

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – Victoria Park Secondary Plan – Draft Secondary Plan (O-8978)

- Eric Turcotte, Urban Strategies – stating that it is a pleasure to be here today and it has been a delight to be working with City staff and the community in developing the recommendation, the strategies, the policy that are a part of the plan; indicating that the key of the plan is to provide a greater comprehensive plan that looks at built form, that looks at open space, that looks at public realm, that looks at how the building development in the place is going to continue to evolve over time; noting that it is a framework for evaluating development proposals as they come forward because there are a lot of opportunities that will present themselves in the future as to how the place, Victoria Park, will continue to evolve; stating that it is a gem within the City, it is one of the magnificent features but there is also, as you can see, around the photo, there are some empty parking lots, places that are obvious places for development, so it is important to make sure that we are getting it right, that it consider the context, consider the heritage, the Act, that it continue to act as a central gathering place for the city and the region as a whole; indicating that the policies that are being put in place are generally in line with the London Plan but they also are bringing a level of specificity that is unique to, that responds to the uniqueness of the site here; noting that what you will see through the policy is the organize, although most policies apply to the entire character area; stating that there are some specific policies that would respond to each individual quadrant that are around the park because the whole park is not uniform, from that perspective so we think that the unique response that can occur; indicating that the plan principle came to you a couple of weeks ago, those were developed by the community through the public consultation, through the engagement, the principles are to preserve and strengthen the visual connection to Victoria Park and create a view corridor where possible to enhance that connectivity and create and improve those existing connections; stating that we need to make it safe and easy to get to the park; noting that this is a green gem, that the landscape edges around Victoria Park are critical and needs to continue to be strengthened and enhanced; indicating that there are two heritage conservation districts here, the West Woodfield as well as the Downtown Heritage Conservation District and these are important heritage resources that need to be preserved and to be enhanced; stating that we need to frame Victoria Park with an appropriate scale street wall, creating a base that frames the park is something that we think is extremely appropriate to create an appropriate comfortable pedestrian environment; noting that the plan as to identify opportunity from compatible and sensitive intensification to respond to the heritage context of the neighbourhood, as well as to the future transit, when it comes and is integrated to protect the residential identity of the Woodfield neighbourhood and mitigate its impact; stating that we want to support and animate the function of Victoria Park as active use and we want the ground uses around the park to support that animation; indicating that he mentioned the prominence of Victoria Park as a city gem, so that means that the buildings that are surrounding the park, we expect very high quality and design excellence, we expect that the response to these buildings, the character, the architecture, is of extremely high quality, probably higher quality than you would expect anywhere else because this is the centre of the city; indicating, again, that we want to enhance the park as not only a green space, but as a destination for all of London and beyond; stating that the policy focus on, there are some policies that are being embedded into the Secondary Plan, so these are consistent with the London Plan, but also they respond to the uniqueness of, and they provide greater specificity than what you have in the London Plan; noting that the policies that are based on your design principle, that we saw earlier, relates to the view corridor, connection, public realm, the cultural heritage, the built form, the land use and the compatibility of the park activities; indicating that he will go into a greater level of detail about what some of these policies that you have in the draft plan about what they specifically are; stating that one of the policies relates to protection and maintaining the creation of view

