

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Victoria Park Secondary Plan

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. Committee, I might hold off on any technical questions and go. We have at least one delegation so you can have a seat Ms. Knieriem. Thank you so much for that. So I will go first to Mr. Stapleton who is here with a presentation of his own I do believe.
- Stephen Stapleton: Thank you very much Madam Chair and Members of Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to come back again and speak to you about the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. After a year and a half of process unfortunately there still remains some issues that are yet to be resolved as part of this process. Fundamentally they deal with how to determine appropriate height around the Park. What we need to understand about how we go about understanding or determining what's appropriate height, there's an evolution process that we go through, we have to understand the evolution of the core what transitional cues exist, is this neighborhood a stable neighbourhood or is it a transitional neighborhood, these locational attributes are they in proximity to support intensification, these are things like open space, employment, retail, things of that nature but we also have to understand what are the impacts of having this intensification in this process and this dialogue continues today. The first aspect if I could just take a couple of seconds I'm going to be around five minutes, I timed myself so I should be okay, is the historical evolution of the area and it's quite interesting the evolution of Victoria Park and our quadrant, I'll call it, which is the east policy area. They developed separate from Woodfield, they evolved later than Woodfield; however, at one point in time they did have an urban fabric similar with single family homes along the east side of, of the Wellington corridor. You'll notice this in, in these photographs. The original block south of or north of Dufferin all the way to almost Pall Mall was the Military Barracks and Garrison. This, this shows you approximately the location of our property at 560-562 Wellington Street in that configuration. These photos show the evolution of the Wellington corridor, that should say "prior to year 1972" at the top, not, that's the historical single detached residential lot fabric that existed on Wellington. It was replaced in the 1960s, early 70s, with the conversion of this corridor to employment, institutional, residential and office uses that stretch from Wellington and extend to our property on the south side of Wolfe Street at 560-562 Wellington. Determining appropriate height, so when we look at this, we spoke about locational attributes, you know, intensification close to employment, open space, entertainment, retail, having the infrastructure to accommodate that of a policy framework that supports that, a transit proximity also assists in and dictating to intensification but the question remains how high and where? So determining height we have to do an assessment and a characterization of the area. That means determining whether or not the area is significantly impacted by height and you do that through analysis of the area, is it a stable area, is this a single family residential area where rear yard amenity space is being used for private uses is it transitional meaning is it conversions, is it existing houses being utilized for multi-family office and those rear yard amenity areas being converted for parking spaces. These are these types of cues that represent whether or not you have a stable area or transitional neighbourhood. That depends and those cues will tell you how sensitive you have to determine height. So what are the sensitivities? Well, obviously, sensitivities for someone's rear yard with a pool and private amenity space is more significant than someone's parking area and, and in fact, in this, in our block, we have those cues taken place. So this is south of Wolfe Street looking from our office building down into the internal neighborhood that's in the rear of our property. It is designated Neighbourhood currently; it is under appeal; however, you do have an eight story apartment building and more internal to the Woodfield community. You'll notice the numerous parking spots in all the photographs, there's a number of multi-family and office uses within this block. These cues and

