

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

12. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Properties located at 661 and 667 Talbot Street (Z-8659)
- *(Councillor A. Hopkins enquiring about the OS4, wondering why it is not an OS5.); Mr. M. Corby, Planner II, responding that it is OS4 because the corridor behind it is all zoned OS4 so it is in keeping with the entire corridor.*
 - *(Councillor S. Turner enquiring about the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority communication dated August 25, 2016, attached); recognizing that the communication is from 2016, wondering if all of the concerns been addressed to the satisfaction of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority.); Mrs. C. Creighton, Land Use Planner, Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, responding that yes, they have been addressed.*
 - George Bikas, Manager, Land Development, Drewlo Holdings, on behalf of the applicant – thanking staff for all of their hard work; indicating that they have worked together for a number of years on this application and they finally have come forward addressing a number of issues to provide an enhanced design standard that would fit well within the surrounding neighbourhood; pointing out that, as the Planning and Environment Committee previously heard from Mr. M. Corby, Planner II, the purpose of the zone change is to permit the development of a sixteen storey two hundred thirty-six unit apartment building with two levels of underground parking, totaling one hundred seventy one parking spaces, thirty-eight of those being available for visitors surface parking along with an additional nine registered visitor spaces in the P1 level of underground parking; making the required visitor parking a total of forty-seven spaces; pointing out that the rezoning of the subject site seeks an increase in height and density in return for a form of development that is sensitive to this surrounding context; therefore, the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014; advising that the recommended amendment is also consistent with City of London Official Plan policies and identified as a remnant parcel within The London Plan; advising that the amendment facilitates the redevelopment of an underutilized site, encourages an appropriate form of intensification and makes good use of the existing municipal infrastructure that promotes cost effective development to minimize land consumption and servicing costs; noting that it is within walking distance to both public transit and the Downtown area businesses; indicating that it is close to one of the City's major public open spaces, the Thames Valley Corridor; stating that the development ensures that building design, form and massing all fits well within the surrounding area; expressing support for the staff recommendation; looking forward to receiving the Planning and Environment Committee's approval to move onto Council for final approval; expressing concurrence with the revised by-law that was provided on the Planning and Environment Committee Added Agenda.
 - AnnaMaria Valastro, 1-133 John Street – clarifying that this is outside the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority jurisdiction; reading their comments in the file, they say that it is out of their jurisdiction; advising that she submitted a petition with almost three hundred signatures and they had their own comments attached to their signatures; stating that she submitted it over the summer and was notified that Councillors were made aware of the petition but they do not have to look at it and then she submitted it formally with her comments for this meeting and she was told that it was not part of the public agenda so those people's comments are not being shown; wanting to receive clarification whether Planning and Environment Committee members have seen the petition and read the comments; *(Councillor T. Park indicating that there will not be a back and forth at this time; this is the public's opportunity to make comment on the application.);* advising that it is important to her to understand if the Councillors have seen the petition and read the comments; *(Councillor T. Park reiterating that this is her time to provide her comments on the application.);* wondering if the Councillors can answer her question; indicating that that is part of her time to talk, she would like to get clarification; advising that most people that are concerned about this development put their comments in writing and she does not feel that, some of them are quite lengthy and she does not feel that the synopsis reflects their concerns; asking for reassurance that their comments were read because they took the time to put them in writing and so did she; stating that she does not want to use her time to read everything that she has already put in writing, she just wants to be assured that they were read; advising that she is also acting on behalf of someone else who gave her their comments to read tonight; reading the comments provided to her by Ms. H. Chapman. (See attached petition synopsis.) (See attached communication dated October 23, 2017 from H. Chapman, 3-152 Albert Street.)
 - Pat Cullimore, 156 Central Avenue – expressing disappointment that she is not considered to be part of the neighbourhood as she is beyond the 120 metre area that the City informs people of developments like what is going on on Talbot Street; indicating that she has

lived in her residence for over thirty years and she has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars of money into her home; advising that she considers this matter part of her neighbourhood; thinking it is ironic that if you look at the logo for the City of London it shows a tree; looking at the aerials of that lot, we are going to be losing a lot of trees; believing that one of the things that there is a precedent for is that she attended a planning meeting for a development at 167 John Street and one of the things that came up was that the Committee granted the developer permission for their variance, they were going to put a triplex up but they were going to put a limit on the number of residents; noting that the maximum that they could have had was three units with three bedrooms per unit for a total of nine; they could have granted them a maximum of seven; advising that there is a precedent for having less than the maximum density and if the Committee thinks that lots that have been vacant for decades, we are going from zero density to over seven hundred density and if you think that is not going to have an impact on our neighbourhood she thinks that you would be wrong; believing that a traffic study has been completed but you are going to be including over one hundred vehicles to that one small location; thinking that the Committee needs to drive on Talbot Street at the end of the day or the beginning of the day because it is backed up almost to Downtown because it is only a two lane roadway; advising that one of the other things that came up at the committee meeting for John Street was that the intention for that particular residence was for students as her understanding is this application is for students; making the point that students do not always make the best neighbours; believing that was part of the point in allowing units or restricting units to less than three bedrooms per unit; thinking that for this to be a student residence is discriminatory as it rules out other people renting apartments such as single working individuals, elderly people; stating that if this is an equal opportunity development, there would be one, two and three bedroom units and there are not; relating to student housing, one of the points that Ms. AM. Valastro had made in one of her correspondences was that these are not people who live here, they are probably going to go back to wherever they came from, they are not going to become permanent residents of London and actually contribute to the future and when they are absent, which is five or six months in the summer, other places are more vulnerable to crime; advising that that has happened to her, the home that is next to hers is a rental unit and her house was robbed because the place was left vacant for a four month period.