corridor; noting that you have some existing view corridor that are important to maintain, such as Wolfe Street, but as the development occurs, we think that it is important to continue to preserve some other views and maybe create views that actually create/foster a better connectivity with the park, including along Albert Street and Kent Street; indicating that related to the St. Peters Basilica Cathedral, where the green space along Dufferin Avenue and the façade of the church, maintain the connectivity so the green armature relates to Victoria Park, as well as the view from Victoria Park to the church, there are some places we think we would want to limit the development to maintain that visual connectivity with the church; indicating that there are also some potential connections that, as developments come forward, we want to integrate in future development, a way to facilitate access to the park; noting that those could be identified to one which could be potentially around Princess Avenue coming to the park, as well as Kent Street running east/west; stating that these do not necessarily need to be streets, they could be pedestrian walkways, they could be through development, they can take different forms, it does not have to be an entire street; stating that there are a lot of examples around the world that are quite creative about how you could create those magical places that help to improve and increase these linkages; indicating that we want to strengthen the character, that around the park there are beautiful green edges, the park spills over to the neighbourhoods, spill over on the adjacent street, it is important to continue to maintain and enhance that character as development comes forward so it will be something that will continue to contribute to the positive pedestrian experience; stating that the intention with the policy related to the cultural heritage policies are to complement what is already in the Official Plan, the London Plan, the Downtown Heritage Conservation District, as well as the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District; stating that there are good policies that are in place so the plans refer back to these policies and strengthen them and any new development that will actually occur within these heritage conservation districts will be required to receive a heritage alteration permit before they can continue to proceed, so they will be required to go through a process; indicating that from a built form perspective, the policy will inform height, setback, tower incorporation, podium, the base of the building, as well as expectation of high quality of the architecture; stating that there is a balance between the opportunity that exists around the park for intensification and the richness that exists around the park and the environment; noting that, as you can see in the plan, generally the higher the buildings are located adjacent to the downtown and as you move north there is an expectation of transition to the neighbourhood but also intensification that are anticipated along the transit corridor; noting that the plan includes demonstration scenarios, so this is not to say that this is what the future exactly looks like, this helps the team to inform what policies are going to be in place to ensure that we have a comprehensive way to develop around the park, understanding, for example, where there might be shadow impacts where a tall building is developed, this is being assessed, looking at the impact on the environment; stating that there are different ways there could be some buildings that are lower, that are mid-rise and you can see there is a transparent section on top of the buildings that are more solid and a transparent section, these indicate where, in the London Plan, in the current policy, where bonusing can be applied to allow people to go taller and that lets you capture some of the public benefit that can continue to enhance the character of the place; stating that if we do a tour around the block, we do have the northern policy, the area at Richmond, north of Central Avenue, its adjacent to the EA for the transit corridor, the corner of Central Avenue is a place where intensification is anticipated and the plan indicates that it could be a two to twelve storey building with the possible bonus of the sixteen storeys; noting that there is also a rich edge along the block of very strong heritage buildings but there is also the opportunity for infill within that section, so by preserving the heritage character there is an opportunity to actually create a sense of infill that we think is appropriate in the centre of the block as long as the heritage structures are being preserved; indicating that the east policy area, which is north of this building, there is the highest height of building anticipated just north of this building, so at the south end of the east area, south of Princess Avenue, and as we move north from Princess to Wolfe Street to Central Avenue,

there is a gradual decrease in height to respond to transition with the existing neighbourhood, we want to make sure that is a sensitive transition and some stepping in enough building to allow for the transition toward the more sensitive area of the neighbourhood; stating that the south policy area is where we see the highest level of intensification, buildings that are two to twenty storeys, up to thirty-five storeys with bonusing; noting that we do not expect that London Life is a building that would redevelop but there is a parking lot adjacent to it that we think could take a significant amount of development, and because of its relationship to the downtown, we think this is a place where there could be greatest intensification; indicating that toward the west policy area, the area south of Angel Street and the block that is occupied by St. Peters, there is also opportunity here because of its relationship to Richmond Street and the proximity to the EA, but also in a sensitive way integrate with the Basilica Cathedral, there is a way to preserve some of the individual connection of that connectivity that was shown earlier, but still allow for some intensification on the property; indicating that, from a land use perspective, the plans seek to permit a range of mixed use around the park with street oriented retail and service at grade, the place that it would be more encouraged, where street oriented retail and service at grade would be required along Richmond Street to continue to foster that main street character, that is something that would be very important; *(Councillor A. Hopkins interrupting to enquire how much longer is required for the presentation.)*; Mr. E. Turcotte indicating there is one slide left; stating that to recognize the importance of Victoria Park it is important that new development ensure compatibility with the park activities, that would include the new development that would apply to all development would be required to create a wind study, make sure there is a shadow study that is being put in place as well; stating that a noise study would as well be required, especially looking at the impact of the park to the unit, we want to ensure that the residents that are within these new residential development actually have their construction and design mitigate impact to the park as well as ensuring there are indoor and outdoor amenity spaces included within the development to also mitigate that intensification as there will be a lot of new residents coming here; noting that there needs to be a balance of new residents and users of the park as well as having private amenities within the development to help balance the use of the park. (See attached presentation).