these reasons, because you're on the periphery of downtown, you see these transitional natures all around downtown, on the periphery of downtown, it really informs Planners that these areas are under stress, they are under pressures due to the locational attributes, to suggest a change in land use. So that's what's happening and it's been happening around Victoria Park for some time. This is the transitional multi-family units, this is a City document that came from City Hall shows licensees on Wolfe Street, shows you, it also informs you of the transitional nature that I specified earlier. The existing zoning also informs land use in the area. There's a number of properties with the existing zoning ranging from 22 storeys to 30 storeys on the east side of *(Councillor Cassidy: You have about thirty seconds left.)*; Ok, sorry. I'll speed up. Everyone knows that story. Also this area has already developed once like I said in the 70s it was re-converted and those changes did not affect Woodfield either. Compatibility of built form doesn't equate to compatibility. Again I point you back to the issue of characterization and transitional nature of the area. The issue with the with height, you'll notice in the Secondary Plan the north policy area identifies a 16 story limit which is internalized building within the north policy area; we're seeking a similar height on our block as well, 16 stories. *(Councillor Cassidy: You are over your five minutes right now.)* I have one thing that I should show the Committee. I also see the, the, obviously the public process was quite thorough and there was a number of people that spoke in favor of development not just of our site but the east side of Wellington so I raise that point as well. So in summary in the last Planning Committee I was at there was mention of virtual reality renderings of the area, how does it feel, we did this before we saw the Secondary Plan last Thursday so we went with the, the heights that were described in the draft document, twenty-five city hall sites, twenty-five, twenty-two, the London Life building that you'll see is as the current application is at 18 storeys and then our property is shown at 15 storeys which we did share with staff some time ago. *(Councillor Cassidy: Thank you.)* It's less than a minute. So this is Dufferin Street, driving Down Dufferin Street you get in your flying car, you turn left these are the buildings we just articulated certain buildings, not sure if they're going to be residential or not. This is from Clarence Street looking across the Park showing the band shell in the east streetscape of Wellington Street so it gives you an idea of how it frames the Park and things of that nature. This is on Wellington Street, of course, in front of our proposal, the London Life building next to us and walking through the Park so I think we hit the points that some members of the Committee or Council were at the last meeting. *(Councillor Cassidy: I'm going to have to stop you there. I have given you a lot of leeway.)* We are done. Thank you. *(Councillor Cassidy: Thank you for your presentation Mr. Stapleton.)* (See [attached presentation](#).)

- Councillor Cassidy: We have another presentation. You can come forward to the podium and we will see your presentation. And if you can state your name and I will wait until he gets your thing up on the screen so that we don't start your time too soon because I know sometimes these technical things take time. You can give us your name and once your presentation starts I will give you five minutes.
- Hazel Elmslie, 63 Arcadia Crescent: Although I lived in the Woodfield neighbourhood from 1973 to 2016 and I'm here to talk about impact and how does it feel and I don't agree with Mr. Stapleton but I do not have really big issues with the draft Plan as it's been amended. I believe that street engagement, all the things that they're talking about street engagement, wind, shadowing, parking, understanding that there's quicksand all around here so I don't know how much underground parking they're going to be able to do. Setbacks and greening put into the redevelopment are all very very positive things of this draft Plan and I would like Council to make this so tight when you finally pass it that LPAT will not be able to overturn any portion of it that is so important outsiders making decisions for Londoners. That's not fair. So to talk to Mr. Stapleton in the public amenity space I would remind him that his wind tunnel study of the 30 storeys that was proposed for his property was unsafe in the winter, all winter, and the recommendation from the wind study people was to have the doors