- Sandra Miller, 32 Upper Avenue – expressing concern with the zoning, the design and the historic stone wall that is the remnant still on Talbot Street; regarding the zoning, it is her understanding that the lots are currently zoned for ten storeys, thirty metres; pointing out that the original application was for fourteen storeys and included an application for a minor variance; noting that four storeys being a minor variance is either a technicality or a matter of interpretation; indicating that now they are up to sixteen storeys and now they see in the overview, the property at 699 Talbot Street is ten storeys; 695 Talbot Street is seven storeys and 693 Talbot Street is four storeys; moving into the North Talbot residential area, there is a very nice step down graduated height of buildings; realizing that these are older buildings that have been around for several decades; advising that she is not sure if they were planned that way but it is a very nice transition into what is predominantly a low rise single-family or duplex residential neighbourhood; advising that this is on a short list of a soon to be proposed Heritage Conservation District; noting that they have been exploring this topic and Council has been looking into whether or not that is going to be one of the next ones to study; indicating that it is also a neighbourhood that is under tremendous pressure already for infill development; indicating that this lot has been empty for decades and it is theoretically appropriate for infill development; advising that the buildings to the south of these lots are all two to two and a half storey homes, several award winning heritage designated properties and into the middle of this we are throwing a proposed sixteen storey building even though it is zoned for ten storeys; thinking that the Neighbourhood Association residents would consider a ten storey development assuming that it fit into the context of the neighbourhood streetscape; reading through the staff report as well as hearing the discussion online and in the media about the design of the building; expressing surprise when she was reading the staff report over the weekend to discover that there was an in-between design that, in her personal opinion, was very attractive; noting that the first one was quite bland and the most recent one, and she does not use this word lightly, as the Committee knows, they have heard her speak of design and architecture frequently, is remarkably ugly and she rarely, if ever, uses that term because it is such a subjective term, along with beautiful; indicating that it was quite jaw dropping; getting into the design and bonusing issues, and whether or not this building could be built at ten storeys, fourteen or sixteen, the staff recommendation is to allow for sixteen and the bonusing seems to be completely based on the design which she finds quite stunning; advising that it is going to be sensitive to the surrounding context, it will provide extra green space, it is an exceptional building design, etc.; reading these comments and she is flabbergasted because to her, this is a stolid, hulking monolithic design completely out of context to its surrounding streetscape and its neighbourhood and

it is a result of an unfortunate checklist design by Committee; checking off does it address heritage issues, does it address the step back, etc., etc.; unfortunately we have ended up with a cobbled together creature that is neither elegant or graceful unto its own as a standalone building nor does it compliment or adequately fit into the surrounding streetscape or proposed Heritage Conservation District; expressing shock that this would get bonusing based on exceptional design because if this is what London is going towards in terms of exceptional design, she has serious concerns for what our city is going to look like Downtown and the surrounding communities; recommending the Committee go back to version two because it was a very elegant looking building and perhaps massage some of the height restrictions as you have a winner there, with number three she would put to landfill right away; commenting on the historic stone wall, there seems to have been a variety of opinions about it, we believe that it is not original to the Locust Mount house itself, nonetheless, it is estimated to be about one hundred years old; stating that it is obviously hand crafted of fine stone, it is a neighbourhood landmark, it has, unfortunately, the final remnant of that fine home that was destroyed, arguably, by neglect and arson and/or neighbourhood fires and then ultimately demolished; urging the Committee to urge the developer, regardless of what gets built there, to retain this historic stone wall and incorporate it into the final design; asking that you not replicate it or take it apart and try and create some tribute to it or a commemoration in some new structure or in the building walls that get built; advising that no one in the heritage community supports commemorations of these types or replicas; noting that they are just a feel good gesture that seems to be used on a regular basis to fulfill what was once there, an original, real valuable piece of built heritage; suggesting that to put up a plaque is fine but please do not create a new fake old stone wall.