- *(Councillor P. Squire enquiring how this built form that is being shown in the slides, how is it related to what those properties are currently being used for and whether there is any possibility they will ever be developed; he could not help but notice that there was an allowance for twenty-five storeys where there is a Baptist Church that has been there for a long, long time, much longer than he has been in London, how do you make that connection between we can build twenty-five storeys there and what he would think is a remote possibility that anyone is ever going to build twenty-five storeys there.)*; Ms. M. Knieriem, Planner II, responding that there is a lot of development interest around the Park, in the particular case of the Baptist Church, they are not proposing the removal of the Baptist Church, the towers are just south of it as a matter of clarity; indicating that what they look at is how they see the Park developing over the next twenty, thirty years, it is a long term vision so yes, they consider where there is development interest but they also have to consider the more broad, long-term development of the Park rather than just sort of where are we at today; *(Councillor P. Squire asking for a copy of the staff presentation as it is really helpful and they do not get them regularly, if someone is presenting he would really like to have their presentation if that is possible, he thinks that is sort of technical.)*; Mr. J.M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, responding that between Development Services and Planning, they can work with the City Clerk to figure out how to do that; *(Councillor A. Hopkins asking a technical question relating to the shadowing; she just wants to try to understand the shadowing, does it relate to the upper heights or does it relate to the bonusing; knowing that the bonusing is still in question at the moment but just trying to understand how the shadowing appears.)*; Ms. M. Knieriem, Planner II,

responding that the shadowing that was shown was all calculated using the height with the maximum bonus; for example, on the south side it would be the thirty-five storey so it is whatever the upper limit is in the bonus that is shown on the shadow study; (*Councillor A. Hopkins indicating that is what upper heights means then, with the bonusing, not what is allowed; thank you for that clarification*).

- Mary Francis O'Hagan, 460 Wellington Street – indicating that her work history was in public health, health promotion, community development and research for the Ministry of Health, addressing this report as it raises questions, it is titled “The Two Voices of Woodfield: A Case Study in Public Participation”; referencing the photograph on page seven, the photograph that is shown has been distorted making the building look derelict; noting that her husband drew the yellow lines shown in her presentation to show the degree of distortion in this picture; indicating that this building is located at 560 Wellington Street; advising that the immediate reaction to looking at this photograph is to say this ugly building should be demolished; showing a photograph of the building that is in excellent condition, classic architecture of the era, built in fact in 1967, it is five storey in keeping with the buildings on Victoria Park; stating that then they go on to show precedents; indicating four parks are shown from aerial views; since most of us do not have wings showing the parks at ground level; showing Rittenhouse Square in Philadelphia; noting that this park resembles a concrete fishbowl; it must be stifling in the summer; showing an image of Dorchester Square at night with lights from the high rises and retail stores with their neon lights Victoria Park will look like this; believing this will have a negative impact on Victoria Park's tranquility such as the Christmas lights; showing an image of 22 Picton Street, fine, where it is located one block from Victoria Park, not imposing on the Park; advising that they go on to say that the “existing zoning of land adjacent to the proposed development, only six metres away, can be built to thirty storeys in height”; noting that the land they are referring to is the parking lot at 556 Wellington Street between Centennial Hall and Wolfe Street; outlining that they then go on to say “for the benefit of neighbourhood coherence, most buildings in the sequence should present a consistent alignment unless there is a good reason for a break”; providing a very simple solution, change 556 Wellington Street from thirty storeys to five storeys, this in fact, will preserve the neighbourhood coherence which is now five storeys around the Park; stating that two surveys were done by Blackridge, their client; believing this is the fox guarding the chicken coop; to prevent real, or the appearance of bias, any survey research should have been conducted by a neutral third party not from London; indicating that in this situation the researchers tend to cherry pick a few citizens and locations and engineer the results to prove their hypothesis, in research it is called a positive hypothesis and these data are useless; pointing out this is bad research, bad methodology; reading part of the summary “it will bring over a million dollars in annual property tax revenues, yet save billions in infrastructure...”, the same revenues and savings are available if the high rises are in the vicinity like 22 Picton Street; believing the retail stores are for the convenience of the residents and the profits of the developers, there are numerous retail outlets in the immediate vicinity, it is about ROI; profits are good; (*Councillor A. Hopkins indicating that she is coming up to five minutes*.); showing an image of Merrion Square in Dublin, the park was shown by Urban Strategies, its perimeter is surrounded by four storey two hundred year old Georgian townhouses, no retail stores, no neon signs; stating that in the 1950's wreckers appeared to demolish the townhouse for high rises and Dubliners, forming a human arm-in-arm chain greeted the wreckers and the rest is history; asking that Londoners and the City Council have the will and fortitude of those committed Dubliners to preserve Victoria Park's tranquility and open vistas into perpetuity. (See attached presentation.)