locked so that is why I am so concerned about wind in the Park; however, now we're gonna look at impact on another building that is going not too far from the Park so this is on Dufferin Ave looking east, you can see the Basilica there and then you can see this new building that hardly started, it's going to be 31 storeys, I think and, then we go to the other side of the Basilica and that's what we see and then we go to the corner of Angel Street with the church, the Baptist Church, backing me and this is what you see and we cross the street and we look down Richmond Street and this is what you see. These people pictures were taken this morning so the sun wasn't in my favor and the last picture is looking across the Park from the driveway at Centennial Hall. The tower of the Basilica is right here but this is what, you're gonna see it up here, it's going to be up here, and then last of all, we're looking from the Red Cooper Square steps towards London Life, of course that's One London Place and 35 storeys can go back in here, that's what we're gonna see. So how does that impact make you feel folks? That's all I'm asking. How does it make you feel? (See attached presentation.)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Elmslie. So we have another presentation I believe. Mr. Pol is here and if you want to come to the podium.
- W. Pol: Thank you very much Madam Chair for the opportunity to speak. I was retained through the Urban 360 Lab at Fanshawe College to assist the Friends of Victoria Park. The principle that we'd like to bring forward as Friends of Victoria Park are a vibrant, diverse and healthy neighbourhood that creates a sense of place and character, this is taken as an excerpt from The London Plan 193.9. This is what we're trying to achieve and these principles include retaining the existing landscape, the topographical features in integrating things like Victoria Park into the neighborhood. Proposals that articulate the neighbourhoods character demonstrate how it fits into that neighborhood context. Designed to enhance and ensure that the historical context is conserved into that sense of place being Victoria Park and finally street patterns that encourage active transportation, cycling and walking in support of a transit service. That's what the Friends of Victoria Park are interested in creating. As part of our background work on behalf of the Friends of Victoria Park we prepared these renderings the building in the brown this is a view from City Hall looking across to the west to, through Victoria Park. This was done in August of 2019 so these are the assumptions that we were using at the time. The brown building is under construction now and the proposed ones would be shown in yellow. This is the view from the band shell towards Saint Peter's Basilica on Richmond Street. The view northerly towards, across Central Avenue, Richmond Street being on the left, the view from Victoria Park across the Boar Memorial to the potential development adjacent to the now Canada Life buildings and finally conceptually looking north along Wellington Street adjacent to Centennial Hall and just south of Wolfe Street. From my review of the material 30 storey tall buildings are going to have impact on the sunlight, wind and rain patterns and before the City proceeds, as you may have heard earlier today, we really need to understand the impacts, the physical impacts, on the environment. We think that a Victoria Park neighborhood should consider low and mid-rise apartments to create a neighbourhood where we can create that sense of place. Generally in reviewing the Central London area, mid and low-rise apartments are few and far between and then in fact high-rise development should be directed to vacant parking lots in the downtown core. Mid-rise would be examples on Huron Street, Proudfoot Lane, Fanshawe Park Road East, we have many examples of what could be developed in a mid-rise form of residential. As part of our background work we also partnered with other community members to look at the potential development of parking lots in the core area, the concepts in gray show existing and approved sites, the concept in browns are opportunity sites for parking lot redevelopment. Based on a conservative estimate approximately 2,400 new units could be developed in the downtown without the need to develop in a Victoria park neighborhood. If we look towards bonusing that could be several times that amount, larger buildings with public amenity. And finally, active transportation public transit. Although this is a design exercise we do need to consider policies for cycling in addition to pedestrian access.

There is very little consideration of public transit and on the, on the opposite side of that potentially reducing the amount of parking to encourage other forms of transit. (Councillor Cassidy: *You have about thirty seconds left.*) In terms of height principles an excerpt from Jan Gehl's book on Cities for People at about 5 stories we have a connection to the core area, we've seen these photographs. Recommended heights, angular plane of 45 degrees, Neighbourhood Place Type 2 to 4, Downtown Place Type 2 to 8, Rapid Transit Corridor 2 to 12. In conclusions we are supporting a Victoria Park neighborhood based on a scale that is mid-rise and supports a sense of place. Our recommendation is that the, that the Victoria Park Secondary Plan be reconsidered by staff for three matters: impact on the natural environment, policies regarding heights be revised and include policies on active transportation. Thank you very much for your time Madam Chair and Committee Members. I am available for any questions. (See attached presentation.)

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Pol. Are there any other presentations to be seen on screen? No. Ok. So any members of the public that would like to comment. We have four microphones, one, two, three and four. Make your way to the microphone, give us your name and you'll have five minutes. There we go. Go ahead.

- Dania Walker, 570 Wellington: I'm one of those dinosaur single family home, no rear parking, it's definitely a backyard. I just wanted to go on record for that. 570 Wellington.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Walker. Go ahead up there and then we'll come back down here.

- Jennifer Granger, President, ACO London: To begin with I'd like to say on behalf of ACO that we definitely appreciate the City's efforts to try and balance the intensification with the cultural heritage resources around the Park. I am especially delighted to hear about the possibility of designating the buildings on the north side; however, we do have a few concerns, further to Ms. Elmslie's comments that we heard earlier. Immediately north of Saint Peter's Cathedral heights of up to 30 storeys may be permitted transitioning down to 25 storeys further north of Saint Peter's. That sounds very high for that particular spot and there's been much consideration of view corridors but I would like to express some concern of what the view of the Cathedral is going to look like if you're standing to the south of it and you're looking towards the north. I just wonder what that particular view will look like once there's something that's 30 storeys there. Now we have heard that the Victoria Park Secondary Plan will trump the H.C.D., the West Woodfield H.C.D., I'm not clear exactly on how that works but it seems to be that not enough attention is being paid to the to the Heritage Conservation District of West Woodfield and its guidelines. If we do have tall buildings within the H.C.D. it seems like that sets a precedent for high-rises in other H.C.D.'s around the city. I'm not sure that that's the direction that most of us want to go in. There are many suitable development sites on the southern edge of downtown and ACO has mentioned this many times that it seems as though according to the Planning Department, 19% or 20% of downtown is actually surface parking lots and I think that that is where the City should be encouraging developers to put their high-rises rather than surrounding the Park and I realize that the City can't necessarily tell the developers this is what they're going to do but it would be appreciated if there is some way to encourage them to actually do this. Thank you.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Ms. Granger. First I will go to this microphone down here. Is there anybody down at the lower level here who would like to speak?

