London citizens to use; advising that it is well known science that trees are giant carbon dioxide vacuums that constantly filter out and store this component of air; noting that mature trees especially are effective weapons in the fight against climate change and are beneficial in maintaining clean air; stating that with increased urban density, we need countervailing measures to protect the environment for urban dwellers; advising that if Council is committed to the implementation of the Downtown Plan, the density described in the Plan, then it follows that safe guarding, nurturing and preserving green space, parkland and tree coverage is essential to counter the increased density factor; quoting from Saturday, August 26, 2017 Globe and Mail, "Parkland and green space offer an urban escape that could be the soul of the city."; submitting that it not only could be but it should be the soul of our city; urging the Committee not to allow the Tricar rezoning application that would encroach on the south end of 330 Thames Street currently comprised of green space enhanced with mature trees; stating that there are no compelling reasons for allowing the developer's rezoning request for a building that will be built with or without the amendment; there are, however, compelling reasons for not doing so.
- Shirley Barr, 19 King Street – advising that she lived in the other London, the big London over the pond; indicating that there is a lot of green space there and they are very tight with keeping their common lands; believing that little London can learn from that; stating that we have a beautiful Downtown area but we are losing a lot of the green space; looking at the City logo, it is a tree, it is green; indicating that the thought of giving up 330 Thames Street just so they can add on more parking, a restaurant, retail space, it is not worth it; that is a small part of green space that is part of Ivy Park, that London Council, for many years fought very hard to get those; advising that that area was a huge industrial area, it was crappy, it was awful so look at it now, you have got Ivy Park and can walk all along the Thames River; asking that if the Council has not done it yet, drive up York Street, turn up Thames Street, both sides are green and it is so nice; asking that Council not take that away as there is little enough of the green stuff; asking Council to keep it and be bold.
- Clara Soper, 19 King Street – indicating that she lives in an 03 unit and will be looking at this lovely building; commending Tricar on the design of the building as it lovely and it is an excellent use of almost one hundred percent of their lot; advising that she is not sure where their green space is around three sides but she definitely sees green space to the west, which is lot 330 Thames Street; indicating that she is very clear in her own mind that 330 Thames Street should not be touched; stating that if it is to have a restaurant to bring people in to enjoy looking at the Forks of the Thames and having dinner, it is for a few select people and they cannot see the Forks of the Thames anyway; asking that it be left for people to enjoy it, there are some beautiful trees there, leave them; it would be a real travesty to lose that; stating that, as far as putting up that building, it is an improvement over looking over the glass and the rest of the mess; noting that it was the only thing she hated about the apartment when she looked at it and she thought she just would not look, now she is going to have a nice building to look at; requesting that Council improve their citizens lives by keeping the green; believing that when Ivy Park was designed and the

green space of 330 Thames Street was put there, the intent was that it would be part of Ivy Park, whether or not it is designated, it is shown on all the plans as green in the same way and do not give it away; please do not sell it; believing that a quarter of a million dollars is not worth it.