- Jennifer Granger, President, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, London Branch – advising that the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario has been following this with a great deal of interest of course; indicating that they have looked over the draft plan and they see some excellent things going on here, it is wonderful to see the support for re-establishing connections to the Park with both Kent Street and Princess Avenue possibly in the future; stating that it is good to see the recommendation to extend the green space in the Park's public realm beyond the current Park perimeters, it is good to see the requirement for wind and noise studies that they see in Section 4.8 and it is very exciting to see specific mention and promotion of mid-rise buildings of about four to eight storeys; looking at the examples of Ridden House Square and various other places that they just saw shows why high rises enclosing parks are a concern and why a mid and low-rise buffer zone around Victoria Park would be vital to conserving its open vistas; pointing out a few little things that they have looked at that are puzzling them, for example, in Section 4.4 it said any future development applications in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan boundary for a property that is located in the Downtown Heritage Conservation District or the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District will still be required to receive Heritage Alteration Permits prior to development; indicating that that almost makes it sound as if it is going to be easy to make some substantial changes to the heritage buildings that are close to the Park; expressing concern in 4.6, talking about bonusing but it is actually very vague; enquiring about bonusing, why do they have to have bonusing, what does the City get back, does it get enough back when it allows for bonusing; wondering why not, if an area is zoned for a certain number of storeys, why not just leave it at that; indicating that there does not seem to be very much so far that talks about preserving and protecting vistas, open sky views, if you are going to be standing in the Park in the future, are you still going to have a view of some blue sky; advising that they would like to see a little bit more about that, there are by-laws that have been enacted in Ontario that protect important views and vistas including that of Queens Park in Toronto as an example; reminding the Planning and Environment Committee is that with the information that they have received from the City at the moment, there is 46.6 acres, that is 19% of the Downtown core that is surface parking space, either private or City owned and it is basically just sitting there undeveloped which is contrary to most progressive City building tenants; advising what they need to do is protect the urban historical and natural jewels that make Downtown living so attractive while at the same time trying to build up those under used and wasted sites so if we were to have future development on the Downtown parking lots, then we would not need to tear down so many heritage buildings and we would not need to have so much development around Victoria Park itself; suggesting that we should have parking lots that are near the Park, if they are going to be developed, then they should be appropriate heights, low or mid-rise, so as not to overshadow the Park and if we are going to have high-rises, they should have them farther away and preferably on those unused parking lots.
- Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent – see attached presentation.
- Derek Rice, 296 Queens Avenue – commenting on the comments that have been said mostly about the property on Wolfe Street, since it seems like it is the constant topic; indicating that one of the comments that was made was about a biased survey that was done for it and that got him thinking; after the last public meeting for this, The London Free Press put out a survey about high density, low density and ironically enough, over fifty percent said they were for high density and he feels that that is probably as unbiased as you are going to get; finding that interesting; advising that with the plan that has come out it seems to go for the low density which he thinks is not really forward thinking, the population of London is going up and it is going up fast, we need to be planning for the future, not for right now; understanding that heritage is important and it is important to a lot of people and he respects that but buildings like the Wolfe Street one, he does not think a big brick building does not scream heritage to him; encouraging