- Kate Rapson, speaking on behalf of the Woodfield Community Association: Thank you to the Planning Department and to Michelle and all those involved for drafting this and members of PEC for listening to the Plan and as well as the

comments and certainly a difficult thing certainly to balance as Jennifer mentioned intensification with preserving the Park and also preserving the Woodfield Community. There's lots of varying opinions in our community on the impact of high-rises and what they might mean to Victoria Park, some will say build lots of buildings and build them as high as you can and others will say build high but maybe in the right location. At our last AGM we discussed the Victoria Park Secondary Plan at length, in attendance, there was about seventy people, there was overwhelming majority agreed that this high of intensification scenario and just to remind you that last Spring the Planning Department at one of the public meetings had showed three scenarios low, mid and high intensification around the Park, the one that's the Secondary Plan that is being proposed today looks like they opted for the high intensification around the Park. People at the AGM felt that that level of intensification around the Park would be detrimental to the Park itself, if it's a crown jewel we feel we should protect it and respect it and not sell it to developers. Specifically our concerns live at the height of the buildings along the west and east sides areas of Park, these are thirty storey buildings, no matter how they're designed they should, they would impact this small urban park. We also agree with Jennifer at the ACO as well that the current draft disregards to a large part the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District guidelines which state that new buildings in the area should be low to mid-rise. So in conclusion we would like to ask that the Planning Committee refer this draft back to Planning, sorry, that PEC refer this back to Planning and look for ways to balance the City's intensification goals with the health and access to the Victoria Park as well as to examine how low to mid-rise developments would meet intensification goals whatever they are and finally we like to ask the Planning to hire a consultant to study the environmental impact of this current Plan. If all the buildings were constructed what would the impact be on the Park in terms of the environment with wind, shadowing, heat wells and so forth, also traffic should be considered as well. Wellington, just reminder, is a dead end street. While the draft requires that new development applications include wind and shadow studies they will not look at the Park as a whole, we need that information to make sure what we are doing in the years ahead is best to preserve the Park as a vibrant green space in the heart of the city. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. Ok. I will go over here.
- Mary Anne Hodge, Woodfield Resident: I am deeply disappointed in the Secondary Plan. I recognize that compromises must be made but as the Plan states Victoria Park is a jewel and a location of civic importance. With this Secondary Plan I fear we are selling off this jewel for private consumption instead of public service. The West Woodfield Heritage Conservation Plan was created to preserve this cultural heritage. As the Secondary Plan agrees that four to five storeys is the predominant height around the Park you would think the Secondary Plan would support the Heritage Plan, instead the Secondary Plan advocates for the construction of some of the tallest buildings in London. I do support the height of development at Wolfe and Wellington Streets, the approval of ground floor occupancies other than retail, the requirements for public site plan review and wind and shadow studies, the addition of rear and side yard setbacks and the setback for the southeast corner development at Wolfe Street, although I would request there be stronger language that would clarify that the alignment is with the predominant building face and not the front edge of the porches but these compromises do not address the number one issue that many of us have and that is the overall height of six to seven high rise building circling the Park, many of which are proposed at 30 to 35 stories high and there are five details I wish to highlight. One, the Secondary Plan was revised to address the concern over the impacts of increased intensification on the wear and tear of the Park grounds, the Plan includes a requirement to "provide on-site indoor and/or outdoor amenity space." I propose we remove the or as allowing the amenity space to be indoor space only does not relieve the pressure on the use of the Park especially due to anticipated increased dog populations. Number two, the 45 degree angle rule that was added to

