Good Morning Heather,

My following commentary on the above referenced site was received too late to be included in the Staff Report to PEC.

Melissa Campbell suggested I might send it to you to be included as an agenda item and forming part of the public record.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Marcus Coles
My commentary follows:

I find the concept of the building with its "Micro-suites" interesting and think such a structure might well be worth exploring in another larger, better provisioned site elsewhere.

In fact my major problems with the proposal are the destruction of this historic site and the fact that it is unsuitably large for the existing property.

The concept of zero automobile parking is I think rather far fetched at this time in history, especially in a neighbourhood where parking is already at a premium. But you can have a bicycle!, one per unit, good luck riding it in the winter.
I am actually a cyclist, so I'm not anti-bicycle, just realistic.

With the rather limited side yards, I'm wondering how servicing the rear garbage enclosure is going to work out with "up to 12 units"?

In the time of the few years of the current Owner's stewardship of this historic property I have seen what I consider an accelerated attempt at the classic "Demolition by Neglect", which when taken in the perspective of the Neighbourhood designated under Part 5 of the Heritage Act cannot be seen as anything other than a malicious act.

The preservation of the historic variation in the design and
scale of the historic streetscapes of the community are something that drove the Part 5 designation.

Expecting a Bonus for what is a destructive attempt at maximum monetization of a piece of real estate at the expense of a site which reflects valuable visible evidence of the mixed make-up and evolution of the historic Woodfield Community and London as a whole, is bizarre.

If one looks at the documented cultural history of the site and the implications of those uses, then the existing rather humble structure may be seen a having value on a national scale.

What I would like to see on the site is the current building restored externally and the interior turned into, rent able or sale able units and the building designated under Part 4 of the Heritage Act as it deserves.

The filling in of the variation of the streetscape with a somewhat disguised mini three storey walk-up is poor planning by the Owner and shows a lack of understanding of the current context of the street.

The Owner's attempts at pressing the popular buzz word buttons of "intensification", "car-free", "future solar", and "students and young professionals", in my opinion do nothing to hide the fact that the proposal over develops the site and disregards the published Heritage Guidelines entirely.

I cannot support this change of zoning and think it should be flatly rejected with no offer of compromise.

Thank you for the opportunity of sharing my thoughts on this matter.

Marcus Coles

38 Palace Street,
London,
Ontario.
N6B 3A7

The above represents my personal opinion alone and does not necessarily reflect that of any of my employers, clients, associates or the Woodfield Community Association of which I am a member.