anyone to go on street view; if you look on street view, on Google Maps, looking down Wolfe Street you cannot really see that building, you do not see the top of it so if you put a thirty storey building there you are not going to see the top of it either, it is not going to look much different, it is just not going to be made of brick so from that point of view it is not a big worry; seeing somebody down there doing the street view thing, that is good; in terms of things like that it is clearly a development that they want to develop, a lot of the high density that they have proposed is in areas where something is already built or there is nothing being planned there; in the case of the Wolfe Street there is clearly a want to develop it and that two to eight storeys, he believes, is the current proposed; stating that it does not make sense to knock down a five or six storey building to build an eight storey building, it is not going to get done and therefore there is no high density, there is no population gain if nothing is being built and urban sprawl is going to keep happening, it is something to consider; it seems the plan put forward in some ways is thought out but it seems a bit nearsighted to him; the population of London is going up, it is going up quickly, if you have looked to buy a house you will see it is not easy to buy in London so things of high density he thinks they need to be pushed forward a lot more than they are; understanding a lot of people probably do not agree with him from that aspect but again he thinks the City needs to be planning for the future not to hold onto the now.

- Kate Rapson, Chair, Woodfield Community Association – thanking the Planning and Environment Committee for taking the time to listen to the public input; knowing there is a lot of people here waiting to speak; stating that this is London's park, there are a lot of cities around the world that have similar sized urban parks, the most well-known and appealing of these parks have been protected with restrictions to develop around the perimeter; stating that while London needs to grow up and not out, currently there is over two million square feet of surface parking lots in the Downtown core; believing they should be the focus of exciting development opportunities and incentives while protecting the valuable shared green spaces in the heart of our city which make an attractive space for everyone to live, work and play; there are a number of projects underway or proposed in the core already, indicating that currently there are about five hundred fifty under construction and there are applications at various stages or in the approval process for almost twenty-eight hundred units; stating that the Woodfield Community Association has a number of requests and questions based on the concerns raised at a recent public annual general meeting back in April as well as other feedback she has heard from neighbours; noting that this was e-mailed to the members of the Planning and Environment Committee as well; wondering if we can do more to preserve and enhance the green spaces or the edges as the plan refers to such as the boulevards, front yards and setbacks, a new building should have setbacks with green space and trees and there should not be any exceptions to that; an Environmental Impact Study of new developments of this scale, as far as she knows, has not been done; asking the Committee to please direct City staff to conduct one as there is little data of what the impact would be of new development of this scale on the parks ecology in the draft plan yet they feel that it is important given the City, as far as she understands, has declared an environmental crisis so what does it mean now if we are going to intensify it to this level, how does it impact our urban spaces which are critical as the city intensifies; advising that recently it was revealed to her, someone pointed this out, that there is actually a Victoria Park Restoration Master Plan which has been brought to her attention which dates back to 1999, has a lot of interesting parallels between the discussion today that they are having about Victoria Park and back then; it suggests that even then the City recognized environmental risks of over use of this open space; noting that this plan should have been referred to in the draft Secondary Plan; based on this Master Plan, the Secondary Draft should answer what is the carrying capacity of the Park today; believing this would help them understand how the Park is being used and the impact of uses that will change considerably with high density