the revised Secondary Plan speaks to the concern for high-rise development next to low density, which is great. If we have the same concern for the natural heritage of the Park as we do for the residents and the low density neighborhoods then the Park should get the same consideration. If you draw a 45 degrees line from the 10.5 meters elevation above the Park I believe the maximum height of development around the Park would be around 20 storeys. Now I don't advocate for 20 storeys but it is better than 30 to 35. Number three, the Plan says it strives to gradually reduce the building heights along Wellington Street but allowing a 30 storey building to sit next to an eight storey building does not seem gradual to me. Number four, I challenge you to think about a future for City Hall that embraces the idea of a civic square along Wellington Street. City Hall is twelve storeys and I do not think any building along the side of the Park should be taller than City Hall. Number five, parking has also been a source of concern, it sounds to me that the Plan is saying we would prefer parking to be underground but realize that this probably won't happen so as long as we can't see it from the street then aboveground is okay. The Secondary Plan notes that parking underground is "encouraged", without the will or the shall language this request has little weight. If parking is allowed above grade then this should be offset by providing infrastructure and supports to facilitate shared vehicle usage such as car share services like the new Sifton development at West 5. As you know I am a strong advocate for action on the climate emergency and the Secondary Plan makes a point of commenting on how building 30 storey towers helps with the climate emergency. Intensification does make it easier to participate in public transit and active transportation options; however, the reality is often that residents of buildings such as this continue to drive wherever they need to go as public transit is chronically underfunded in London. The Secondary Plan was revised to include a provision to "encourage" covered secure bicycle parking. I would like this wording strengthened to read "will" provide covered storage facilities for securing bicycles for 15% or more of building occupants. Intensification does not mean density at all costs, even five storeys is increased density. We need to protect the green islands we have in our concrete jungle. I therefore request that PEC send this report back to staff to rethink the heights for all proposed development around the Park and incorporate active transportation initiatives that are more than just encouragements. Thank you.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. I just want to remind the Gallery that you will have opposing viewpoints in here so we ask that you not clap or boo or cheer just so that everybody's point of view is respected and nobody feels intimidated from coming to the microphone so I'll go up to the top there.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: (See attached speaking notes.)
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Go ahead sir.
- Bob Morrison, 961 Wellington Street: (See attached speaking notes.)
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Anybody else? Go ahead. State your name and you have five minutes.
- Greg Priamo, Zelinka Priamo Limited: Thank you madam chair. I am representing Great West Life Realty Services which is the residential subsidiary of Canada Life. They own two properties in the study area both at Dufferin and Clarence and at Wellington and Wolfe. We're in a unique situation because we have a piece of property within the study area that we initiated development approvals on prior to the initiation of the Area Plan and we brought forward a site plan application that was nicely previewed by Mr. Stapleton's presentation and we expect it to be coming through to the Planning Committee later this Winter or early Spring. So we've been following the Victoria Park Plan carefully because it has implications for not only what we're doing right now but also we wanted to ensure that we were having regard for what options and opportunities for development the Park Plan could provide. The Park

