

"Have to get this right"



I am happy that this plan has been developed but I am also disappointed on many levels.

I will nit pick a few items:

1. In the planners analysis there was discussion of the impacts <sup>of the</sup> appeals to the London Plan - but we have no idea what properties within this draft plan are affected, other than 560 & 562 Wellington. We have no idea how these appeals, if successful will impact this proposal.

2. under point 4.5 Built Form, North Policy Area, planners analysis, allows that as the block is in the rapid transit corridor, higher heights are allowed. But I understood that much of the Rapid Transit Policy is under review, so it does not make sense to me. The map on page 26 of the Draft Plan shows this in blue. These properties that could be developed to a higher density are Victoria homes abutting West Woodfield HCD. So we are making a proposal that is in direct conflict with the London Plan, and the W Wood HCD, as well as this Draft: I quote page 3 of the draft "cultural heritage resources within the Victoria Park Secondary Plan are FOUNDATIONAL to the character of the area". This includes listed properties. I believe that the streetscape of Central Ave. is one of the best features of Victoria Park. Tampering with it is a mistake.

3. under point 2.2 of the Draft Plan, North Policy Area, it does not acknowledge that this block is bounded on 3 sides by HCD and, to my count from City Maps viewed today at the planning office, and not the version available to the public on City Maps, all but one of the properties are listed. The plan uses "many". But in fact it is almost all, so the actual statistic should be used.

4. The City already has an application in hand, in the East Policy Area, for the GWL parking lot at Wellington & Wolfe - there is not a discussion of how this will fit into the Draft Plan. If it is approved by council before the Draft Plan is approved then the whole east policy area is moot. Does this proposal meet the requirements of this Draft proposal, ESPECIALLY, in relation to stepping?

5. There appears to be strong wording for wind studies and shadowing. If the maximum heights were reached do you really think the flora of the park will thrive with only less than 6 hours of direct sunlight between Sep 21 and Mar 21? Also how will you enforce mitigation of wind? I have studied in depth the Wind Study for the 21 storey development at 560/562 Wellington that was done in 2014. Wind levels were unacceptable then. Winds have gotten worse in the last 6 years. You may be able to mitigate for pedestrians at ground level, but trees are higher than ground level and they have no where to hide. You can recess doorways to protect pedestrians, but there are no doorways for the trees. It is better to put in place planning now for acceptable levels of light and wind, rather than be seen to approve the maximum and try to back track later.

6. I would like to see everything above 6 stories lowered, with a maximum of the height of City Hall.

Hazel Elmstie

63 ARCADIA CR

VICTORIA PARK

Before E + W W

elevation of greenspace + landscaping?  
architecture