intensification so even then in 1999, the report stated that the Park had exceeded its carrying capacity so it will be interesting to see what it is today and how it relates to what it did then; wondering if the plan can examine specific policies to limit the height of the new towers to twenty storeys in the south policy area where the plan currently supports up to thirty-five storeys with bonusing; advising that the west end of the south area, while it is not in the West Woodfield Heritage District, but the development would impact the Park which is in the Heritage District and protected under several policies; wondering if the plan can examine ways to limit the height to the east policy area to fewer than eighteen storeys, currently the draft supports building up to twenty-five storeys; if the principles were there to protect view corridors, why does the plan show two twenty-five storey towers along Clarence Street; the west policy area is of particular concern, this area abuts Woodfield where there are predominantly two to three storey buildings along Wolfe Street and Waterloo Street, there is very little buffer between the high rise towers and these homes; enquiring about the City Hall precinct area, her understanding is that City Hall was to be the center piece of that where there plan that was presented tonight shows a different twenty-five storey tower which would over shadow City Hall so it is a good question to have, what is the vision for the Square and City Hall in relation to the Park, do we want to overshadow City Hall with other buildings or do we want to make it the showcase or the front porch of London; (*Councillor A. Hopkins reminding her that she is coming up to five minutes.*); wondering what more can this plan do to ensure the views and public access are protected if the draft were approved as it is, the south side of the Park would have thirty storeys, the west side would have twenty-five storeys and so on, the result would be there are towers on all four sides of the Park; while the draft does a good job at summarizing the issues and concerns, there seems to leave many critical pieces such as wind shadowing and traffic impacts; that part of the application process on new applications is left to site plan approval stage so it feels like a lot of critical pieces are left to site plan rather than the planning part; as the City sets its goal to increase intensification by forty-five percent, how close is London to that in the core, why is there so much pressure to build around the Park when the Downtown is still underdeveloped.

- Stephen Stapleton, Vice-President, Auburn Developments – understanding that there are going to be subsequent processes to speak with staff and they welcome that; advising that they do have some issues with the draft as presented; although they have had, and he saw it in the first stage, a major role in the genesis of this project, they did not want to turn it into a referendum on their application; thinking the discussion would be helpful for all of them to understand the sensitivities that Mr. J.M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, spoke about and how it relates to height; indicating that people understand that and they can appreciate that argument, how you allocated the height, how you came about, what are the sensitivities, what is driving its location; thinking we would be better off, all of them, understanding where this is going; coloured plans without basic background reports, the analysis attached in an Appendix would have been helpful for this so they would look for that information as part of the discussion as they move forward so they can appreciate where they are going with this and the Committee and the members of the community could also understand and he can understand as well; thinking there is still a lot of work to do here; knowing their reward for being part of the genesis of this was getting the lowest height on their property so they will be looking to try to maximize that somewhat in the future months and they welcome the dialogue.
- Christine Dirks, - see attached presentation.
- Tom Okansky, 310 Wolfe Street – advising that he is a resident, owner and investor in other properties in the area, particularly old Victorian properties; applauding Council endorsing the principles and comment that overall the draft plan conforms to those principles; we, the representatives of the Friends of