Plan as it is currently contemplated would have material impact on the approvability of the site plan application that we currently have before staff. The application does not require any amendments to the Zoning By-law, it's a hundred percent in compliance and it is represented by an eighteen-storey terraced building that largely fronts on Wellington Road. We have had the opportunity and we have appreciated the opportunity to discuss the Park Plan with staff from the very beginning of the process through to very recently and we appreciate the efforts that staff have made to respond to some of the concerns or as many of the concerns raised through the public process as possible. However, that being said, in its current form our client would continue to have reservations about whether or not it will deliver the best outcome. In particular, there are a number of regulatory tools that have been inserted in the Plan since the last draft was brought forward which we've only had since Wednesday of last week and we haven't had the opportunity to fully explore the implications for what that might mean for development on both the lands currently owned by Canada Life. That being said, and as a number of the speakers have addressed, this is very complicated process with a lot of varying interests and should the Committee decide to refer this matter back we would continue to engage with staff and provide our input and try to affect an outcome that's consistent with the objectives of the Park Plan but also recognizes our objectives on our clients lands equally as best we can. In the event that it goes forward in its current form it's a document that our client would oppose for the reasons I've identified. Certainly happy to answer any questions that the Committee might have.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you Mr. Priamo. Down at this microphone. Go ahead.
- Kelley McKeating, 29 Victoria Street: (See attached speaking notes.)
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you so much and we could send somebody up to get your notes if you would like your written notes included in the record.
- Kelley McKeating, 29 Victoria Street: I e-mailed them earlier today.
- Councillor Cassidy: Wonderful. Thanks very much. Go ahead sir, your name and then you'll have five minutes.
- Casey Kulchycki, Zelinka Priamo: I'm a planner with Zelinka Priamo Limited. I am here tonight representing the Roman Catholic Diocese of London and their property at St. Peter's Basilica. We provided some late correspondence this morning to the Planning Committee and we're not sure if that got into your package or not but I'm just going to quickly just go over what was in that package. We had provided some correspondence to city staff on the previous drafts of the secondary document and we are a little disappointed that a lot of our concerns that we raised with staff were not addressed in the latest draft and the implications of the potential development on our property. Furthermore, new policies have come to light in this draft that would have further implications on the property and we haven't had the opportunity to fully address those and what those implications are. So we would like to see a deferral back to staff in order for us to fully explore those implications and then to also continue the dialogue with staff on the previous concerns that we have raised. Thank you.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. Go ahead.
- Mike Wallace, Executive Director, London Development Institute: Thank you Madam Chair and thank you Councillors. My office is within this planning area at 562 Wellington Street, I'm not here about my office. As you can see this is actually what the report looks like. We got it on Thursday. I had the pleasure of being with you folks Thursday and Friday for your budget meetings, looking forward to the rest of the week. The fact is that we also would like, as an organization, this referred back to staff. We

have not as a group had an opportunity to look at this final draft that's going to staff. It's not necessarily just about the Victoria Park Secondary Plan but what the implications might be for other Secondary Plans for the city that do affect our organization and the land owners that belong to the LDI. So we have an opportunity as a group to be reviewing this over the next week or two, which we'd be happy to provide you comments and what we think about this and what's its implications might be for other Secondary Plans as they come forward whether they are around other areas within the community that you're hoping to see some redevelopment and development. So we're asking you to send it back and not pass it tonight and give us a chance to give you a proper response. Thank you very much.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. I just want to say that anybody that has written notes that has already spoken or who will speak at some point if you have not sent your comments in, we can take those comments and include them so just if you have something written down and you want us to include it in the record exactly how it is written we can do that. I'll go over here to see if there is anybody else that would like to comment we have two microphones on this side. Not seeing anybody jumping up, over here. Come to the microphone, state your name. Go ahead.
- Janet Hunten, 253 Huron Street: I want to propose, suggest, an alternative way of approaching the heights that might be termed an averaging if one building is select a height, don't ask me how, something in the mid-range. If one building is taller, another one must be shorter and this is what I mean by an averaging and this is the way we appreciate what we look at, not one tall building, not so bad but twenty, not so good so I offer that suggestion.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you very much. Go ahead sir, your name and then you will have five minutes.
- William, 298 Wolfe Street: Just like to, just a personal observation, Mr. Stapleton spoke about his sixteen storeys or whatever, well I'm directly impacted by that. I have a balcony at the back of my apartment which would be submerged in a shadow much much earlier in the day. The grass that we have growing in the backyard would be dead as the trees are now because of the amount of vehicles that occupy the lane way. I'm in a transitional property. In 1982 I transitioned into 296 and I'm now transitioned into 298, all the while improving the property to its historical standard, okay and if there's all this development going on let me tell you I'm going to have a videographer in because the City and the people who do the development are going to pay the price because even when the trucks go by they can damage the structure quite easily, it's 1892. It's still there. I'd like to see it there for another hundred years for people to enjoy. Victoria Park is the gem of our city, it's like a diamond but it's not in the rough and hopefully we don't cover it with coal, okay, by blackening it out with all these huge buildings around it. Council here has an opportunity to protect, okay, ongoing for generations to come that beautiful little Park. It is not, it is not, Central Park in New York. It is not acres and acres, it's a postage stamp and you want to drown it by putting all this shadow and darkness around it. I just don't think it's real. I hope, I hope, that this Council can make the appropriate decision because since I've been here this city, not your fault, but downtown was gorgeous and they turned it into a mausoleum of derelict buildings and neon and people just hanging out. It was thriving, no more. Please make the right decision on Victoria Park it's a gem don't turn it into coal.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you sir. Any other comments? Mr. Brown.
- Gary Brown: Thank you. I'm not going to comment on the height of the buildings whatsoever but I guess one thing I'd like to say is, you know, we seem to be failing on, as a city in general, that interaction between the sidewalk and the pedestrian and the building itself. Like I find that the critical thing that we have to look