- Margorie Shespe, 19 King Street – speaking to the concern about the wind study; advising that the applicant proposes that a holding study requiring a wind impact assessment be removed; indicating that no wind studies at ground level have investigated the wind effect in the driveway between 19 King Street and 21 King Street; advising that that driveway is as wind tunnel; noting that whenever there is wind from the north or the south; without a wind impact assessment the effect of turbulence caused by a seventy-two metre tower directly to the south of the driveway is unknown and must be investigated; until that assessment is carried out and the results made public, the application to amend the Zoning By-law must be denied.
- Dr. D. Barry, 19 King Street – stating that the reason she is there is because her grandchildren enjoy Ivy Park a lot and she does as well; indicating that one of the main features of living in the City of London is the amount of trees and it is what attracted her to the City and why she retired here, there is greenery; stating that intensification alone does not make a downtown liveable, greenery does, lots of it; noting that it is her understanding that there is a City-wide campaign, in partnership with ReForest London, the Million Tree Challenge and the City of London to plant thousands of trees every year which is a wonderful environmental campaign with support from citizens and especially schools and her grandchildren are very excited about it and they have been planting trees; stating that our future generation of Londoners are planting trees; indicating that according to the City website, the entrance to Ivy Park is the beautiful tree-lined Thames Street which includes 330 Thames Street; stating that this amendment zoning application will result in cutting down at least ten trees, she has counted them, there are maples, Norway spruce and cottonwood; noting that it is an inconvenient truth that trees take a lifetime to grow, a generation; asking how this sacrifice of trees on parkland, as of option one be reconciled in light of the City of London's ReForest London campaign, how can any bit of current parkland even be considered for re-zoning via bonusing; asking does this mean that all London parkland can be considered for re-zoning via bonusing, would approval of this application not be a change in parkland use; stating that she is appalled by the gall of these applicants to ask for re-zoning as bonusing, shame on them for this request; stating that it appears to be bonusing to enhance their building design by sacrificing a portion of beautiful Ivy Park, a piece of our future; asking to encourage them to build their building according to the current zoning as per option two, it is more than adequate for their needs, it is a beautiful addition to York Street; stating that as a taxpayer she strongly objects to this application; urging the Committee to turn down this re-zoning application for the sake of all future London generations, stating that the job of the Committee is easy, just say "no".
- Jim Donnelly, 19 King Street – advising that he has been there for the twenty-nine years that the building has been there; noting that he is an original resident; advising that they have watched a lot of changes, they have seen the building of the Market, Budweiser Gardens; recollecting all of the industrial development, the Rad Shop, the Dutch Laundry, etc., that was along Thames Street; noting that it really was not very pretty once upon a time; stating that the City has reclaimed it quite nicely, the building that they are in fits in quite nicely; indicating that what the gentlemen have asked to do, which he finds interesting, in addition to the practical items that have been pointed out by a previous speaker, such as the proximity of a suspended pool; believing that the applicant has a solution to make sure that the pool does not get damaged; thinking that they have designed an excellent building from what he sees; advising that the difficulty that he has is that Option 2, he finds that an asset to the Downtown and he really has no personal objection to it; relating to Option 1, it creates a bit of a problem in the sense that, for one thing, it is a false reduction in density for all intents and purposes because, in conversations with Tricar, they are going to build the same number of units, which would be based on density, inside the two towers; indicating that the towers on Option 2 are the same towers as Option 1 but Option 1 has more outside amenities such as restaurants, a rooftop entertainment center three storeys up and having a patio; advising that these are all things that take away from the character of the area; indicating that somebody commented earlier about lack of peace in Peace Park; noting that is true; advising that he does not mind the noise in Harris Park, it rolls its way over but to constantly have an

entertainment or relaxation center on top of a building that is right outside their west side, as well as having a patio down below, takes away from what they have right now; thinking that it does not make a huge difference outside of whatever revenues come from the restaurant because they have the ability to put their green space, which they are already going to do on top of the ten storey and if they need another one, they will put it on top of the twenty-four storey; indicating that it is really not necessary to encroach into Thames Street to go and take parkland; advising that they show two different density's but the density in the towers is exactly the same in Option 1 and Option 2; stating that if you go with Option 2, he thinks that makes good sense and would be most welcome into their community and they would be good neighbours; thinking Tricar will do a good job; advising that the extension into the parkland, notwithstanding the argument for the trees and the parkland and the reason we should keep it, it is also the dislocation of having the noise levels injected into that rather quiet street right now; indicating that he does not believe that they would have that if the Council goes with Option 2; advising that this Council has made some good decisions and some bad ones; thinking that if Council approves Option 2, that is a good decision, Option 1 not so much because of the dislocation and the fact that it really does not give any more units to the developers other than what you are going to allow the bonus to anyway.

- Paula Bernard, Stantec Consulting, on behalf of the applicant - expressing agreement with the staff recommendation.
- Susan Smith, Bruce Street – indicating that it would not be appropriate to take that minimal amount of green space; advising that it is pretty creative to call it 330 Thames Street but it should not be used for any foot print for this development.