Victoria Park group, understand that you seek to find compromises in what the consultants have acknowledged at the very outset was an unfortunate set of existing zoning parameters which restricts the creativity of what could otherwise be accomplished around the Park; advising that they have several detailed points to the draft plan which they will express in a document to be presented to the Committee but he would like to highlight three of those that they deem most crucial; first, Victoria Park's ambiance is largely defined by the comfortable mix of low rise residential, institutional and commercial that exists today; the public and planning opinion reported in the staff summary recorded in the principles and expressed in the plan seeks to preserve and enhance that environment; indicating that the draft plan includes a case study of urban parks which notes in their study places where a park was situated in a historical built form context or should they say in a Heritage Conservation District new development complemented the historic architecture in form, scale and use of materials and further notes that in most cases these built form edges were between four and ten storeys in height; the properties around Victoria Park are governed by not just the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District but also the Downtown Heritage Conservation District and a specific heritage designation for Victoria Park; the Consultants' report highlights several parks around the world that are similar in size and are profoundly successful that will also be in a predominant building height of four and five storeys, this is the same height that the Heritage Conservation Plan endorses; advising that this is the height that the Friends of Victoria Park implore you to consider; stating that the Park is a jewel, it is not just a Park, it is an extension of civic space in our town square; asking to please keep any new development, especially the development along Clarence Street, which is not currently zoned for high rise development to six storeys and maintain the strong building height created by the London Life building on the south, St. Peter's Basilica and the Baptist Church on the west and the historic buildings that wrap the north and south and east portions; secondly, they advocate the removal entirely of bonus zoning of all buildings surrounding the Park, the criteria that allow for bonusing complicates and compromises the principles the Committee is endorsing in the Secondary Plan; for example, one is the provision of affordable housing, the requirement for a twenty percent discount from average rents that will certainly exceed \$1,800 a month around the Park would hardly constitute affordable; another bonusing provision is given for public parking, they have been told many times by those same developers wanting to build high rises that you cannot economically, feasibly build more than two storeys of parking underground in this area; to create more parking will require aboveground parking, levels which then create dead spaces along the building and there are ample opportunities to provide such bonusing in other areas of the city where the height of the building is not nearly as contentious; Section 4.3 of the Summary deals with the public realm, the principles to preserve and enhance the landscaped edges indicates that the improvements to the streetscape will expand the green landscaping of the Park into the surrounding area; bravo, in the City owned area that includes Centennial Hall and Centennial House apartments in Reg Cooper Square the suggested development plans for the elimination of that green space and landscaping on a thirty storey building with a large podium is allowed; proposing that the City examine its own commitment to the principles of this plan because that is City-owned land; encouraging the City to take a leadership role in this planning process with the properties it owns that front a significant portion of that Parks perimeter; wondering, would it not be perhaps more in keeping with the principles to down zone the property, a very intense idea, down zoning, but the City could do that, down zone those properties height and make this Square an extension of the Park in a way that, unfortunately, has not been achieved to date; think about what a true civic square could look like that includes an intentional connection with Victoria Park by creating a section of flex street in front of Reg Cooper Square, this would especially enhance the connection to the Park in those times in which Wellington Street is closed due to

events at the Park; indicating that those are his key points and in summary, asking that we not be deterred from what has been an otherwise constructive exercise by staff, citizens and Councillors to engage Londoners in determining the future direction of Victoria Park.

- Sandra Miller, 32 Upper Avenue – thinking it has been a Jurassic Park kind of day; believing we have all seen the film and you might recall a really popular quote from that film; paraphrasing, we are so preoccupied with how we can that we do not stop to think if we should; keeping that in mind; expressing appreciation to the city staff and the consultants for their continuing work on this important once in a generation plan that will guide and determine the long-term value of Victoria Park; indicating that we, Londoners, all of us, are the stewards of this historical and ecological urban jewel; indicating that Victoria Park is a beloved, shared community gathering space that was first established in 1874, this is not some random real estate to be exploited and leveraged from maximum market sales and municipal tax income; hoping to see a cohesive and grand vision for the Victoria Park precinct; random high rise infill based only on zoning and developer proposals fall short of the vision expected of a Secondary Plan and it is unsettling to see so many important details left to individual site plan review; expressing surprise and disappointment to see little, if any discussion, of the ecological value of the Park in this Secondary Plan compared to other comparable plans such as the London Psychiatric Hospital's Secondary Plan; wondering if staff and the consultants reviewed the 1999 Victoria Park Restoration Master Plan and/or the 1995 Victoria Park Inventory and the condition report; if so, how are the findings of those reports included in this draft Secondary Plan and, if not, will that happen; hopefully before the final Plan is submitted for voting and review; advising that even nicer would be to see an update of the Park Restoration Master Plan; noting there are a lot of statistics in there about usage and the current state it was in twenty years ago, it was already over pressured and over used; ultimately, this artificial demand to develop the perimeter around Victoria Park is being driven by the lack of availability of the more than two million square feet of shovel ready surface parking lots laying fallow in our Downtown core; wondering why we should encourage and allow development of a cluster of high rises surrounding Victoria Park when a full twenty percent of our Downtown core is still surface parking lots and a large chunk of it is also low rise buildings that could easily be built up, built over, demolished, they are not all heritage buildings; enquiring what is Council doing to help unlock and leverage those desirable development sites prioritized in The London Plan and what are you doing to protect valuable ecological and historical sites such as Victoria Park and our riverfront that make the Downtown living so appealing to people of all ages including newcomers who are moving to London; indicating that there are so many creative ways for us as a City to grow inward and upward, to increase access to real affordable housing, to continue to revitalize our core and conserve our valuable environmental and heritage resources; hyper intensification of this urban oasis while so many core parking lots continue to languish is irresponsible and abdicates our collective civic leadership; looking forward to participating with other Londoners in the continued fine tuning of this important Secondary Plan for the benefit of generations of Londoners to come.
- Greg Priamo, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Great West Life – advising that they received the document on Thursday and they are doing a careful review of it and they plan to take advantage of the future public participation processes that are planned for this project; indicating that it is evident from the comments tonight that there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed; expressing agreement with planning staff that it is important and from some of the comments from the public to get this right and finding the right balance to ensure that everybody's interests are being attended to and they look forward to participating in that process; stating that the report now presents some challenges given their plans for their clients property but that does not mean that they do not feel like they