at in design. You know the first three stores of your building is parking, guess what I don't want to be next to it. I don't care how high it is, there is nothing there and it's also going to be dangerous for pedestrians coming in and out of the entrance. I haven't seen a single entrance way downtown where that is not the case. We are just not there, we haven't figured it out yet. Other cities have, maybe we should look to there. But the other thing I wanted to comment on has not come up and this has been, well it's a focus of your budget discussions and your five year plans. I know this is a design and an area plan but nobody has talked about the affordability of the core, not one word, not a single word, if this is what's important to us we need to be talking about it. I think we have proposals for buildings downtown and I know that our legs got cut out from under us with the recent changes to the PPS and I understand that but I'm not restricted by the PPS, my comments, so it really doesn't matter but is it not important that the core remain affordable to everybody. I live in a building and in the last five years the rents have doubled, literally doubled. I haven't got twice as much space to live in so the affordability of our city is going down and down and down and I think here is and I don't know if we even have the tools to do it anymore, I know I feel for you because I know how most of you really feel about it, too. But do we not at least have to have the conversation about the affordability of our core, buildings for families, buildings that are affordable for families, you know, and a place to live not just for the rich. Anyhow. Thank you.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Go ahead sir.
- Marcus Coles, 38 Palace Street: What seems to be missed and I agree with a lot of the comments here but when we have these buildings with all these residential units in, we're going to have a lot more traffic down these streets it stands to reason. And those buildings have to feed off these streets, you know, with access to their parking above ground, below ground or whatever and that doesn't seem to be addressed and these streets are going to end up as not wide enough for you know you're going to run into transit problems with conflicts and I don't think this has really been fully addressed. Another thing is just the servicing of the buildings. I don't know how much sewer capacity is around Victoria Park but if you are putting up big buildings you have to service them and I don't know if the City's development funds are going to cover that or what but it seems to be sort of sliding behind below the radar too. Anyway, thank you very much for this opportunity.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you sir. Ok, we have somebody here. So I will go down here first and then the upper mic next. Go ahead.
- Rebecca Francolini, 52 Palace Street: What a memory. Now I know my neighbour. I grew up in Woodfield, I went to Bishop Cronin, I went to Lord Roberts and I went to Central and I have moved back there. My kids went to Beal. I really love my neighborhood but unlike what feels like everybody in this room, I really want the development. I want more people downtown. I want more people in our core and I think that if we build these buildings with families in mind like my neighbor said and talk about affordability and getting families into the core I am so for this. I mean I would love to walk from my home and know that I had part of what was happening in my neighborhood, I mean as we look around Woodfield we see all of these buildings that were probably not given a welcome mat. I mean we all know them, we look at them when we go oh, what is that. But it's now part of our neighborhood and we embrace it just the same so couldn't we possibly come together as a community and decide that more people in our community, welcome them, welcome the new people to our community, the youth that want to live in the core and come up with a solution that would be artistic, embrace architectural features that are in our neighborhood now. So don't have three stories of a glass wall of an apartment building parking complex I don't want that either, could we possibly incorporate some of the gothic columns that we see in our neighborhood. I think there are other ways than just saying no.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Up here at the top.
- Daphne Allen, 520 Wellington Street: I love the view from my balcony of Victoria Park, the sunset, the lights, the skaters. Everybody should have a view like that. I think maybe I have two questions. Number one, how many thirty-story buildings are there in the downtown core of London right now? (*Councillor Cassidy: So what we do is we take the comments and questions and we let everybody have their turn and then whatever comments have come up then staff addresses them all at once*). This is the first time I have ever been here and probably the last. (*Councillor Cassidy: You're doing great.*) If all the Council people can turn to, you probably have it open to 33, I'm not sure if it's 209 or 33, it's the page that has the permitted heights. My question was how many thirty-storey buildings are there in the downtown core London because I'm just new here and after many years. They are building one across and it is fascinating to watch every day. So my question is, if, did anybody say how many there were downtown? (*Councillor Cassidy: We will get you that answer at the end*). Why would the planners, I know you've done a fantastic job on this, on other areas and the only one I complain about is the heights. So I think ten to twelve maximum.
- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you. Any other comments? Anybody else wish to speak? One more time, is there anybody else in the Gallery that would, go ahead.
- Michael Cattrysse, 92 Kent Street: Party to the Official Plan. I can see what is happening with the City of London in the growth and the trajectory of what is happening in the future. There is an opportunity and I think you guys are grabbing the bull by the horns to really take advantage of the potential of what's going to come in the future. London is known as an industrial city, it's been around for two hundred years. I've had an opportunity to really take an organic look at where we came from and where we are now and what seems to be missing is the opportunity for the families, for the seniors, for the new people coming into the city to really root themselves not just in a location to live but also an opportunity to work. Being the industrial city that we came from I'm just curious with all of these buildings that are going around the, the downtown core is it inviting for a lot of new industry to come in. I know one of the buildings is going to be London Life, it's going to bring a lot of jobs into the downtown core which is an opportunity for the new people coming into the city to work. Is there more opportunity coming into the downtown other than just residents? The senior population is going to blossom I guess you could say, in 1946 was the start of the baby boom generation which went on for about twenty-three years so the rate of growth for the next twenty-three years after that went up at a rate of about ten percent to twenty percent per year because of that baby boom. That baby boom as of 2016 for the next twenty-three years is going to amplify the population from twenty percent up to forty percent so taking that into consideration how is that going to affect the growth in the downtown core for the baby boom generation. Is there going to be opportunities for them to move downtown as well or is the target going to be strictly students and the party generation downtown, which I'm not objecting to because I am a young person myself, I love the life, I have a young family that lives downtown. There's a lot of opportunities for all of us. I'm just hoping that in this generation is there an opportunity for paired living environments for the students, for the seniors, for the families organically to live together. High-rises, they are going to go up everywhere. I'm promoting the growth of the downtown as a whole because we need it, we're in desperate need of the accommodations to allow for the baby boom generation, to allow for the growth of the city. I did some renovations in my home. It's quite an old home and what I found unique about the house was everything in my house was manufactured in the City of London, remarkably, all of the piping, the knob and tube wiring, the little diodes, absolutely everything was manufactured in London. Everything that I put into the house, there was absolutely nothing manufactured in London except for me. So just going forward for all of these new buildings and all of the new potential for the city are we organically taking into consideration what this growth potential allows us to do. Are we going to take the

industry that existed and re-introduce it to the city so that we can grow and blossom properly or is it going to be dysfunctional and imbalanced and I think there's an opportunity to take all of these things into consideration moving forward. So in being part of and directly associated with the RRHINO which is the Random Residential High-rise Intensification Narrow Outliner, being an acronym. It's an opportunity to really take into consideration more than what we are considering right now with the Official Plan process, with the consulting that we've already had done. It's an opportunity to take another crystal ball look and alter the trajectory of what we're establishing right now. Like right now we are getting the foundations in, which is important, the momentum is just about to kick off and it's already started and I'm also part of that but we have to consider much more of the residential infill and the balance of the industry versus the residents, what opportunity is there for them moving forward. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

- Councillor Cassidy: Thank you, thanks very much. That was right on five minutes so good job. We have someone over here. Changing seats, sorry. Anybody else who would like to make a comment? We have four open microphones. I'm not seeing anybody jumping up out of their seats, I think we have everyone has commented who wished to comment. So I will ask the Committee to close the public participation meeting.