cannot find positive solutions to those differences and they look forward to an engagement with staff and other stakeholders in the process to try to find those; thinking it is important for the Committee to understand that they are involved and they will continue to be involved and are thankful for the opportunity; indicating they will make detailed submissions to staff and if necessary to the Committee when the matter comes back before them in the Fall.

- Gary Brown, 35A – 59 Ridout Street South – indicating that this is not his neighbourhood but he is one of the multitudes in London that gets lost when it comes to elections and rate assessments; noting that they pay more than anyone else, he is a renter so places like Victoria Park, the Coves, the Green, they are his front and backyard; stating that he chooses to live in an urban environment and these are the green spaces that he uses; remembering a similar argument taking place not that long ago about the Coves when they wanted to build two tall towers on Toyotatown; remembering this Planning department and this Council opposing this and taking it to the Ontario Municipal Board; advising that he is not so sure what is different here, they are having the opposite, they are proposing tall buildings around the Park; wondering if the historical vista here is not of equal value; noting that he spends more time in Victoria Park, everybody does; looking at the pictures of Merrion Square in Dublin, one of the principles in their country is the preservation of historical vistas and they really take it seriously; wondering why we do not think about it; asking a couple of questions; wondering what bus rapid transit corridor they are referring to because he does not know of any plan on the books whatsoever and it has been voted down; advising that he would really like that question answered because if they were having a discussion about intensification around a bus rapid transit corridor, his comments would be entirely different; predicating this discussion on that, it was mentioned earlier by the consultant, he would like to know what the Committee is referring to at this point; assuming we are talking all residential studies and would he be correct in assuming that the ratepayer is on the hook for development charges; indicating that as we build taller, is that not more money that has to come from the ratepayer to pay these development charges; realizing we say we wave them but that is technically illegal and they have to be paid by somebody; wondering if it is not in the developers best interest in general to build taller buildings and get even larger of a subsidy from taxpayers; reiterating that he would like his questions answered as the Committee is looking at very tall buildings here; expressing agreement with some of the comments earlier that he thinks that every building around this place right now is four to five storeys in height and it feels comfortable to walk there; realizing we are trying to build taller buildings that do not intimidate pedestrians but so far there is not a tall building that he walks by in this city that he is comfortable walking by as a pedestrian; reiterating that it is something that we are trying but we have failed so far so do we not need to demonstrate that ability before they even consider building tall buildings around our cities most coveted and loved green space.
- Janet Hunten, 253 Huron Street – commenting on the citation of The London Free Press poll; thinking that most of us know how easy it is to influence an online poll; stating that the words street wall came into one of the principles which seems a bit alarming; noting it is the word wall that is alarming; suggesting that the streetscape across from the Park on every side should be low, mostly where we see it now and that it should be porous, with a variation in the heights as you go along and the allowable height should increase gradually as you move farther away from the Park.